

An Integrated Approach for the Study of Symbolically Inspired Literature

Ron Shane^{[a],*}; Lauren Kupis^[a]; Alva Liang^[a]

^[a]Department of Theatre, University of California, San Diego, California, USA.

*Corresponding author.

Received 2 July 2015; accepted 10 August 2015
Published online 26 August 2015

Abstract

This paper is an essential work to any individual who is involved in trying to comprehend the literary, creative process. This article represents a bifurcation of literary art in terms of how this kind of creation is either derived from the subconscious of the artist, or represents, in platonic terms, the fusion of self with ineffable mental machinations. Theorists like Coleridge, Karl Jung and Shelley postulated paradigms where literary art was either created purely from the practitioners' subconscious mental activities or were muse-driven to where the artist abandoned all aspects of his or her psychological dynamics. This work is an essential reading for anyone in literary criticism who is interested in the mystical dimensions of sublime creation as well as Neoplatonism. The author creates a theoretical model where visionary artists are capable of a deeper coalescence with subtle energy dynamics which is not understood by conventional neuroscience.

The true man is the source he being the poetic genius... No man can think write or speak from his heart, but he must intend truth... As non by traveling over known lands can find out the unknown, so from already acquired knowledge man could not acquire more. Therefore a universal poetic genius exists... (Blake, 1790, pp.2-3)

No, lead me where some heavenly silence glasses the purer joys.
That rounds the poet throng... (Goethe, 1962, p.45)

The poets eye in a find frenzy rolling,/doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,/and as imagination bodies forth/ the forms of things unknown, the poets pen/ turns them to shapes, and gives to aire nothing a local habitation and a

name./Such tricks hath strong imagination... (Shakespeare, 1952, p.536)

Key words: Visionary poetry; Karl Jung; Shelley; Poetic inspiration; Coleridge; Imagination; Wordsworth

Shane, R., Kupis, L., & Liang, A. (2015). An Integrated Approach for the Study of Symbolically Inspired Literature. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 11(2), 1-14. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/7375> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/7375>

INTRODUCTION

Poets and other artists who "are of the imagination compact" or have the power of visionary genius, aren't typical of the countless numbers of writers and artists throughout the ages who have tried their hand at creating art (Ibid., p.536). In general, the species of poets and writers of any period of history have only managed to imitate or adulate some of the greatest writers. These writers either aren't able or don't attempt in their creations to remove the fetter that bind their sublime imaginations. This class of writers doesn't experience a sense of contrition for not adapting a mode of thinking which results in the release of their precious traces of genius. Goethe, in the following extract, clearly delineates that man possesses two rather distinctive faculties for thinking. Earthly or mundane sensations are apprehended by the first faculty, and the other one is akin or fitted to know the loftier impressions and affections inspired by the human mind.

One impulse art thou conscious of, at best O, never seeks to know the other! Two souls, alas! Reside within my breast, and each withdraws from, and repels, its brother: one to the world is bound in clinging lust, the other soars, all earthly ties unheed, to join ancestral gods, far from this dust, in fields where naught mundane is needed. (Ibid., p.45)

In this passage from the first part of Faust, it is seen how these two human rival powers struggle against each

other. Each of these two varying aspects of the human consciousness, would produce a literary composition that resembles its essential nature. Moreover, literary works significantly differ with respect to the kind of creative force which forms their complex properties. Jung's description of the creative process and Coleridge's discussion of the imagination provides what might be evidence that literature is actually shaped and wrought by either one of the two different forms of the created powers.

1. JUNG'S ARTISTIC CREATIONS

Jung has distinguished two entirely different modes of artistic creations, which were classified by him as "sentimental" art introverted" and "naïve" kind 'extraverted'" (Jung, 1972, p.73). These two categories for differentiating modes of artistic creation were based on Schiller's earlier scheme of classification.

These two different creative patterns were described by Jung as follows:

The introverted attitude is characterized by the subject's assertion of his conscious intentions and aims against the demands of the object... The material is mastered by the conscious intention of the poet. There the poet appears to be the creative process itself, and to create of his own free will without the slightest feeling of compulsion. He may even be fully convinced of his freedom of action and refuse to admit that his work could be anything else than the expression of his will and ability... It is a conscious product shaped and designed to have the effect intended.

Whereas the extraverted attitude is characterized by the subject's subordination to the demands which the object makes upon him. From what I have said, it will be apparent that a shift of psychological standpoint has taken place as soon as one speaks not of the poet as a person but of the creative process that moves him... Poet comes into the picture only as a reacting subject... The consciousness of a poet is not identical with the creative process. The unborn work in the psyche of the artist is a force of nature that achieves its end either with tyrannical might or with the subtle cunning of nature herself, quite regardless of the personal fate of the man who is its vehicle. It is a split-off portion of the psyche, which leads a life of its own outside the hierarchy of consciousness. (Ibid.)

Coleridge's description of the imagination as opposed to fancy parallels Jung's characterization of the extraverted creative pattern as opposed to the introverted type. The imagination was held by Coleridge to be:

The living power and prime agent of all human perception, and as a repetition in the infinite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I am. It is essentially vital. (Coleridge, 1971, pp.283-284)

Coleridge's view of the imaginary faculty is very different from the way he regarded the process of fancy.

Fancy, on the contrary, has no other counters to play with, but fixities and definites. The fancy is indeed no other than a mode of memory emancipated from the order of time and space; and blended with, and modified by that empirical phenomenon of

the will, which we express by the word choice. But equally with the ordinary memory it must receive all its material ready made from the law of association. (Jung, 1972)

Literary works inspired by the fiery furnaces of what Coleridge has called the "imagination" and Jung's notion of the "extraverted attitude," represents the class of composition from which we can infer a knowledge, which is rooted in man's sublime mental regions. Literary compositions produced by the faculty, which Coleridge has labeled as "fancy" or the Jungian concept of "introverted" art, reflect a mode of artistic creation that pictures the pedestrian events which are stored in the outward memories of the artist. This mode of creation typified the majority of literary works that have been produced in the foregoing centuries. A writer who is oriented toward this time of artistic creation is merely "an amasser and combiner of the experience he has discovered in the world" (Ibid.). Conversely, those few artists of the more imaginary tradition can be viewed as "wearing, hidden on his person, fastened to an invisible chain, a golden key with which, as soon as no one was looking, he would open the gate leading into a marvelous garden" (Musil, 1964, p.9).

Literary art created by these two very different creative forces, each with its own distinctive domain of sensibility, has produced two divergent modes of artistic composition. Popular literature of any period merely exhibits the "scabbard" of the sword, while Shelley sees the great masterpieces as being the "swords of lightning, ever unsheathed, which consume the scabbard" (Shelley, 1951, p.505). In the "Defense of Poetry," Shelley extensively delineates the fundamental properties that distinguish these two literary modes. He pejoratively depicts literature of a momentary fancy (literary composition devoid of any attachment to an eternal wisdom and consisting of only a thick raiment) as:

A cold imitation of the form of the great masterpieces of antiquity, divested of all harmonious accompaniment of the kindred arts; and often the very form misunderstood, on a weak attempt to teach certain doctrines, which the writer considers as moral truths; and which are usually no more than specious flatteries of some gross vice or weakness which the author in common with his auditors are infected. (Shelley, 1951, p.505)

This description of literature concerned with the caprice and appetite of the author's historical period was published by Shelley in 1821. His viewpoint may have been influenced by an earlier essay written by Wordsworth. In the later half of the "Essay Supplementary to the Preface of 1815," Wordsworth treats comparatively these two forms of artistic creation. He argues that "superficial" literature or the common form of literary creation, is a distorted form of artistic contemplation, since it lacks those essential deeper visionary qualities of sublime artistic creations. This incomplete mode of literary composition can only represent the surface characteristics of human life. In the following quotation from this essay,

Wordsworth clearly states how insignificant and limited in their scope are these literary works that are framed by the powers of fancy rather than the imagination. Wordsworth's attitude toward the surface form of literature probably at least affected Shelley's later formulization.

The qualities of writing best fitted for eager reception are either such as startle the world into attention by their audacity and extravagance; or they are chiefly of a superficial kind, lying upon the surfaces of manners; or arising out of a selection and arrangement of incidents, by which the mind is kept upon the stretch of curiosity, and the fancy amused without the trouble of thought. (Wordsworth, 1815/1954, p.70)

Both Shelley and Wordsworth views literary compositions formed by the conscious creative process as referring to a sphere of human sensibility which lies below the divine beauty illuminated by the majestic imagination. Instead, they saw this surface kind of art as living in a marketplace with its "noise of the great actors and buzzing of the poisonous flies" (Nietzsche, 1968, p.163). Kathleen Raine, a twentieth century British poet, similarly regards evanescent works of literature as representing only a physical function belonging simply to the hygiene of the human animal, and not to the vision of the beautiful (Raine, 1967, p.106).

Elsewhere in Shelley's essay, he compares these two literary modes of composition in terms of how they vary with respect to universality, beauty, and truth.

A poem is the very image of life expressed in its eternal truth. There is this difference between a story and a poem, that story is a catalogue of detached facts, which have no other connection than time, place, circumstance; cause and effect; the other is the creation of actions according to the unchangeable forms of human nature, as existing in the mind of the creator, which is itself the image of all other minds. The one is partial, and applies only to a definite period of time, and a certain combination of events which can never again recur; the other is universal, and contains within itself the germ of a relation to whatever motives or actions have place in the possible varieties of human nature. Time, which destroys the beauty and the use of the story of particular facts, stripped of the poetry which should invest them, augments that of poetry, and for ever develops new and wonderful applications of the eternal truth which it contains. Hence epitomes have been called the moths of just history: They eat out the poetry of it. A story of particular facts is a mirror which obscures and distorts that which should be beautiful: Poetry is a mirror which makes beautiful that which is distorted. (Shelley, 1951, pp.499-500)

In this passage, Shelley proposes that literature or poetry is composed of two sorts. The first class, is concerned with portraying traditional subjects chosen from everyday life; the incidents that comprise the author's mediations don't extend beyond the knowledge gleaned through his five senses. This type of writer is skimming the surface of his mind, and his eye perceives "nothing useful but what pampers the appetite or fills the purse" (Plotinus, 1969, p.140). Blake acrimoniously speaks of this class of writer as:

Ah weak and wide astray! Ah shut in narrow doleful form,
creeping in reptile flesh upon the bosom of the ground! The eye
of man a little narrow orb, clos'd up and dark, scarcely
beholding the great light, conversing with the void; the ear a
little shell, in small volutions shutting out all melodies and
comprehending only discord – and harmony; the tongue a little
moisture fills, a little food it cloys, a little sound it utters and its
cries are faintly heard, then brings forth moral virtue the cruel
virgin Babylon. (Blake, 1970, p.98)

Blake charges the writer who is a slave to the mundane, with being responsible for retarding or driving away the consciousness of a society from the divine vision or what I have referred to as the second mode of artistic creation. For Blake, this type of writer, by concerning himself only with the surface features of outer reality has closed himself off and the other members of society whose perceptions are affected by reading his works, from the sublime or golden virtues of human experience. Blake emphatically believed that the reign of literature (the arts in general) is responsible and is the primary way for a person to achieve knowledge of the divine vision. This first class of literature and its writers were seen by the nineteenth century English romantic poets as being imprisoned by a pragmatic world view of a "preposterous pig of a world" caught in its mournful inescapable ravine (Yeats, 1957, p.481).

Shelley describes the second class of literature as a form of creation where the writer climbs over the gates of history to gather those deep-seated images of man's universal nature. The ideas of truth or beauty voiced by this type of literature are congenial with the ancient conceptions of neo-platonic philosophy. The seat of beauty or truth for this mode of literary composition is not rooted in the external world: "To see the divine as something external is to be outside of it" (Plotinus, 1956, p.422). But rather the authors of this literary form hold that beauty is grasped by the "vision of the intellectual cosmos" or 'the beauty of the authentic intellect' (Plotinus, 1956, p.422). These artists possess a "melodious harp" that awaits to be struck by the overflowing sense of beauty of their divine imagination (Blake, 1970, p.98). The unseen power floats tho' unseen among us, is the domain which this second class of literature is dedicated to representing, and its authors have proclaimed it to be the only viable source for the arts. (Shelley, 1816/2011, p.366)

Shelley, as with the other romantic poets, defends the view that the truth or beauty embodied in artistic creations wrought from the inspiration of poetic genius, don't wither or fade with the passage of time, as is the case with the literary compositions of the first class. Evanescent artistic works are created by writers who don't consider anything beyond their sensible forms and who allow the attributes of their spatial and time-bound world to only govern their creative thinking. In the foregoing citation, Shelley states that the circumstances and events comprising the subject matter of the non-universal artistic

creations, “distorts” the ecstatic beauty which the artist of the sublime elevates our pining eyes to once again behold.

In this century, Jung in the article *Psychology and Literature*, which was written very late in his life, classifies literary works into two opposing categories. His literary categories are essentially identical to Shelley’s two divergent forms of literary composition. Jung’s scheme of classification only differs from Shelley’s insofar as his description is less poetic or elaborate, and isn’t as sophisticated in its comprehension of the subject. What Shelley referred to in his first class as story, Jung calls “the psychological mode;” and Shelley’s second category of poetry corresponds to what Jung has labeled as the “visionary form.” The following passages from Jung’s article describing his two forms of artistic creation will remarkably resemble what was previously quoted from Shelley’s *Defense of Poetry*.

The psychological mode works with materials drawn from man’s conscious life with crucial experiences, powerful emotions, suffering, passion... and expressed with a power of conviction that gives us a greater depth of human insight by making us vividly aware of those everyday happenings which we tend to evade or to overlook because we perceive them only dully or with a feeling of discomfort. The raw material of this kind of creation is derived from the contents of man’s consciousness... countless literary products belong to this class: All the novels dealing with love, the family milieu, crime and society... whatever artistic form they may take, their contents always derive from the sphere of conscious human experience – from the psychic foreground of life.... (Jung, 1930, pp.89-90)

Conversely, Jung says of the visionary form:

The experience that furnishes the material for artistic expression is no longer familiar. It is something strange that derives its existence from the hinterland of man’s mind, as if it had emerged from an abyss of a prehuman age, or from a super human world of contrasting light and darkness. Sublime, pregnant with meaning, yet chilling the blood with its strangeness, it arises from timeless depths; glamorous, daemonic and grotesque, it bursts as under our human standards of value and aesthetic form, a terrifying tangle of eternal chaos... it can be a revelation whose heights and depths are beyond our fathoming, or a vision of beauty... it is a vision of other worlds... formation transformation eternal mind’s eternal recreation. (Ibid., pp.90-91)

Jung adduced that literary works of his first category spring from mental material lying in the artist’s “personal unconscious.” He defined the personal unconscious as:

The thin layer immediately below the threshold of consciousness (Jung, 1970, p.80)... it is really nothing but the gathering place of forgotten and repressed contents. (Jung, 1930, p.9)

... The personal unconscious is made up essentially of contents which have at one time been conscious but which have disappeared from consciousness through having been forgotten. (Jung, 1936, p.43)

However, the visionary mode of artistic creation is spawned from what Jung calls the “collective unconscious.” Jung differentiates the collective unconscious from the personal unconscious in the following way:

There exists a second psychic system of collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals. This collective consciousness does not develop individually but is inherited... common psyche substrata of supra-personal nature the collective unconscious contents are concerned I would say with primordial types, that is, with universal images that have existed since the remotest times. (Ibid., pp.43-44)

Robert Graves, in his critical review of poetry written throughout the ages, has found that two different strains of literary composition evolved from an earlier original form. What the investigation has revealed appears to be identical to the way in which both Shelley and Jung have differentiated literary works. Numerous other writers and critics have suggested that works of literature cluster or surround one or the other extreme of diametrically opposed classes of literature. As I have already noted, literary composition takes the form of either revealing the beauties and mysteries of the divine universal imagination or it illustrates a charming variability of precepts, events, motives and circumstances deliberately formed by the writer’s conscious mind.

A literary composition possesses the eyes of either the personalized subconscious or eyes of the ubiquitous unconscious Literature generated by the personalized subconscious sees, in the words of D. H. Lawrence, “The cellar in the mind that keeps its own bastard spawn (Lawrence, 1960, p.9). The literature erupting from this part of the mind does not hold in it the light beauty and wisdom inspired by the noble imagination; but instead, brings forth the fleeting brightness of the unprophetic “conscious portions of our nature” or the dressy sensual and pathetic fabrics divested of “the brightest rays of human nature” (Shelley & Baker, 1951, pp.517-525). This type of art is a record of man’s dreary and dross plowings and travels through the earthly mire or his chained pathway. The enchanting isles or the “spirit of beauty, that dost consecrate with thine own hues all thou does shine upon of human thought” is lost to these artistic compositions not formed by the power of the poet’s divine imagination (Shelley, 1816/2011, p.367). Conversely, artistic works produced by the fiery fecundity of the unconscious with its “wings of knowledge and hope” is never lured down to the dust and blood of fierce chaos, but unflinchingly maintains its unfettered “flight into the heaven of time” (Shelley & Baker, 1951, p.509). This type of literary art echoes the invisible sounds and images of “some sublimer world” (“Thy light alone, like mist o’er mountains driven, or music by the night wind sent thro’ strings of some still instrument”), unheard or unseen in the literary compositions shaped from the memories and thoughts of the conscious mind (Shelley, 1816/2011, p.367). D.H. Lawrence forcefully claims that

literature of the unconscious is the true or authentic literary mode.

The sex of which Adam and Eve became conscious derived from the very god who had—they be not conscious of it—it was not spawn produced by secondary propagation from the mental consciousness itself. (Lawrence, 1960, p.9)

Literary works then fall into two distinctive categories. It has been suggested by the writers and critics that I have cited in the preceding pages, that each of these two qualitatively succinct forms of literary composition is created by its own particular mental power, which produces its distinctive and characteristic properties. The truth of this assertion can be demonstrated by perusing invulnerable passages from massive archives of literary works. To illustrate the fact that literary works inspired by the different creative powers of the mind are truly dealing with opposing levels of experience, I will adduce excerpts from the poetry of two English-speaking poets who wrote in the early part of the twentieth century. The following passage to be cited from Yeats' poem, *The Second Coming*, when juxtaposed to Sandburg's poem "Chicago," which he wrote five years earlier, should clearly show how different the poetry that is fashioned by the poet's creative faculty of fancy is from poetry that is inspired by imagination.

In Yeats' poem *The Second Coming*, exemplifies a literary work produced by the creative imagination of the poet.

Turning and turning in the widening gyre,
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the center cannot hold'
Mere anarchy is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity

Surely some revelation is at hand;
Surely the second coming is at hand;
The second coming! Hardly are those words out
When a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi
Troubles my sight... A shape with a lion
Body and the head of a man
A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun...
And what a rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

(Yeats, 1970, pp. 914-915)

In the next extract, the images in the poem "Chicago," were created by Sandburg's conscious mind or derived from the storehouse of his personal memory.

Hog butcher for the world,
Tool maker, stacker of wheat
Player with railroads and the nation's freight handler...
They tell me you are wicked and I believe them,
For I have seen your painted women under
The gas lamps luring the farm boys.
And they tell me you are crooked and
I answer: Yes, it is true I have seen the

Gunman kill and go free to kill again.
And having answered so I turn once
More to those who sneer at this my city,
And I give them back the sneer and say to them...
(Sandburg, 1970, pp. 952-953)

In this poem of Sandburg's, according to the strict laws of meter and metaphor, there is not a series or even single line that actually differs from that of prose. However, in Yeats' *The Second Coming*, even the strictest critic would find, in terms of its meter, a considerable difference between it and prose. The ostensible prosaisms of Sandburg's poem are not so apparent in the lines of Yeats' *The Second Coming*.

The stylistic differences between these two poets aren't of central importance to the current discussion. What is of primary interest is that each of these two poets is shaping their images by utilizing opposing realms of knowledge. Sandburg uses language to drape the sensory impressions received from his previous interactions with the external world. While Yeats employs images that don't literally signify anything experienced or anyway referring to the physical world. His images are clothing impressions that are inspired by the transpersonal imagination. These impressions bear no correspondence to anything that Yeats could have produced out of his personal memory. Yeats tells his audience that the vision, which this poem is addressing, has come to him from his universal memory: "Hardly are those words out when a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi troubles my sight." (Yeats & Eastman, 1970, p.915). In another writing, Yeats defines the Spiritus Mundi, as a form of knowledge like a "Great Memory," which is understood when personal memory is forgotten.

...or Anima Mundi, The Great Memory. Before the mind's eye, whether in sleep or waking, came images that one was to discover presently in some book one had never read and after looking in vain for explanation to current theory of forgotten personal memory, I came to believe in a great memory passing on from generation to generation... (Ibid.).

Yeats' poetry and thinking deals with what he calls "a vast luminous sea" or universal knowledge, that is not learned from the physical world. (Ibid.). Sandburg's poetic thinking would be viewed by Yeats as a form of "daily thought" or like a "line of foam at the shallow edge of a vast luminous sea." (Ibid.).

Without going through numerous other comparisons between the two forms of literary composition, there seems to be justifiable grounds for asserting that literature draws the substance of its impressions either from the writer's personal memory or his unconscious memory. The universal or sublime writers aren't basing their compositions on knowledge that they have personally discerned from their experiences in the outer world, but rather possess the magical key which unlocks the vast storehouse of knowledge of their universal memory. The

ordinary artist of any time period does not know how to or isn't concerned with mining the precious knowledge that awaits him sitting above his conscious memories. This kind of creative person is content, as shown in the preceding passage from the poem "Chicago," to record the experiences of his personal memory as though they were the sole form of knowledge which the artist has at his disposal. Sandburg does not make any reference to anything beyond what I immediately recognizable to his conscious mind through his five senses.

Blake regards any artist whose art is rooted only in the sensory impressions of the five senses and who creates his art exclusively from this type of information, as being unable to raise the dying bones of his human spirit. In the poem "Jerusalem," Blake opens an attack on the more conventional types of artists by asserting that they destroy their loftier imaginations through their unwillingness to subdue the impressions of their personal memories.

The spectre is the reasoning power in man; and when separated from imagination and closing itself as in steel, in ratio of the things of memory. It thence frames laws and moralities to destroy imagination! The divine body, by martyrdoms and wars (Ibid., p.227).

In this excerpt from his poem *Jerusalem*, Blake is suggesting that the mundane form of the imagination shouldn't be separated from the sublime portion. When this occurs, the resulting literary composition reflects this lack of communion with the exalted imagination. Blake regards this form of literary composition as being criminal, when "inspiration deny'd; genius forbidden." (Ibid., p.150). For Blake, artistic creation of a loftier form or true artistic creation employs both the energies of inspiration from the universal memory, and the forming powers of the personal memory. Moreover, literature produced from solely the powers of the lower portion of imagination (fancy) is seen by Blake as being incomplete and false.

Thus far I have shown that literary works qualitatively differ as a function of whether they are a product of an artist's personal memory or universal memory, transpersonal ego or personal ego, or were created by his unconscious impulses or conscious impulses. However, Blake has complicated this simple formula by introducing a unified conception of literature. In actual operation or what actual experience would indicate, this dichotomous way of viewing literary compositions attains a high degree of validity; but in theory, according to Blake's system, this scheme for understanding literary art is a falsification. In Blake's paradigm, literary works break into two contrary forms because the conscious creative energies have separated themselves from the creative forces of the sublime imagination. The acceptance of Blake's theory would mean that the literary works produced by the ordinary artist are to be judged as an abnormal or unnatural phenomenon resulting from a breakdown in a writer's total creative process. While art

spawned by a man's unconscious processes would be viewed as a process of nature, whereby the initial opposition of the creative forces of the consciousness and the unconscious are combined and organized into a stupendous and complete art form. Blake's perspective toward literature was not an isolated position, but has been commonly accepted by certain other poets throughout history. For example, the Romantic poets, Keats and Shelley, regarded the consolidation of the creative process as being necessary for the creation of authentic literature. Plato's dialogue in the "Ion," represents an example of artistic creation which is sudden and effortless, and where the muse of the super-consciousness joins with personal conscious mind to produce a complete and original work. The Romantic poets were familiar with this dialogue of Plato's; Shelley even translated this particular dialogue. Plato describes in this dialogue a holistic creative level which was sought by the Romantic poets and other universal poets, where the conscious-temporal mind is suddenly subordinated and then united to the divine essence of the immortal imagination. From this fantastic occurrence works of genius have resulted.

For the best epic poets, and all such as excel in the composing of any kind of verse to be recited, frame not those their admirable poems from the rules of art; but possessed by the muse, they write from divine inspiration... So these melody poets pen those beautiful songs of theirs only when they are out of their sober minds... No longer draw water, but honey and milk out of the springs and fountains though unable to do anything like it when they are sober. For they assume us, that out of certain gardens a flowery value belonging to the muses, from fountains flowing there with honey, gathering the sweetness of their songs, they bring it to us, like bees... Nor do they tell us any untruth. For a poet is a thing light, and volatile, and sacred; nor is he able to write poetry, till the muse entering into him, he is transported out of himself.... (Plato, 1968, p.412)

Plato's depiction of the prophetic creative experience, is said by him to occur when the artist by natural influence comes into contact with the inflamed and spontaneous overflowing divine wisdom of his universal imagination. And this in turn elates and causes his earthly memory to rise to his universal mind; thereby enabling him to transform his eternal vision into an immortal and beautiful work of art communicable to other men of present and future ages. The most noble poetic inspiration would pass away as suddenly as it came, and there would be no living record of its wisdom or beauty if men didn't possess a conscious creative mind which transposes the firey prophesy of their sublime minds into lines of verse that live forever. However, following the path of thought of this theory of literature, those literary works produced by the creative power of the conscious mind without the gestating power of the faculty of the higher imagination can result only in a mechanical, deformed, hollow, and empty artistic work. This type of art is a mere veil devoid and separated from the beautiful happy climate of the sublime imagination.

Writers of nearly every literary period have discussed the importance of maintaining a methodological viewpoint toward literary creation that is not fragmentary in its nature, but is all-inclusive with respect to literary genesis. Pope saw the “more finished and regular” works of art as being a synthesis of the natural imagination and the characteristics and tincture of the artist’s particular technical capabilities (Pope, 1778, pp.270-272). Abrams interprets Schelling as having purported a theory of literature which saw a holistic work of art as a way of resolving the dialectic between the two opposing systems of knowledge (conscious and unconscious) within man.

In other words, he needs a concept which will close the dialectical circle and resolve the initial opposition by combining both intelligence, and nature, conscious and unconscious,...such a concept Schelling discovers in the activity of genius in producing a work of art; hence he is able to make the triumphant claim that the creative process of imagination is “The general organon of philosophy, and the keystone of its arch”. (Schelling, 1953, p.209)

Schiller expressed the importance of recognizing that genuine art was not solely based on the outpouring of the writer’s unconscious mind, but that the activity of the conscious mind was equally vital for the production of a superior literary composition.

I fear that in their ideas, these idealist-gentlemen take too little notice of experience; in experience, the poet entirely with the unconscious... and poetry, it seems to me, consists precisely in being able to express and communicate that unconscious—i.e., to carry it over into an object... the unconscious united with awareness constitutes the poetic artist. (Schiller, 1953, pp.210-211)

For Wordsworth, if the domain of human sensibility was to be expanded through art, the poet had the responsibility of utilizing the sublime enjoyments of his divine visionary faculty and conjoining it with the more lowly commonplace thoughts and language of his conscious or everyday mind. In his Prospectus to the “Recluse,” Wordsworth states his intentions to wed the powers of the prophetic mind with the contemplations of the common mind.

A gift of genuine insight; that my song with star-like virtue in its place may shine... and if with this I mix more lowly matter; with the thing contemplated, describe the mind and man contemplating; and who, and what he was – the transitory being that beheld this vision; when and where, and how he lived. (Wordsworth, 1814/1949, p.6)

Coleridge’s *Biographia Literaria*, contains many instances in which he argues that authentic literature is a blend of man’s two creative faculties. This work of Coleridge’s can be seen as the Romantic’s theoretical manifesto of literature. It is in this work that Coleridge fully develops and unifies the issues that Wordsworth scantily examined in his critical writings; and also he examines the various problems that pervaded the Germanic Romantic tradition.

In dealing with the problem of man’s conflicting creative impulses, Coleridge does consider them to be irreconcilable at first glance, but he contends also that they must be in a warring state before flowing together into a unified whole.

Each in its excess of strength seems to threaten the extinction of the other... or like two rapid streams, that at their first meeting within narrow and rocky banks mutually strive to repel each other, and intermix reluctantly and in tumult, but soon finding a wider channel and more yielding shores blend, and dilate, and flow on in one current and with one voice. (Coleridge, p.297)

The stupendous power of a literary work for Coleridge can only result when the poet merges the gift of his inspiring genius with the knowledge of his habitual feelings and experiences. Coleridge saw in the following excerpt from the poem of Sir John Davies, an appropriate characterization of the ideal perfection between the two powers of the mind in which a sublime artist is able to attain through the medium of his art.

Thus does she, when from individual states she doth abstract the universal kinds which then re-clothed in divers names and fates steal access through our senses to our minds. (Ibid., p.291)

The ideal work of art, as conceived by Coleridge, occurs when the poet is able to bring “the whole soul of a man into activity,” the loftier imagination subordinates its conscious contrary for the purpose of literary creation. The writer is described by Coleridge as a man that:

Diffuses as a tone, and spirit of unity, that blends, and (as it was) fuses, each into each by that synthetic and magical power, to which we have exclusively appropriated the name of imagination. (Ibid., p.290)

Coleridge attributes the divine imagination of having the capacity of blending together man’s two diverse creative powers into a perfected beatific literary composition. The inferior conscious mind does not possess the capability for this form of synthesis nor is it able to produce a perfected artistic work with the strengths of its own powers. When an artist neglects the wisdom of the divine imagination (as I have discussed throughout this chapter), he is subject in Goethe’s words to the following error.

Thou hast it destroyed,/the beautiful world/with powerful hand/in ruin ‘tis hurled,/by the fist of a demigod shattered!/The scattered/ fragments into void we carry,/deploring beauty lost beyond restoring. (Goethe & Faust, p.92)

Friedrich Nietzsche upbraids Socrates or holds him responsible for causing the bereft and degeneration of artistic creations. He quotes Socrates as having said that “To be beautiful everything must be conscious” (Nietzsche, 1967, p.86). Socrates’ conception of art and beauty is seen by Nietzsche as having eliminated the need for works of art to go beyond the base of its root, and to spring to life the lighter beauty above its stalk. In other words, Nietzsche interprets Socrates as having advocated the divorce of the unconscious or Dionysian creative

power and knowledge from literary creation. Nietzsche himself believed the real truth of art is when no separation exists between the worlds of the unconscious or Dionysian reality and the everyday mundane world. If the artistic phenomenon is to have a redeeming vision, it must mingle “the Apollinian and its opposite the Dionysian” (artistic energies which burst forth from nature herself) (Nietzsche, 1967, p.38).

...In Greek tragedy – at once artist in both dreams and ecstasies; so we may perhaps picture him sinking down in his Dionysian intoxication and mystical self-abnegation, alone and apart from the singing revelers, and we may imagine how, through Apollinian dream-inspiration, his own state, i.e., his oneness with the inmost ground of the world, is revealed to him in a symbolical dream image. (Ibid.)

Perfectibility in an artistic creation holds a hidden enchantment for Nietzsche. He regards a sublime work of art (as did Blake) to be more than just a harmonious blending of man’s two opposing creative principles. The work of genius permits the conscious mind of the artist and his reading public to be elevated to the primal ecstasies and eternal knowledge of the unconscious mind. The fully bloomed work of art serves the conscious mind as a way to universal knowledge or a means of observing the unconscious forces of human experience.

To summarize the first part of this chapter, I have shown in actuality there exist two distinctive modes of literary art. However, the theoretical conception of literary art advanced by certain artists, philosophers, and literary theorists, states that there is actually only one authentic form of literary composition. But the majority of artistic works produced are judged by the adherents of this theoretical position to be deformed or never reaching their full development. This unripened form of literature has been separated and cut off from the nourishing and vital properties of the divine imagination. For these theorists, art of the highest expression uses outer creation as a way of giving a language to the eternal beauty and truth of the world of inward creation. The outward world serves as a set of symbols for making understandable the expressions of the spirit and mind. This idea is expressed more clearly in the words of Emerson:

But this origin of all words that convey a spiritual import, — so conspicuous a fact in history of language, — is our least debt to nature. It is not words only that are emblematic; it is things which are emblematic. Every natural fact is a symbol of some spiritual fact. Every appearance in nature corresponds to some state of the mind, and that state of the mind can only be described by presenting that natural appearance as its picture... as we go back in history, language becomes more picturesque until its infancy, when it is all poetry; or all spiritual facts are represented by natural symbols. (Emerson, 1969, pp.13-14)

The highest form of art as I have described in the preceding pages, occurs when the divine imagination is able to subordinate the powers of the conscious mind to express its supreme beauty and eternal truth. The artist who can reconcile the conflicting creative tendencies

within himself can then produce a supreme and original artist creation. This grand form of art elevates a mundane mind to the remote and prophetic enjoyments of the sublime imagination or allows it to breathe the “finer spirit of all knowledge” (Wordsworth, 1802/2012, p.18). Von Hartmann, in 1868, published his monumental study, *The Philosopher of the Unconscious*. Sociologists have responded torpidly to this and other major tracts like it which have explored and observed the inmost ground of the sublime reality of man’s unconscious mind. In fact, in the twentieth century, the major analytical writings of the sociologists fail to mention or make any allusion to the domain of the unconscious or visionary imagination as having a powerful influence on the outward circumstances of man’s everyday life. This particular study, as I have indicated in the first chapter, will be an attempt to analytically investigate this important but neglected area of research. Literature that has been formed by both the unconscious and conscious creative impulse permits the sociologist to bring his science into a close proximity to this cryptic sphere of human experience in order to begin to systematically observe it. The British Romantic tradition affords the sociologist a convenient stepladder into the regions of human behavior that are outside the range of the methodological techniques that have been employed in the traditional sociological research. Studies like this one and others that may be inspired by it, through the use of artistic works that give the conscious mind a way of seeing into and comprehending man’s unconscious world, will furnish to the theoretical framework of sociology a way for other more traditional theorists to link their empirical theories of man’s variegated patterns of outward behavior with what writers of extraordinary perception have discovered about man’s unconscious life.

In the following section of this chapter, I will be describing the critical tradition which sociologists of literature have developed as their methodological framework for treating artistic or literary phenomenon. This sociological critical tradition does not give the sociologist who wishes to study the sublime literary composition a methodology by which to study that mode of artistic creation. The critical approach adopted by the sociologically minded critic or sociologist at best may be fitted to address the issues and the insights of those works of literature that haven’t been created by a writer who has been able to integrate his two opposing creative forces. These critics have analyzed works of literature that have not been created by writers who utilized the power of the visionary imagination in their literary productions. This type of writer, it will be recalled, creates from the descending levels of his mind, and strays from the permanent beautiful forms of knowledge residing in the uppermost powers of his mind. Thus the current critical method in which sociologists have approached the study of literature isn’t appropriate or suitable for those literary

works that communicate man's internal nature which is usually concealed from everyday thought processes. The nature of this research project, necessitates my moving outside of the guidelines of study established by other sociologists of literature; since I will be examining works of literature that bear little or no resemblance to those artistic creations that have been occupying the attention of literary sociologists in the past. Before initiating that task, however, I will briefly explicate the theoretical positions of the various sociologists and other sociologically minded critics that have developed the sociological perspective for analyzing and understanding the literary phenomenon.

Bruford divides the early theoretical work related to sociologists at best may be fitted to address the issues and the insights of those works of literature that haven't been created by a writer who has been able to integrate his two opposing creative forces. These critics have analyzed works of literature that have not been created by writers who utilized the power of the visionary imagination in their literary productions. This type of writer, it will be recalled, creates from the descending levels of his mind, and strays from the permanent beautiful forms of knowledge residing in the uppermost powers of his mind. Thus the current critical method in which sociologists have approached the study of literature isn't appropriate or suitable for those literary works that communicate man's internal nature which is usually concealed from everyday thought processes. The nature of this research project, necessitates my moving outside of the guidelines of study established by other sociologists of literature; since I will be examining works of literature that bear little or no resemblance to those artistic creations that have been occupying the attention of literary sociologists in the past. Before initiating that task, however, I will briefly explicate the theoretical positions of the various sociologists and other sociologically minded critics that have developed the sociological perspective for analyzing and understanding the literary phenomenon.

Bruford divides the early theoretical work related to the sociological orientation toward literature into five main categories.

a) The sociological conditions of literary creation and influence, subdivided into: (A) the poet and his social standing, (B) the reading public, (C) the agencies mediating between author and public...

b) The history of fame and influence.

c) Tendencies and fashions in taste.

d) Literary criticism and its effect on the public.

e) The literary taste of particular individuals. (Bruford, 1793, p.5)

Recently, Wellek has identified the current scholarly approaches of the sociological tradition. His system of categorization of divides the various approaches that have developed for understanding the relationship between

society and literature into three categories. The first category Wellek enumerates is "the sociology of the writer" and it is concerned with how the writer is affected by the various institutions of society.

There is the sociology of the writer and the profession and institutions of literature, the whole question of the economic basis of literary production, the social provenance and the status of the writer, his social ideology... (Wellek & Warren, 1956, pp.195-196).

Wellek describes his second category as "the problem of the social content, the implications and social purpose of the works of literature themselves" (Ibid., p.96). This category is most characteristic of the theoretical approach taken by the theorists of this tradition. The theorists whose research interests fall within this category are either concerned with viewing how changes within society affect literary styles and content, or the reverse, what are the social implications of literary themes on outward social manifestations and a related concern of these theorists is to determine what insights can literature afford them in their attempts to understand society.

His final category involves "the problem of the audience and actual social influence of literature" or how it affects the individual reader (Ibid., p.96). This discussion will center primarily on Wellek's second category, since it is most reflective of the theoretical efforts of the sociologically oriented theorists.

2. SOCIOLOGY OF THE WRITER

Critics have shown that there is a relationship between a writer's literary style and such social factors as: social provenance, family background, economic position, social status, allegiance and ideology. For example, Marxist critics have undertaken extensive research to assess the relationship between social origins of Russian writers and their literary ideologies. P.N. Sakulin investigated the differences between the literatures of the various economic classes within the Russian society: "The peasants, the small bourgeoisie, the democratic intelligentsia, the déclassé intelligentsia, the bourgeoisie, the aristocracy and the revolutionary proletariat" (Ibid., p.97).

The theorists whose research is reflective of this category, attempt to trace the social status of the writer, his degree of dependence on the ruling class, his economic sources of support and the prestige of the writer in relationship to style and themes of a writer's work.

3. THE PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL CONTENT OF LITERARY WORKS

Tomars has argued that literature isn't a part of a social institution, but is a social institution in itself.

Esthetic institutions are not based upon social institutions: they are not ever part of social institutions: they are social institutions of one type and intimately interconnected with those others. (Ibid., p.94)

For Duncan, the symbolic expression of literature is a “social institution which is concerned with the conservation, efficiency and invention of symbols not simply as means of knowing or believing but as a means for acting” (Duncan, 1961, p.74).

The Marxian literary critics consider literature not to be a separate institution of society, but part of the “cultural superstructure erected, according to the materialist conception of history, on a particular economic and social basis and never free from its influence (Bruford & Strelka, 1973, p.6). Hohle regards Marxian literary sociology to be primarily occupied with ascertaining “the effects of literature on the class struggle” (Hohle, 1966, p.6). Marxian literary scholars pay only scant attention to the aesthetic dimension of literature, as they principally view it to be a phenomenon whose origin lies within the social superstructure (Brang, 1973, p.211).

Marxian literary criticism comprehends the aesthetic attributes of a literary work by reducing them to social economic variables. G. V. Plekhanov, a Russian Marxian theorist, argues that the critic’s major task is “to translate the idea of a particular work of art from the language of art into that of sociology in order to find that which can be designed as the sociological equivalent of a particular literary phenomenon” (Ibid., p.213). For Plekhanov, literary critics should only view literature as an “expression of the strivings and the condition of a given society” (Ibid., p.213). Another Marxian critic, P.S. Kogan, believes that “the dominant forms of economic life” bear a direct determination to the thematic patterns of literary works (Brang, 1973, p.218). The “orthodox reflection theory” evinced by Georg Lukas and Lucien Goldman sees literary production as a reproduction of the economic process (Fugen, 1973, p.263).

In short, the Marxian literary scholar seems to deny the esthetic characteristic of a literary work, since he limits his sphere of analysis to only those attributes contained within the boundaries of his social reality (Ibid., p.262). For the Marxian critic, a literary work is held to be solely a social phenomenon, and there is no difference for him between specific artistic phenomenon and social phenomenon as both are treated by the Marxian critic as if they were the same (Ibid., p.262).

Non-Marxian sociological critics, J.N. Krutch, G. Hicks, Taine, and Whipple regard literature as do the Marxians to be merely a mirror reflection of the socioeconomic conditions within a society (Rudnick & Strelka, 1973, p.271). Wendell’s statement that “literature is the expression of national temper” represents this group’s position toward literature (Ibid.). Kern has investigated the relationship between structural and thematic tendencies of a literary work “to certain groups,

classes, generations, professions, religious sects, parties, geographic regions (Ibid., p.274).

Literary style is understood by Kavolis to be a product of the prevailing economic or political forces of a particular society or “as an expression of particular factors within that society” (Ibid.).

According to C. Borra, the formal structure and genre of poetry is shaped by the prevalent political ideology within a social community. Another important view of this group is that the mainstream values of the bourgeois or middle class are expressed through the literary genre of the novel. H. Levin sees the role of the novel in society more broadly, as he believes that the novel in society more broadly, as he believes that the novel barometrically records any sociological developments. W. J. Havey, Alan Friedman and J. H. Raleigh share the view that “the novel depicts a developmental process combined with a mimetic reproduction of the reality of experience as it is generated by the particular environment” (Ibid., p.277).

These non-Marxian sociologically oriented critics confine themselves to understand literature through establishing its correspondence with the various aspects of society. However, two sociologically oriented critics, Leo Lowenthal and Lewis Coser, have inverted the relationship between sociology and literature. They have employed the acumen of literary artists to serve as the principal “indicators of the socio-psychological characteristics of the multitude” (Lowenthal, 1961, p.x). These critics have looked to literature as a primary means of understanding society, rather than observing it as a secondary source of information. Lowenthal stresses the importance of literature for providing the “diagnostic tools for studying man in contemporary society” (Ibid., p.xii).

Great works of literature enable us to study the way in which people live out their social roles. Direct social observation and the portraits of social types in literature speak for themselves; they are what many people have in mind... Indeed, it is often precisely where a writer thinks he is discovering immutable truths about human nature that we can see the process of social change at work most clearly. Analyses of such works can reveal, in other words, those central problems with which man has been concerned at various times, permitting us to develop an image of a given society in terms of the individuals who compose it. (Ibid., pp.xii, xiv, xv)

For Lowenthal, the extreme sensitivity of literary content enables it to illuminate these elements of the modern state which has been neglected by modern sociological theory. In other words, Lowenthal considers literature to be like a living fountain that produces original and innovative insights into man’s social reality.

4. LITERATURE INFLUENCE ON ITS AUDIENCE

Duncan has defined two separate dimensions to explain the effects of the institution of literature on the members

of society. In the first dimension which Duncan labels “magical art,” the reader is inspired “to practical actions held desirable within institutions controlling a society” (Duncan, 1961, p.20). Popular literature is then serving the purpose of transmitting the goals and paths requisite for success to the individual members of society, by symbolically enabling its reader to feel what it is like to be successful (Ibid.). Duncan suggests that literature achieves its instructive influence on a reader in a way that is similar to a “pep talk.”

A “pep talk” before a department store sale makes those who take part more confident of selling. As I read a success story, I become charged with greater courage, faith, and hope for success, because as I read, far from escaping competition, I compete on a symbolic level under conditions where ends of competition are clear, and above all, people do become successful when they act in terms of these rules. (Duncan, 1961, p.21)

Duncan refers to his second dimension of literary influence as “make believe” which offers the reader a means of dissipating certain emotions, if developed into action would be a threat to those in control of the society (Ibid., p.42). This form of literary influence allows the reader to “express horrible desires in make-believe so that they will release the energy which might find bad or ugly expression in real life” (Ibid., p.43). The reader of this “wish-book” category of literature can purge himself of emotions and desires that should not find any other channels of expression.

The scholarly research stemming from the sociological critical orientation toward literature is typified by its emphasis on the analysis of the social qualities that are embodied within a literary work. The various extrinsic methods employed by critics of the sociological tradition, which I have reviewed, interpret literature in terms of the particular properties of a given social context. However, critics and literary theorists outside the sociological methodological tradition have vociferously assailed the scholar whose research fails to consider a literary work as something other than a showcase of dominant attitudes and values held within a society.

Hyman suggests that the research contributions of the sociologically oriented critic are greatly mitigated by this blindness to literary values; and his methodological approach to literature “is a weapon with which to kill poetry” (Bruford & Strelka, 1973, p.7). Seeing literary works “only as a means of understanding society,” writes Paul Ramsey, “is an offence verging on the criminal...” (Ramsey, 1973, p.21). Similarly, Christopher Caudwell points out “that purely economic and social approaches” to literature can only touch a small segment of the spectrum to be investigated by a serious critic who attempts to do justice to an artwork” (Rudnick & Strelka, 1973, p.270). Kuhn argues that “literature transcends the social reality that affects it or that serves as its material” (Fugen & Strekla, 1973, p.255). Even the “current

sociological typologic concepts,” used by the scholars of the sociological tradition is seen by Hauser, “as inadequately differentiated to allow for relevant comprehension of the variety of artistic conceptions and objectives” (Ibid.).

The critical attacks that have been waged against the sociologically oriented critic, hold their veracity only for those literary creations which are steeped with the magnificence of the universal imagination. The sociological critical method is indeed suitable for examining works of literature that are created from the conscious personal experiences of an artist. The aforementioned assailments of the critical position of the literary sociologist are then not valid when his literary treatment is directed towards literary productions whose scope is limited to man’s conscious mind. But non-sociologically oriented scholars’ attack on the sociologist is solidly valid when or if the social researcher examines an artistic creation that emerges from the deep spring of the universal mind.

When the literary sociologist explains all literature as only something caused by environmental and social determinants, or as having a major connection to a certain historical period or a current social context, he is subject to the derisive charges brought against him by other critics. But the non-sociologically oriented critic’s debasing commentary of the critical approach of the sociologist isn’t justifiable when the social researcher concentrates his critical examination on those literary works whose scope is commensurate with his perspective. In other words, the critical theory of the sociologist himself does not recognize the two diverse forms of literary composition. The literary sociologist regards all literature as being only a product of the writer’s conscious creative mind or based upon certain social and political determinants of his particular cultural setting. He buries those works of literature of a visionary light under the rubric of literary creations which reflect man’s everyday world. If a sociologist is to analyze and examine literary art that apprehends man’s unconscious domain, he must adopt a methodology which is not restrictive in the tenets of the traditional literary methodology that is employed by the theorists of his discipline. In this study, I will be treating works of literary art that doesn’t fit into the scope of traditional sociological critical perspective. I am therefore compelled to depart from the methodological framework of the scholars of my field in order to enlarge their methodology; whereby it will be able to critically examine literary art created by man’s highest imagination, and won’t be as likely to fall prey to the upbraiding by scholars in other disciplinary fields.

My modified sociological methodological position, in comparison to the more restricting traditional form, sees certain works of literature as not being correspondent to and as lying outside the writer’s time-bound

consciousness. Those works of literary art that are resonances of the divine imagination are viewed as being separate and beyond the thoroughfare of the writer's everyday experience. The symbol of cultural sensibility is acknowledged as being subordinate to the writer's timeless hidden symbols embodied in his divine intellect. The ineffable beauty and truth voiced by the writer's universal mind cannot be apprehended or understood by the weighty scientific theorems of the traditional sociologist. For this form of literature, the sociologist as argued by Paul Ramsey has "to enter imaginatively into the spirit of what is described or one does not understand it." (Ramsey & Strelka, 1973, p.23)

It is now a truism of anthropology that the anthropologist who sees only as an outsider does not see, that the observer who thinks a religious ritual is merely inefficient technology does not understand and hence cannot accurately describe or interpret that ritual. What is true of at least some sociology and anthropology is true of every literary work: Not to enter it imaginatively and responsively is not to understand it. (Ibid.)

In this modified sociological literary method, the sociologist should enter the sphere or a sublime literary work with only those concepts and criteria that won't burden his passage through its delicate chambers by being grounded in the traditional theories of social reality. If the sociologist brings the concepts of traditional sociology to analyze a literary work of the unconscious mind, he would be likely to blight or dismiss the essential nature of this form of literary art by placing gloomy and drab garments over its splendid beauty. Jung warns the psychologist and sociologist when attempting to examine literary art sprung from the divine imagination, that the social scientific researcher must suspend or leave behind his theoretical structures; otherwise, he will drive away the golden strength and knowledge embodied in that form of literary art.

Since this kind of analysis is in no way concerned with the work of art itself, but strives like a mole to bury itself in the dirt as speedily as possible, it always ends up in the common earth that unites all mankind. Hence its explanations have the same tedious monotony as the recitals which one daily hears in the consulting rooms. It strips the work of art of its shimmering robes and exposes the nakedness and drabness of homo-sapiens, to which species the poet and artist also belong. The golden gleam of artistic creation — the original object of discussion -- is extinguished as soon as we apply to it the same corrosive method which we use in analyzing the fantasies of hysteria. The results are no doubt very interesting and may perhaps have the same kind of scientific value as, for instance, a postmortem examination of the brain of Nietzsche, which might conceivably show us the particular atypical form of paralysis from which he died. But what would this have to do with Zarathustra? Whatever its subterranean background may have been, is it not a whole world in itself, beyond the human, all-too-human imperfections, beyond-the-world of migraine and cerebral atrophy? (Jung, 1972, pp.68-69)

This revised sociological literary theory that I am forming insists that the sociologist when reviewing

literary art of the universal imagination, must suspend his distance or separation from the object of his investigation, and most importantly the theorems and constructs comprising the framework of his discipline has to be temporarily suspended from his mind in order for him to fully comprehend the radiant vision held within the treasured words of this form of literary art. For those artistic works that soar beyond the everyday concerns of reality, pursuing its sociological properties will only offer the sociologist informative background material or insights into the circumstances surrounding its creation; but will not furnish him with the necessary knowledge contained within the internal nature of this type of literary work. The sociologist who wishes to examine the "invisible nature of man" curtained within the metrical arrangements of the poet's language has to intellectually act in a way that is contradictory to the theoretical position established by the scholars of his discipline if he is to advance sociology's knowledge of this subject (Ibid., pp.68-69).

The sociologist, if he is to be instructed and truthfully informed by immortal literary art, is going to have to bring himself to see this type of literature with the same subtle sagaciousness which Shelley evinces in the following passage.

But a poet considers the vices of his contemporaries as a temporary dress in which his creations must be arrayed, and which cover without concealing the eternal proportion, of their beauty. An epic of dramatic personage is understood to wear them around his soul, as he may wear the ancient armor or the modern uniform around his body; whilst it is easy to conceive a dress more graceful than either. The beauty of the internal nature cannot be so far concealed by its accidental vesture, but that the spirit of its form shall communicate itself to the very disguise and indicate the shape it hides by the manner in which it is worn. A majestic form and graceful motions will express themselves through the most barbarous and tasteless costume... It is doubtful whether the alloy of costume, habit, and etc. be not necessary to temper this planetary music for mortal ears. (Shelley & Baker, 1951, p.497)

When the sociologist reviews art created from the universal mind, he must consider both its internal wisdom and its outer covering or dress. For the sociologist to only study the "costume that gently swathes the heart of the poetic" is not to grasp the works of literary genius adequately and completely (Ibid., p.501). The sociologist must come to realize that sublime literary art is a symbolic whole and should be comprehended in its totality, if its fountains of wisdom are to be seen. When the sociologist insists on examining only one certain level of a timeless work of literature, he is then responsible for decapitating its other various levels that need to be seen before the totality of its symbolic visionary meaning can be recognized. Kathleen Raine stresses the importance of seeing the multiple levels of a literary work in order to apprehend it as a meaningful representation of man's hidden and mythic world.

CONCLUSION

Literary works which spring from the writer's "imperial faculty" do not express only a relationship between elements on any "one level of the real," but rather "of multiple levels one with another" or a harmonious order amongst its various levels (Raine, 1967, p.147). Coleridge described this working relationship between the temporal outer costume of a literary work and its eternal properties as "the translucence of the eternal through and in the temporal" (Coleridge, pp.103-104).

By my modification and broadening these conceptions of which have dominated the thinking of literary sociologists, I will not be able to work within a methodological paradigm that will allow me to render works of literature that were formerly incomprehensible to the theories and language of sociology, intelligible to the theorists of this discipline. The radiant perspicuity shining brightly from the mythic literary form, can now be examined and analyzed by a sociologist, in order to make its knowledge communicable to the sociological scholar. I hope that this expanding of the sociological literary theory will reach other sociologists studying literature, so that the calamitous treatment of literature that has characterized former attempts by literary social theorists can now be something of a blighted past; and the studies to follow, the literary sociologist will be equipped to apprehend the harmonious totality of mythic literary creations and communicate his discoveries and findings to the discipline of sociology.

REFERENCES

- Blake, W. (1970). All religions are one. In Erdman (Ed.), *Poetry and prose of William Blake* (pp.2-3). New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Blake, W. (1970). *Jerusalem: Chap.III* (p.227). New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Blake, W. (1970). *Jerusalem: Chap.I* (p.150). New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Blake, W. (1970). *Milton: Book I* (p.98). New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Brang, P., & Strelka, J. (Ed.). (1973). Sociological methods in twentieth-century. *Russian literary criticism* (p.211). The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Bruford, W., & Strelka, J. (1973). "Literary criticism and sociology," *literary criticism and sociology* (p.5). Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Coleridge, S. (n.d.). *The statesman's manual* (pp.103-104). In K. Coburn (Ed.). *Inquiring Spirit*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Coleridge, S., & Schneider, E. (Ed.). (1971). *Biographia literaria. Selected poetry and prose* (pp.283-284). San Francisco: Rinehart Press.
- Duncan, H. A. (1961). *Language and literature* (p.74). New York: Bedminster Press.
- Emerson, R. W., & Cook, R. (Ed.). (1969). "Nature." *Selected prose and poetry* (pp.13-14). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Friedrich von Schiller, J., & Abrams, M. H. (Ed.). (1953). "A letter of July 26, 1800," *the mirror and the lamp* (pp.210-211). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fugen, H. H., & Strelka, J. (Ed.). (1973). *Literary Criticism and Sociology in Germany. Literary Criticism and Sociology* (p.263). The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Goethe, J. W., & Atkinds, S. (1962). *Faust: Part I* (p.45). In S. Atkinds (Trans.). New York: Collier Books.
- Hohle, T. (1966). *Problems einen marxistischen literatursoziologie* (p.477). Wissenschaftliche Zeitung der Universitate Halle.
- Jung, C. G. (1972). *The integration of the personality: Archetypes of the collective unconscious* (p.9). In W. S. Dell (Trans.). Zurich: Rascher.
- Jung, C. G. (1930). *Psychology and literature: An international quarterly for creative experiment* (pp.89-90). In W. S. Dell (Trans.). Zurich: Rascher.
- Jung, C. G. (1972). On the relation of analytical psychology to poetry. In H. Baynes (Trans.). *British Journal of Psychology*, 73.
- Jung, C. G. (1936). The concept of the collective unconscious. *Journal of St. Bartholomew's Hospital (London)*, XLIV.
- Lawrence, D. H. (1960). *Psychoanalysis and the unconscious* (p.9). New York: Viking Press.
- Lowenthal, L. (1961). *Literature, popular culture, and society*. (p.x), x.
- Musil, R. (1964). *Young torless* (p.9). In E. Wilins (Trans.). New York: Signet Classic.
- Nietzsche, F. (1967). *The birth of tragedy* (p.86). In W. Kaufmann (Trans.). New York: Viking Press.
- Nietzsche F., & Kauffman, W. (1968). *Thus spoke Zarthustra* (p.163). In W. Kauffman (Trans.). New York: Viking Press.
- Plato, R. K. (Ed.). (1968). "Ion" in *blake and tradition* (Vol. I, p.412). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Plotinus, (1956). *The Enneads* (p.422). In S. MacKenna (Trans.). London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Plotinus, R., K. (Ed.). (1969). *Concerning the beautiful* (p.140). In T. Taylor, T. Taylor, & the Platonist (Trans.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pope, A. (1778). *Preface to works of Shakespeare* (270-272). London.
- Raine, K. (1967). *Defending ancient springs* (p.106). London: Oxford University Press.
- Ramsey, P., & Strelka, J. (Eds.). (1973). "Literary criticism and sociology," *literary criticism and sociology* (p.21). The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Rudnick, H. H., & Strelka, J. (Ed.). (1973). Recent British and American study concerning theories of a sociology of literature. *Literary Criticism and Sociology* (p.271). The Pennsylvania State University Press.

- Sandburg, C., & Eastman, A. (Eds.). (1970). *The norton anthology of poetry* (pp.952-953). Chicago, New York: W.W Norton and Company, Inc.
- Schelling, F. (1953). *System des trascendentalon idealismus: The mirror and the lamp* (p.209). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, W., & Harrison, H. (Eds.). (1952). "A midsummer night's dream," *Shakespeare: The complete works* (p.536). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Shelley, P., & Baker, C. (Eds.). (1951). *Defense of poetry, selected poetry and prose of shelley* (p.505). New York: Modern Library.
- Shelley, B. B. (1816/2011). *Hymn to intellectual beauty*. In Nicholson & Lee (Eds.). New York: Modern Library.
- Warren, A., & Wellek, R. (1956). *Theory of literature* (pp.195-196). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company.
- Wellek, R., & Warren, A. (1956). *Theory of literature*. New York: Harest.
- Wordsworth, W. (1815/1954). The prelude: Selected poems and sonnets. In C. Baker (Eds.). *Essay supplementary to the preface of 1815* (p.70). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Wordsworth, W. (1814/1949). *The poetical works of William Wordsworth* (p.6). In E. Selincourt (Eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wordsworth, W. (1802/2012). *Preface to Lyrical Ballads* (p.18). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Yeats, W. B., & Allt, P. (Eds.). (1957). *Blood and the moon: The variorium edition of poems* (p.481). New York: MacMillan Company.
- Yeats, W. B., & Eastman, A. (Eds.). (1970). *The norton anthology of poetry: The second coming* (pp.914-915). New York: W.W Norton and Company, Inc.