



16142856

ENLARGING IRISH HATE: THE OBJECTS AND USES
OF YEATSIAN HATE

presented to the

Faculty of Arts
University College Dublin

for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

for

Professor Augustine Martin
Department of Anglo-Irish
Literature & Drama,
University College,
Dublin

Joseph M. Hassett
October 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Foreward	1
Chapter I -- "All Hated Whiggery": The Fundamental Opposition Between Locke's Empiricism And Yeats's Theory of Poetic Inspiration	5
Chapter II -- "A Kind of Frenzied Hatred Which is Quite Out Of My Control": Hatred as the Impulse to Create	36
Chapter III -- <u>Per Amica Silentia Lunae</u> And The Self- Distrusting Poems: Inspiration That Arrives "The Moment I Cease To Hate"	66
Chapter IV -- Sibylline Frenzy Blind: <u>Saeva Indignatio</u> As Gateway To The Wisdom Of The Dead	92
Chapter V -- "An Intellectual Hatred Is The Worst": The Fall, The Antinomies And Abstract Ideas	123
Chapter VI -- Sexual Love and Spiritual Hate: The Antinomies Resolved in the Beatific Vision	149
Chapter VII -- "Hatred of God May Bring the Soul to God": Yeatsian Hatred as Gnostic Virtue	175
Chapter VIII -- Objects Of A Hatred That Seeks Its Own Infinity: Materialism And The Idea Of Progress	192
Chapter IX -- "The Purging Away of Our Civilization By Our Hatred": History As Catastrophe	215
Conclusion	243
Footnotes	251
Abbreviations	310
Bibliography	311

Foreward

"Why should I seek for love or study it?"^{1/} Yeats's challenging question exemplifies his departure from the poet's traditional role as lover. Hate is Yeats's passion of preference -- so much so that when he dreamed of his goals as a poet, he "dreamed of enlarging Irish hate".^{2/} The work is true to the dream. Yeats's letters and essays bristle with a hatred that is never far beneath the taut surface of his poetry. The sheer scope and intensity of Yeatsian hate is breathtaking, and more than a little puzzling.

The range of hated objects extends from the deeply personal to the purely philosophical; from Maud Gonne, who "taught me hate/By kisses to a clown",^{3/} to John Locke, whose doctrine of abstract ideas earned the enmity of two Yeatsian favorites, Blake, from whom Yeats had "learned to hate all abstraction",^{4/} and Swift, who personified "Irish hatred of abstraction."^{5/}

The conjunction of Blake and Swift is revealing. However unlikely a pair in other respects, they shared with Yeats a predilection for the vigorous articulation of strongly felt hate. Blake was Yeats's mentor as an exponent of "enthusiastic hatred".^{6/} Swift, as Dubliner Owen Aherne remarks in "The Tables of the Law", "made a soul for the gentlemen of this city by hating his neighbor as himself."^{7/}

Yeats liked to think of himself as haunted by savagely indignant Swift, and, believing that all movements are held together more by what they hate than what they love, made it his poetic business to "hate great and lasting things".^{8/}

The enemies of his movement cover the gamut of modern thought. They included Huxley and Tyndall, whom he "detested":^{9/} they had deprived him of the "simple-minded" religion of his childhood, and epitomized Victorian science, a discipline he "had grown to hate with a monkish hate".^{10/}

In the drama, there was Ibsen's A Doll's House ("I hated the play"^{11/}). As to literature, "I hated, and still hate with an ever growing hatred, the literature of the point of view."^{12/}

In short, the time was out of joint. The era into which Yeats was born excited in him "a vague hatred".^{13/} To hurry a better future he could only "intensify my hatred".^{14/} Like his mask Ribh, who shunned the study of love, but "stud[ie]d hatred with great diligence",^{15/} Yeats was sometimes a victim of hate, often its celebrant, and always its student.

This overwhelming preoccupation with hate all but cries out to be examined, and understood. At a minimum, analysis of the objects of Yeatsian hate is likely to reveal what it was they challenged in the poet's thinking, thus shedding light on those aspects of Yeats's thought he guarded most jealously. For example, as considered in Chapter I, Yeats's antipathy for Locke highlights the importance of his own

belief in the power of the poetic imagination and his commitment to the poet's sacred duty to use the transforming power of imagination, as Blake enjoined, to restore the unfallen world.

Moreover, study of the precise role played by hate in Yeats's creative process shows how Yeats used his hate to penetrate the uncharted depths of his own mind in search of the primordial instinct, myth and emotion that would unite his mind with all minds -- a process that Jung would ultimately describe as a healing of the split between the conscious and the collective unconscious. Blake called the same task the restoration of the unfallen world. Yeats himself would say that, in those precious moments of union between "the sleeping and waking mind",^{16/} he achieved that ever-so-elusive desideratum, "unity of being". Chapters II and III, in particular, inquire into the role of hate in Yeats's creative process. If nothing else, such inquiry clarifies the distinction between what Eliot called "personal spleen" and the "significant emotion . . . which has its life in the poem and not in the history of the poet",^{17/} thus liberating the reader's appreciation of the poetry from his reaction to the personal spleen.

The ultimate value of an inquiry into Yeatsian hate must be measured in terms of the extent to which it contributes to understanding and appreciation of the poetry.

The remaining chapters consider ways in which Yeats's pre-occupation with hate illuminates particular poems and poetic themes. Among the matters considered are Yeats's cultivation of Swiftian indignation as a source of poetic knowledge and power, his variations on Blake's theme that sexual love is founded on spiritual hate, Gnostic Ribh's belief that "Hatred of God may bring the soul to God", the message of Yeats's "communicators" that the Beatific Vision "comes from being free of Hatred", and Yeats's prayer for himself and his daughter that, "all hatred driven hence," the soul might recover "radical innocence".

A foreward is necessarily sketchy -- not the place to address the large questions of the wisdom or desirability of a poetics based so heavily on so dangerous an emotion. The broad outline sketched here adumbrates a portrait of Yeatsian hate as a force of enormous power, the articulation of which was often, but not always, its purgation.

I

"All Hated Whiggery": The Fundamental
Opposition Between Locke's Empiricism
And Yeats's Theory of Poetic Inspiration

In 1916 Yeats set about acquiring his tower, Thoor Ballylee.^{1/} Seven years later, Carl Jung began constructing a tower on the lake above Zurich at Bollingen.^{2/} Jung sensed the presence of his ancestors congregating about his tower. He believed that their souls were sustained by the atmosphere of his tower because he had confronted in his life questions that his ancestors had left unanswered in theirs.^{3/}

Meanwhile, at Thoor Ballylee, Yeats was creating his own ancestry, and summoning his ancestral spirits with a series of declarations. In rapid succession, he declared that "this tower is my symbol", that its winding stair is "my ancestral stair", and "That Goldsmith and the Dean, Berkeley and Burke have travelled there."^{4/} Yeats's work in the years after he acquired the tower is true to these declarations: it reflects his search for an hereditary affinity with those "four great minds"^{5/} of the "one Irish century that escaped from darkness".^{6/} Yeats finds his link in "The Seven Sages".^{7/} Significantly, the bond that unites him with the four great minds is a shared hatred: they all hated the thought of John Locke, an outlook Yeats capsulized as "Whiggery":

All hated Whiggery, but what is Whiggery?
A leveling, rancorous, rational sort of mind
That never looked out of the eye of a saint
Or out of drunkard's eye.^{8/}

Locke's "rational sort of mind" was fundamentally opposed to Yeats's belief that the poet, like the drunkard

and the saint, could experience inspiration, a breath of wisdom from sources other than the operation of the senses on the rational mind. Yeats would have had no trouble agreeing with tower-dwelling Jung that Locke's "disastrous" idea that the mind is born a tabula rasa and "that everything comes to the human psyche from the outside" contributed to the modern world's impaired capacity for introspection and its consequent need for the inspiration of poets.^{9/} Although Yeats and Jung were unaware of the parallelism in their thought,^{10/} this uncommunicated harmony, symbolized by their parallel towers, is itself a tantalizing challenge to Lockean empiricism.

It is characteristic of Yeats that his reaction to Locke took the form of hatred, a reaction so intense that when he read Wyndham Lewis's assertion of the primacy of mind over the flow of Lockean sensation in Time and Western Man, he felt that Lewis had "found an expression for my hatred -- a hatred that being half dumb has half poisoned me."^{11/} Yeats's autobiographical hints as to the origins of his hatred are considered in Chapters II and III. Whatever its source, the hatred serves two purposes. First, it enhances Yeats's sense of alliance and continuity with his new-found ancestors: he will resolve questions they left unanswered. Second, it stirs him to create - so much so that he confesses that his ideal form of expression is most nearly approximated

when he writes out of "the greatest possible amount of hereditary thought and feeling", particularly ancestral "hatred and pride".^{12/} Examination of those aspects of Locke's thought that Yeats found worthy of hate is thus likely both to illuminate the content of Yeats's theory of poetic inspiration, and to provide background for examining the process by which Yeats converted hate into creative energy.

Locke and Yeats are fundamentally opposed from the start. Locke began his philosophy in the tradition of Descartes, separating the thinking mind from the world outside the mind. Yeats, famously, was the partisan of Locke's first great critic, Berkeley, who healed the Cartesian split between mind and reality by putting the world into the mind. Locke, faced with a split between the knower and the known, was bound to ask himself the question that, he said, occurs to every man with respect to the ideas that go through his mind: "How comes he by them?"^{13/} Locke's answer was simple: "To this I answer, in one word, from EXPERIENCE", by which he meant sense data about the external world and the mind's reflection thereon.^{14/}

Locke's one-word answer rejected the doctrine of innate ideas, gave birth to empiricism, and earned the enmity of Yeats, who had convinced himself that ideas enter the mind without

passing through the senses, and that, when a poet speaks, "some knowledge or power has come into his mind from beyond his mind".^{15/} Moreover, when Yeats set out to create poetry he had no use for the rationally-measured sense data of Locke: "I wanted the strongest passions, passions that had nothing to do with observation" ^{16/} Yeats's passions were the motive power of creative imagination, a notion foreign to Locke's view that, in perceiving simple ideas about the world, the mind is "merely passive", reflecting the external world like a mirror.^{17/} For Yeats, the poetic imagination must fashion the world, "the mirror turn lamp".^{18/} If, as such contemporary historians as James Engell now suggest, Locke's doctrine of the fusion of simple ideas into complex ideas was a "primordial form" of the concept of "productive, as opposed to reproductive, imagination",^{19/} it was not so recognized by Yeats or, for that matter, by Coleridge and Blake who, as with the Romantic critique of Locke generally, saw Locke as the enemy of creative imagination.^{20/}

Locke was again the enemy when he conceded that knowledge of the world cannot, in the nature of things, attain to certainty. Yeats's longing for certain knowledge about the spiritual world was a quest that the naturally "religious"^{21/} poet began early in life and never abandoned. He retained the most vivid recollection that, as a child in Sligo, "my father's unbelief . . . set me thinking about the evidences of religion

and I weighed the matter perpetually with great anxiety, for I did not think I could live without religion."^{22/} Most of the pursuits and preoccupations of Yeats's life were one form or another of weighing "the evidences of religion" in search of knowledge of a spiritual world lying behind the material world of sense impression. Toward the end of his life, he was still searching. Writing in 1938, he proclaimed:

I am convinced that in two or three generations it will become generally known that the mechanical theory has no reality, that the natural and supernatural are knit together, that to escape a dangerous fanaticism we must study a new science[.]^{23/}

The new science he hoped for was one that would yield knowledge of the spiritual world of such devastating certainty as to overcome the unbelief of his father, Locke, and the nineteenth century. An 1890 letter to Katherine Tynan shows Yeats's longing for evidences of certain knowledge of the spiritual world with which to confound his "enemy", materialism. He tells of "experiments in which a needle suspended from a silk thread under a glass case has moved to and fro and round in answer to my will, and the will of one or two others who have tried, no one touching the glass; some experiments too of still stranger nature."^{24/} He explains that:

Probably if I decide to publish these things I shall get called all sorts of names - imposter, liar and the rest - for in this way does official science carry on its trade. But you do not care for magic and its fortunes and yet your Church's

enemy is also materialism. To prove the action of man's will, man's soul, outside his body would bring down the whole thing - crash - at least for all who believed one; but, then, who would believe? Maybe my witnesses, more prudent than I, shall bid me remain silent.25/

Before Yeats publishes, he wants to know for sure.

This ardent longing took cold comfort from Locke's melancholy view that knowledge of the world is necessarily uncertain. Locke could reach no other conclusion from his Cartesian starting point that the objects of our knowledge are ideas. Although his draft left the question open, Book IV of the Essay begins with the unequivocal statement that we know only ideas and not things:

Seeing the mind in all its thoughts and reasonings hath no other immediate object but its own ideas, which it alone does or can contemplate, it is evident that our knowledge is only conversant about them.26/

But if knowledge is only "conversant about" ideas, how can it ever be sure that its ideas correspond with reality? It cannot, confessed Locke. Knowledge of the world is, at best, probable. The degree of probability depends on our own observation, the testimony of others and the relation between them. In this regard, Locke makes the interesting comment that the King of Siam ceased to believe what Europeans told him when they mentioned ice.^{27/} Locke himself would discount the testimony of madmen and all those with "want of skill to use proofs".^{28/}

The testimony of skilled observers of the world could lead to probable knowledge, but no more. Certainty was an impossible dream. In fact, belief in certainty could itself be a sign of a "warmed or overweening brain"^{29/} and thus "offensive to a sober good man."^{30/} Locke is here speaking of that cardinal sin of eighteenth century thought, "enthusiasm", the belief that one's thoughts are the product of divine inspiration. Persons who believe they are inspired, says Locke, with a sober shudder, usually think that firm belief in a thought is a sign of its truth.^{31/} This is the hated

rational sort of mind
That never looked out of the eye of a saint
Or out of drunkard's eye.^{32/}

Yeats aspired to certain truth, and would search for it in the inspired madness of saint and fool, the "sibylline frenzy" of Swift,^{33/} the "inspired . . . frenzy" of Blake.^{34/} He knew, as Shakespeare knew from Renaissance philosophy, that the "seething brains" of lovers, madmen and poets "apprehend more than cool reason ever comprehends", and that their minds are not mere receptacles of sensations but the active makers of "shaping fantasies."^{35/} In direct contrast to Locke's "rational sort of mind",

The lunatic, the lover, and the poet
Are of imagination all compact.^{36/}

Yeats felt the strength of his own shaping fantasies, and knew the poet's affinity with lover and lunatic. Did not

the image of poet as loving fool in "The Cap and the Bells"
come to him in a dream?^{37/}

Moreover, he had conducted his own experiments that proved the transmittal of ideas other than through sense experience. He knew for certain "that images well up before the mind's eye from a deeper source than conscious or sub-conscious memory."^{38/} For example, Magregor Mathers had given him a cardboard symbol which, when he held it to his forehead with his eyes closed, brought

before me mental images that I could not control: a desert and a black Titan raising himself up by his two hands from the middle of a heap of ancient ruins.^{39/}

Ultimately, Yeats would identify this vision in "The Second Coming" as "a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi".^{40/} For now, he experimented with the symbols, finding that he could induce in his uncle George Pollexfen the vision appropriate to the symbol by thinking of the symbol while uncle and nephew walked the sandhills and cliffs at Rosses Point.^{41/} This was practical proof of the sort for which Yeats yearned. Thus he is pleased to report that he has gleaned "much evidence" that the images called up by Mathers' symbols "can influence the bodily health." For example, one night when George Pollexfen was seriously ill and delirious, Yeats, "when the delirium was at its height," asked George what he saw. Upon learning that it was red dancing figures, Yeats

promptly imagined the symbol for water, and "almost at once" George said "there is a river running through the room", and the delirium departed.^{42/} Others might scoff; Yeats concludes his account of the episode on a satisfied note of finality: "The delirium did not return."

However much Locke's enlightened conclusions might commend themselves to common sense, here were actual cases -- evidences -- of ideas passing from mind to mind without proceeding by way of the senses. Yeats heard of other occasions where ideas themselves acted directly on the senses. Florence Farr reported that Mathers had scattered a field of sheep by imagining a ram,^{43/} George Pollexfen heard the sound of barking dogs coming from his pillow when Yeats imagined watch-dogs in his room at night, and was it not said that when a friend of Strindberg's, in delirium tremens, was haunted by mice, a friend in the next room heard the squealing of the mice?"^{44/} The modern world might laugh; Yeats "tried half a dozen times to excite a cat by imagining a mouse in front of its nose."^{45/} In all events, Yeats "mastered Mathers' symbolic system, and discovered that for a considerable minority . . . the visible world would completely vanish, and that world, summoned by the symbol, take its place."^{46/}

Yeats's belief in a spiritual world to which access might be gained by magic may embarrass some of his admirers. But Yeats's magical pursuits cannot be consigned to the

periphery of his life. In a famous letter to John O'Leary in 1892 Yeats asserted that magic is "a study which I decided deliberately four or five years ago to make, next to my poetry, the most important pursuit of my life."^{47/} Moreover, in the same letter, Yeats defines his role as magician in terms of his antipathy to Lockean rationalism: "I have always considered myself a voice of . . . the revolt of the soul against the intellect . . . now beginning in the world."^{48/} That revolt endured throughout Yeats's life, culminating in the observation at its end that "Man can embody truth, but he cannot know it."^{49/}

The young poet's reason for taking up magical pursuits is grounded in his anxiety at his father's unbelief, his search for evidences of religion, and his longing to refute Locke by attaining certain knowledge of the spiritual world:

I had not taken up these subjects wilfully, nor through love of strangeness, nor love of excitement, nor because I found myself in some experimental circle, but because unaccountable things had happened even in my childhood, and because of an ungovernable craving.^{50/}

Locke might deride belief in spiritual communications unsupported by testimony of the senses. Yeats concedes to Locke that "[w]hen supernatural events begin, a man first doubts his own testimony", but adds this: "when they repeat themselves again and again, [the man] doubts all human testimony."^{51/} Yeats's reaction to Locke's human testimony is like that of the King of Siam to the news of ice.

Yeats's "ungovernable craving" for certain knowledge about the spiritual world brought him to Madame Blavatsky and the Theosophical Society in the late 1880's and, when he sought active magic rather than mere study, to Macgregor Mathers and the Order of the Golden Dawn in 1890. Both groups relied on the writings of Henry More, one of the "Cambridge Platonists" who brought the Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance from the Florentine Academy to seventeenth century England.^{52/} In More, Yeats found respectable philosophical support for a non-Lockean world in which the material and spiritual were intertwined, and the mind obtained ideas directly from the spiritual world rather than through the senses. More lent weight to Madame Blavatsky's assertion of correspondence between the individual soul and a Universal Oversoul.^{53/} He advanced the doctrine that the world is animated by an unconscious soul, an anima mundi, or spirit of nature, defined as "a substance incorporeal, but without sense and animadversion, pervading the whole matter of the universe, and exercising a plastical power therein, . . . raising such phaenomena in the world, by directing the parts of the matter and their motion, as cannot be resolved into mere mechanical powers."^{54/} Among the arguments for the existence of the anima mundi, More pointed to the instinctive actions of birds in making their nests, an art that, as More argued and Yeats would eventually agree, no one had ever seen

being taught by one bird to another, but was better explained
as the work of the anima mundi.^{55/}

More's doctrine of anima mundi is firmly rooted in
the Platonic tradition. In the Timaeus, it is said that

God set the soul in the midst [of the
universe] and spread her through all
its body and even wrapped the body
around with her from without . . . And
from the midst even to the ends of the
heavens she was woven in everywhere and
encompassed it round from without^{56/}

Plotinus gave definite form to the doctrine by providing that
the third stage in the process of the emanation of the world
from the original "One" is the universal soul, situated between
the rational intelligence and the dark immovable matter, whence
it "penetrates from all sides pouring in its light" as "the
rays of the sun throwing their brilliance upon a lowering cloud
make it gleam all gold"^{57/}

The doctrine of the world soul was not only a part
of the exoteric Neoplatonic tradition, but was a central
element of the esoteric tradition. Both the Corpus Hermeticum
and the Kabbalah advance a view of creation as a "procreative
life force dynamically active in the universe",^{58/} a dramatic
and graphic depiction of the idea of universal animation.

The Hermetic and Cabbalistic traditions were linked with each
other and with Neoplatonism by Ficino and Pico della Mirandola
during the Florentine Renaissance, and thereafter passed on
to Henry More.^{59/} Yeats's mentor Mathers had translated the

Kaballah, and the symbols he taught Yeats were derived from that holy book.^{60/} Both the Golden Dawn and the Theosophical Society also incorporated elements of the Hermetic tradition.

Whether expressed exoterically by Plotinus or esoterically by Hermes, the doctrine espoused by Henry More stressed the interrelatedness of all things in the world, and between the world and the heavens. The essence of these interrelationships is summed up in the famous Smaragdine (Emerald) Tablet which contained the aphoristic kernel of Hermes' thought. As Yeats learned it from Madame Blavatsky, the tablet proclaimed that "[w]hat is below is like that which is above, and what is above is similar to that which is below"^{61/} This theory of the universal inter-relatedness of all things is the fundamental basis of alchemy in particular and all magic in general.^{62/} It is congenial to alchemists, seekers after the prima materia that links all things, and magicians, who would transcend the apparent distinctions among things. The doctrine commended itself to Yeats as well. It is no accident that his narrator in "Rosa Alchemica" has written a book on the relation of alchemy and art, "a fanciful reverie over the transmutation of life into art"^{63/}

More broadly, More's Anima Mundi provided a fundamentally different answer to Locke's question as to the source of our ideas. When Yeats pondered that question as applied to

images evoked by Mathers' symbols that resembled images in ancient texts, he

. . . had as yet no clear answer, but knew myself face to face with the Anima Mundi described by Platonic philosophers, and more especially in modern times by Henry More, which has a memory independent of embodied individual memories, though they constantly enrich it with their images and their thoughts.64/

Yeats recognized the Anima Mundi as a source and explanation of the poet's inspiration. Yeats also welcomed More's belief in innate ideas. They promised a certainty that Locke's epistemology could not provide. The notion of innate ideas is as old as the Stoic conception of the universal reason and has apparent similarities with the Platonic doctrine of reminiscence. Innate ideas were accepted by Augustine and Descartes, and endorsed by More. More was careful to say that he did not accept the doctrine in the simplified form in which it was later attacked by Locke in Book I of his

Essay:

I do not mean that there is a certain number of ideas flaring and shining to the animadversive faculty like so many torches or starres in the firmament to our outward sight, . . . but I understand thereby an active sagacity in the soul, whereby some small business being hinted to her, she runs out presently into a more clear and larger conception.65/

The "active sagacity" of More stands in sharp contrast to the mind described by Locke, not only because of its innate

ideas, but because it is an active maker of its picture of the world, rather than the passive mirror described by Locke. Yeats, an inveterate maker of the world through poetic imagination, warmed to the doctrine of More and took pleasure in what he believed to be Locke's inability to match More in dealing with the instincts of animals. Yeats relates that:

When Locke's French translator Coste asked him how, if there were no "innate ideas," he could explain the skill shown by a bird in making its nest, Locke replied, "I did not write to explain the actions of dumb creatures," and his translator thought the answer "very good, seeing that he had named his book A Philosophical Essay upon Human Understanding."^{66/}

Yeats is quick to point out that:

Henry More, upon the other hand, considered that the bird's instinct proved the existence of the Anima Mundi, with its ideas and memories.^{67/}

As we shall see, Yeats read More extensively in 1915^{68/} and ultimately championed More's theories, including some of the more esoteric ones, in his 1917 Per Amica Silentia Lunae. In his 1901 essay, "Magic", he makes no explicit reference to More, but the often obscure young poet is sufficiently emboldened that he states straightforwardly that "I believe in the practice and philosophy of what we have agreed to call magic".^{69/} Specifically, he states his belief in three doctrines which he takes to be the foundations of nearly all magical practices:

- (1) That the borders of our mind are ever shifting, and that many minds can flow into one another, as it were, and create or reveal a single mind, a single energy.
- (2) That the borders of our memories are as shifting, and that our memories are a part of one great memory, the memory of Nature herself.
- (3) That this great mind and great memory can be evoked by symbols.^{70/}

Although Yeats does not say the words oversoul or "Anima Mundi", the shifting borders of mind and memory rest implicitly on the notion of a universal mind interwoven throughout the fabric of reality. Rather than relying on authority, Yeats cites "the evidences" that support his three doctrines. As to the first, he describes an occasion on which he and others all saw the same vision, an experience that showed many minds flowing into a single mind, even as it raised the question, "who was it made the story, if it were but a story?"^{71/} The enigma prompts Yeats's very un-Lockean observation that "our most elaborate thoughts, elaborate purposes, precise emotions, are often, as I think, not really ours, but have on a sudden come up, as it were, out of Hell or down out of Heaven."^{72/}

In support of the second doctrine, Yeats cites the cases of persons seeing intricate symbols from writings of past ages that he will eventually refer to as images out of Henry More's Anima Mundi in the 1922 autobiographical passage already quoted.^{73/} Yeats concedes the possibility that he or the others had seen the image and forgotten it, but concludes, with a

barb directed at Locke, that "[o]ne cannot go on believing in improbable knowledge forever."^{74/} Rather, says Yeats, this fact -- that "[a]lmost everyone who has ever busied himself with such matters has come, in trance or dream, upon some new or strange symbol or event, which he has afterwards found in some work he had never read or heard of" -- is "proof that there is a memory of Nature."^{75/} Sixteen years later Jung would write that the existence of the collective unconscious "explains the truly amazing phenomenon that certain motifs from myths and legends repeat themselves the world over . . . [and explains] why it is that our mental patients can reproduce exactly the same images and associations that are known to us from the old texts."^{76/}

The third doctrine, that the Great Mind and Great Memory can be evoked by symbols, grounds poetry in magic. Yeats expands on this doctrine by linking magicians and poets, saying that symbols are the greatest of all powers "whether they are used consciously by the masters of magic, or half consciously by their successors, the poet, the musician and the artist."^{77/} Magicians and poets are both transformers of reality. Yeats reports that after struggling to define what it is that makes a symbol capable of evoking something from the Great Memory, he concluded that "symbols are of all kinds, for everything in heaven or earth has its association, momentous or trivial, in the Great Memory"^{78/} Although Yeats stops short

of explicitly so stating, his theory of symbolism is based on Great Hermes' doctrine of correspondence between things below and those above: "For things below are copies, the Great Smaragdine tablet said."^{79/}

Having cited "evidences" of each of the three principal doctrines of magic, Yeats closes this groundbreaking essay with a paragraph that emphasizes the contrast between his concept of the transforming power of imagination, rooted in a universal mind, and Locke's idea of the mind as the passive recorder of sense data. Whereas Locke's mind is made by the external world, Yeats, in the penultimate sentence of "Magic", would have the imagination remake the world:

[W]e must cry out that imagination is always seeking to remake the world according to the impulses and the patterns in that Great Mind, and that Great Memory [.80/]

Finally, things below being copies of those above, these impulses of the Great Mind are but signals "that the supreme Enchanter, or some one in His councils, is speaking of what has been, and shall be again, in the consummation of time[.]"^{81/} In short, the creative imagination, rooted in the universal mind, is seeking to remake the world in the vision of the unfallen world that once was, and shall be again.

This is almost pure Blake. The concluding paragraph of "Magic" no doubt reflects Blake's view, as summarized in Yeats's essay on "The Theatre", that the function of art is

"to bring again the Golden Age"^{82/} which, in terms of both the Christian and Hermetic traditions known to Blake, was the world before man's fall from primordial grace. Yeats's summation of Blake's beliefs in the preface to the edition of Blake he and Edward Ellis published in 1892 shows his keen interest in Blake's teaching that everything once united by the universal mind was divided after the fall, and that imagination contains the promise of redemption: "In Imagination only", Yeats summarizes, "we find a human faculty that touches nature on one side, and spirit on the other."^{83/} That is why, as Blake's doctrine is quoted in Yeats's essay on "Blake's Illustrations to Dante", painting, poetry and music are "the three powers of man in conversing with Paradise".^{84/} The Great Mind, touching earth and heaven, is both the basis of magic and the seat of imagination, linking things above with those below.

Yeats's inheritance from Blake thus included not only the notion of "the religion of art"^{85/} but a very vigorous attack on Locke's denigration of the validity of poetic inspiration. Blake's Annotations to Sir Joshua Reynolds's Discourses are the classic statement of the passionate imagination against the passive intellect of Locke. Yeats's essay on Blake's Illustrations to Dante makes clear that he was familiar with the Annotations and recognized the Lockean basis of Reynolds' Discourses.^{86/} Locke lurks, for example,

in Reynolds' statement that "enthusiastick admiration seldom promotes knowledge" and that a student "examines his own mind, and perceives there nothing of that divine inspiration, with which, he is told, so many others have been favored."^{87/}

Reynolds here shuns enthusiasm and inspiration like Locke's "sober good man" who finds enthusiasm offensive. Blake answers bluntly: "[E]nthusiastic Admiration is the first Principle of Knowledge & its last The Man who on Examining his own Mind finds nothing of Inspiration ought not to dare to be an Artist"^{88/} Apropos of what Blake and Yeats would see as the artist's vision of the unfallen world, Reynolds says that the good artist "never traveled to heaven to gather new ideas; and he finds himself possessed of no other qualifications than what mere common observation and a plain understanding can confer."^{89/} Blake responds: "The man who never in his mind and thoughts traveled to heaven is no artist." To Reynolds' observation that "great ideal perfection and beauty are not to be sought in the heavens, but upon the earth",^{90/} Blake answers: "A lie."^{91/}

Yeats found in Blake a summary statement of all of Locke that was inimical to the young poet, and the ready-made response of Blake's poetic imagination. Blake's answers to Locke corresponded with Yeats's own experience that artistic creation occurs "because some knowledge or power has come into his mind from beyond his mind". The

combination of Blake and Henry More led Yeats to the conclusion that the source of knowledge beyond the mind was in the Great Mind or Great Memory and that "[g]enius is a crisis that joins that buried self [of the Great Mind] for certain moments to our trivial daily mind."^{92/}

The ideas of the Great Mind are in a sense "innate", and thus Yeats also warms to Blake's belief in innate ideas. Blake quotes Reynolds to the effect that the artist's notion of "ideal beauty" is to be gained by close scrutiny of nature. Blake responds that "Knowledge of Ideal Beauty is Not to be Acquired. It is Born with us. Innate Ideas are in Every Man, Born with him; they are truly Himself." Similarly, Blake says of Reynolds, as might be said of Locke, that he "Thinks that Man Learns all that he knows. I say on the Contrary that Man Brings All that he has or can have Into the World with him. Man is Born Like a Garden ready Planted & Sown. This World is too poor to produce one Seed."^{93/}

Blake's use of the term "Garden" brings us face-to-face with Yeats's enigmatic observation on Locke from "Fragments":

Locke sank into a swoon;
The Garden died;
God took the spinning-jenny
Out of his side.^{94/}

The term "garden", used in the context of God's removal of something from man's side, plainly enough evokes an image of the unfallen world. On one level, the death of the garden can simply mean the end of Eden. However, Yeats's

adoption of Blake's capitalization of the word "Garden" is a sign that Yeats has in mind Blake's doctrine of innate ideas. The fragment thus also suggests empiricist Locke's responsibility for the death of belief in innate ideas, the replacement of the "active sagacity" attributed to the mind by Henry More by the passive, swooning mind envisioned by Locke.

The notion of Locke sinking "into a swoon" also has its sources in Blake. Blake's Albion is a God-man, like Adam Kadmon of the Kabbalah, whose fall was the creation of the universe. Northrup Frye points out that "there are various accounts of the Fall in Blake . . . , but the invariable characteristic of them is Albion's lapse from active creative energy to passivity."^{95/} In Four Zoas, for example, Albion lingers too long in adoration of the nature he has created, and with his mind in this passive state, forgets that nature is his own creation and begins instead to regard it as an independent external world separate from imagination.^{96/} Albion is a paradigm of Locke who likewise "sank into a swoon" when he postulated a world external to the passive mind. The first half of the fragment is thus a sort of counter-Genesis. It tells the story of the death of imagination and pins the blame on Locke.

There is another sense in which Locke can be said to be responsible for the death of a garden. This arises out of the distinction he drew between primary and secondary

qualities. Locke held that our ideas of primary qualities correspond to things in the world, but those of secondary qualities do not. He defined primary qualities as those inseparable from body, and identified them as solidity, extension, figure, motion or rest, and number. Secondary qualities are everything else: color, sound, smells, etc. Ideas of secondary qualities exist only in the observer.

This distinction leaves us a world consisting only of matter in motion, with all the distinguishing characteristics of matter, its color, sound, and smell, existing only in the mind. Locke's world, as described by Yeats, is a drab place "without color, sound, taste, tangibility"^{97/} - no natural beauty, or, in a word, no garden - and none of the passion nature stirs.^{98/} Lockean reality was no country for a poet:

Nature or reality as known to poets and tramps has no moment, no impression, no perception like another, everything is unique, and nothing unique is measurable.^{99/}

Yeats put it more bluntly in his diary, saying that Locke "took away the world and gave us its excrement instead."^{100/} Blake again is in accord, thinking it madness to

[d]educt from a rose its redness,
from a lily its whiteness, from
a diamond its hardness, from a sponge [sic]
its softness, from an oak its height,
from a daisy its lowness . . . ^{101/}

In the face of this spirited attack, Locke's position stood on shaky ground. As already noted, by limiting human

knowledge to knowledge of ideas, Locke precludes certain knowledge about the world. In particular, there is no way of establishing the validity of the distinction between primary and secondary qualities. Moreover, Locke got himself into further difficulty when he attempted to explain how we obtain knowledge of the undifferentiated mass of primary qualities that exists out there in the world. Locke postulated that, because we perceive qualities in collections, "we accustom ourselves to suppose some substratum wherein they do subsist" ^{102/} This is the idea of substance in general. In attempting to explain where this idea comes from, Locke argues that it comes from "abstraction", but this process is different from what Locke had earlier described as abstraction, the process of separating ideas from each other. Rather, it is a process of inferring the existence of something in the world around which the qualities are collected.

Berkeley made a telling point when he said that those who believe in material substance are misled by sentences with subjects. According to Berkeley, the fact that sentences predicate qualities of a subject misled Locke into thinking that there must be a subject beneath the qualities. ^{103/} Rather, said Berkeley, things are simply what we perceive them to be and we perceive no Lockean substance. ^{104/} Indeed, there are no abstract general ideas. If we would simply understand that reasoning must be about particulars, we would no longer waste

time looking for things that correspond to general words like matter.^{105/} Zeroing in on Locke, Berkeley argues persuasively that extension in general and motion in general are meaningless terms, depending "on that strange doctrine of abstract ideas".^{106/} In sum, argues Berkeley, primary qualities are no more independent of perception than secondary qualities.^{107/}

It is difficult to quarrel with Berkeley's conclusion that primary and secondary qualities must stand on the same footing. Accepting this conclusion, one might attribute all qualities to the world or all to the mind. Berkeley famously concluded that neither primary nor secondary qualities exist outside the mind, that esse est percipi, to be is to be perceived. As Yeats put it, Berkeley restored a "world that only exists because it shines and sounds."^{108/} He brought the garden back to life, and simultaneously dealt a blow to hated "abstract ideas" by proving that they are "mere words".^{109/} More broadly, Berkeley reunited subject and object, eliminated a world existing outside the mind, and thereby eliminated the need for some non-mental reality like Locke's substance existing behind perception. This was the "God-appointed Berkeley" who "proved all things a dream" and, so long as his doctrine of the world's continuing perception in the divine mind is ignored,^{110/} proved, as well,

That this pragmatic, preposterous pig of a world,
its farrow that so solid seem,
Must vanish on the instant if the mind but
change its theme.^{111/}

In Berkeley's world, imagination reigned supreme; for Yeats, he "opened once more the great box of toys."^{112/}

Berkeley's refutation of Locke came alive for Yeats because Berkeley was not only Irish but defined his opposition to Locke in terms of his Irishness. Yeats delighted in Berkeley's Commonplace Book note on Locke:

There are men who say there are insensible extensions. There are others who say the wall is not white, the fire is not hot, & C. We Irishmen cannot attain to these truths.^{113/}

Berkeley's comment was a favorite Yeatsian reference.^{114/}

It laid the foundation for the notion that an attitude of Irish hatred united Yeats and the "four great minds" of Eighteenth Century Ireland in opposition to Locke. We know that Irish Berkeley had proved that Locke's "abstract ideas were mere words",^{115/} and will eventually see how Yeats attributed to Swift "an Irish hatred of abstraction".^{116/} Berkeley's "we Irish cannot hold with this", as Yeats was inclined to recall it, rooted his spirit in Yeats's tower and fueled Yeats's belief that he most approximated his ideal expression when he wrote out of "the greatest possible amount of hereditary thought and feeling", particularly ancestral "hatred and pride".^{117/}

Yeats stirs this ancestral feeling when he emphasizes the rankling fact that Locke's doctrine of primary and secondary qualities, although proved wrong, "worked, and the

mechanical inventions of the next age, its symbols that seemed its confirmation, worked even better, and it worked best of all in England" ^{118/} One of those symbols is the spinning jenny that God takes out of Locke's side.

However destructive Locke had been to the creative imagination and however wrong he was from a theoretical standpoint, the irritating fact remained that his distinction between primary and secondary qualities had worked to create a powerful England. Yeats was historically accurate. As Bertrand Russell points out, Locke's dualism in regard to primary and secondary qualities was "philosophically out of date" ever since Berkeley, but nonetheless

dominated practical physics until the rise of quantum theory in our own day. Not only was it assumed, explicitly or tacitly, by physicists, but it proved fruitful as a source of many very important discoveries. The theory that the physical world consists only of matter and motion was the basis of the accepted theories of sound, heat, light, and electricity. ^{119/}

Locke's philosophy merged perfectly with Newton's science to create the Eighteenth Century view of the world as matter in motion subject to uniform laws. McLuhan is thus right to see swooning Locke as the "philosopher of mechanical and lineal associationism . . . hypnotized by his own image". ^{120/}

Recalling Sam Johnson's claim that he refuted Berkeley by kicking a stone, ^{121/} Yeats retells the story of the Locke fragment this way in his introduction to "The Words Upon The Window Pane":

I can see in a sort of nightmare vision the 'primary qualities' torn from the side of Locke, Johnson's ponderous body bent above the letter to Lord Chesterfield, some obscure person somewhere inventing the spinning-jenny, upon his face that look of benevolence kept by painters and engravers, from the middle of the eighteenth century to the time of the Prince Consort, for such as he, or, to simplify the tale -

Locke sank into a swoon;
The Garden died;
God took the spinning-jenny
Out of his side.122/

In either version of the tale, Locke is the villain. The interchangeability of the primary qualities and the spinning jenny as the thing removed from Locke's side emphasizes the equation Yeats makes between Locke and the mechanism of the Eighteenth Century. Because of the Eighteenth Century's allegiance to Locke,

instead of a science which had rediscovered Anima Mundi, its experiments and observations confirming the speculations of Henry More, came materialism: all that Whiggish world Swift stared on till he became a raging man.123/

Yeats emphasizes that imagination "sank into a swoon" with Locke by repeating the word "sank" when, in the essay on Bishop Berkeley, he observes that "[i]magination, whether in literature, painting, or sculpture, sank after the death of Shakespeare" ^{124/} "The mischief began," Yeats eventually opined in his Introduction to the Oxford Book of Modern Poetry, "at the end of the seventeenth century when man became passive before a mechanized nature"

The passive Lockean mind reflecting observations of the external world is summed up in Stendhal's "mirror dawdling down a lane"^{125/} and Coleridge's turning the "mind into the quicksilver at the back of a mirror."^{126/} In place of literature and art that merely reflect observations of the external world, Yeats would have an art of the creative imagination that transforms the world. The soul must become "its own betrayer, its own deliverer, the mirror turn lamp."^{127/}

Yeats puts the case against Locke on different grounds when he claims that "Bacon, Newton, Locke" - the trio is Blake's traditional three-fold villain - made literature decadent by eliminating the freedom, God, and immortality that Kant found necessary to make life livable.^{128/} In fact, rational Eighteenth Century religion believed in all three.^{129/} What the Eighteenth Century did away with, as one of Blake's two great "witnesses", John Wesley, was quick to note, was the notion that this world is a fallen one.^{130/}

Kant put freedom, God and immortality on a new footing, but it was on the pedestal of faith rather than the stern rock of knowledge. Grappling with the problem of certainty that Locke had left unresolved, Kant posited that the mind can never know what the world is really like, but can know the world only through the filter of its own limited capacity. Our mind experiences a sense of moral obligation, a religious reverence for something in the world greater than ourselves, and a sense

of beauty in things. These experiences of conscience, beauty and the religious impulse, reasoned Kant, are unintelligible unless the world is in reality a place, different from what the mind can actually know, in which there is a basis for these experiences. Because of the limitations of our mind, we can neither prove nor disprove through the methods of science whether the real world is or is not in accord with these experiences. Kant concludes that, where science can neither prove nor disprove, we are justified in having faith: "I must, therefore, abolish knowledge" of God, freedom, and immortality, "to make room for belief."^{131/} But, as we have seen, Yeats does not want faith; he wants knowledge - evidences. Moreover, as we shall see in the next chapter, he wants knowledge of the world the eighteenth century ignored, the unfallen world that preceded our present state of affairs, and is yet to come.

II

"A Kind of Frenzied Hatred Which is Quite Out
Of My Control": Hatred as the Impulse to Create

The vilification Yeats heaped on Jules Bastien-Lepage seems out of proportion to his status as an ordinary, if popular, French realist painter of the nineteenth century. He and portrait painter Carolus Duran are linked with Thomas Huxley and John Tyndall in terms of great bitterness. For example, when an editor rejected Yeats's effort to kindle interest in Jack Nettleship's paintings, Yeats considered that he was "lifting . . . an obsequious caw in the Huxley, Tyndall, Carolus Duran, Bastien-Lepage rookery."^{1/} Similarly, Yeats feared that certain young painters might be "spattered by . . . dropping[s]" from the "Huxley, Tyndall, Carolus Duran, Bastien-Lepage bundle of old twigs."^{2/} He was "angry with the indifference to subject, which was the commonplace of all art criticism since Bastien-Lepage",^{3/} and was "put into a rage by the followers" of that unholy quartet "who not only asserted the unimportance of subject matter in art or literature, but the independence of the arts from one another."^{4/}

The sinfulness of asserting the unimportance of subject matter is not self-apparent. The offense takes on deep significance, however, in its context as a threat to Yeats's conviction that poets and artists ought to be messengers of a specific subject matter consisting of "certain heroic and religious truths, passed on from age to age, modified by individual genius, but never abandoned."^{5/} Painting, for Yeats, was not mere line and color on canvas, nor poetry

mere sound. Both conveyed a content of "truth" and, as Yeats affirms in a telling autobiographical passage, the truths of the traditional subject matter are truths about the supernatural world.^{6/} Poetry thus beckoned Yeats as a potential answer to his "ungovernable craving" for truth about the spiritual world.^{7/}

This explains why Yeats links painters Bastien-Lepage and Carolus Duran with Huxley and Tyndall. The latter, enthusiastic popularizers of Darwinism, not only deprived Yeats of the "simple-minded religion" of his youth by undermining its account of creation,^{8/} but threatened his art, as well. For if man had ascended from the apes -- and not fallen from Paradise -- then there was no unfallen world, and no basis for Blake's doctrine of the imagination as man's link with that world. By neglecting the religious and heroic truths that challenged the "Grey Truth"^{9/} of Huxley and Tyndall, the realist painters became accomplices in depriving Yeats of religion and the religion of art. Thus was formed the quartet of "Huxley, Tyndall, Carolus Duran and Bastien-Lepage", successor in Yeats's mind to Blake's triadic nemesis, "Bacon, Newton, Locke".

The vehemence of Yeats's reaction to this quartet is a response to the threat their ideas posed to his life as a poet. That threat was sharpened by the fact that, as Yeats

subtly but insistently points out, the threatening ideas were also those of his father. The threatening role of his father emerges only slowly and obliquely.

Nonetheless, it was present at the formation of Yeats's belief in the importance of subject matter. That belief arose when Yeats, anxious at his father's unbelief and deprived of his childhood religion, responded by making "a new religion" out of the traditional subject matter "passed on from generation to generation by poets and painters with some help from philosophers and theologians".^{10/} Yeats "wished for a world where I could discover this tradition perpetually", and when he listened to the imagined voices of its inhabitants speaking "out of the deepest instinct of man," they "seemed always to speak of one thing only: they, their lives, every incident in their lives were steeped in the supernatural."^{11/} This was the world of which poet and painter were afforded a glimpse in moments of inspiration. That is why Yeats, at the founding of the Dublin Hermetic Society, proposed "that whatever the great poets had affirmed in their finest moments was the nearest we could come to an authoritative religion"^{12/}

In disregard of the traditional sacred duties of artists, the realist painter, indifferent to subject matter,

simply "paint[ed] what I see in front of me",^{13/} like a Lockean mirror of sense perception. Courbet, author of The Realist Manifesto, taught that "[a]bove all, the art of painting can only consist of the representation of objects which are visible and tangible for the artist". Things below were just things, not copies. Nor did imagination travel to heaven. "Imagination in art", said Courbet, "consists in knowing how to find the most complete expression of an existing thing, but never in inventing or creating that thing itself."^{14/}

Realist Bastien-Lepage thus shunned the Ecole des Beaux Arts because "you wish to paint what you see, and instead of this you are urged to aim at an unknown ideal, that is to say, to imitate old pictures more or less."^{15/} Bastien-Lepage could not be more opposed to Blake who, believing that the "world of imagination" was the "world of eternity", thought

it was of less importance to know men and nature than to distinguish the beings and substances of imagination from those of a more perishable kind, created by the fantasy, in uninspired moments, out of memory and whim; and this could best be done by purifying one's mind, as with a flame, in study of the works of the great masters, who were great because they had been granted by divine favour a vision of the unfallen world^{16/}

The realist painters were not interested in eternal truths. They would depict the here and now. Perception, not

imagination, was their stock in trade. Specifically, Courbet taught that:

[b]eauty, like truth, is a thing which is relative to the time in which one lives and to the individual capable of understanding it. The expression of the beautiful bears a precise relation to the power of perception acquired by the artist.^{17/}

The artist was mirror, not lamp.

By championing imagination over perception Yeats was playing out in his life the struggle of Blake against "Bacon, Newton, Locke". Blake's villain was Reynolds; Yeats's, Bastien-Lepage. The lurking presence of Locke is apparent from the fact that, having devoted Section I of "Fragments" to the parable of God's removal of the spinning jenny from Locke's side, Yeats devotes Section II to the very un-Lockean proposition that Section I is an example of the recurring nature of poetic inspiration. Section II begins with a question that exactly parallels the question - How came he by them? - that Locke says all men have about the ideas in their minds. Believing that a poet's ideas are "truths", Yeats opens Section II with this question about Section I: "Where got I that truth?" The question is a fundamental one. A superficial answer is given in the Introduction to The Words Upon The Window Pane where Yeats says the gist of Fragment I came to him in a "nightmare vision".^{18/} But what was the source of the nightmare vision, and of poetic inspiration generally?

The five remaining lines of Fragment II suggest, with classic Yeatsian indirection, that the source is in the spiritual world.

The path to that conclusion begins with the text of Fragment II:

Where got I that truth?
Out of a medium's mouth,
Out of nothing it came,
Out of the forest loam,
Out of dark night where lay
The crowns of Nineveh.19/

The apparently mystifying reference to Nineveh in fact leads the way to the answer because, in his early essay "The Symbolism of Poetry", Yeats suggests that the recurring nature of the subject matter of poetry "is maybe what Arthur O'Shaughnessy meant when he made his poets say they had built Nineveh with their sighing."^{20/} What O'Shaughnessy's poets of the ages said was this:

We, in the ages lying
In the buried part of the earth
Built Nineveh with our sighing
And Babel itself with our mirth;
And o'erthrew them with prophesying
To the old of the new world's worth;
For each age is a dream that is dying,
Or one that is coming to birth.21/

In the Introduction to "The Cat and the Moon", Yeats associates O'Shaughnessy's Nineveh with an image of autumn leaves falling at the end of the day and covering "Nineveh's crown" with dark leaf clay:

Decline of day,
A leaf drifts down;
O dark leaf clay
On Nineveh's crown.22/

Sufficient dark leaf clay accumulates after the decline of day that, in Fragment II, the crowns of Nineveh are buried in the forest loam. The reference to the crowns of Nineveh in "Fragments" thus takes the reader, via Yeats's essay, to O'Shaughnessy's account of the poet's cyclic building and overthrowing of Nineveh and then back to Yeats's essay, with its more direct answer to the question "Where got I that truth":

Solitary men in moments of contemplation receive, as I think, the creative impulse from the lowest of the nine hierarchies, and so make and unmake mankind, and even the world itself, for does not 'the eye altering alter all'?23/

The creative impulse comes, then, from the lowest of the nine hierarchies of celestial spirits. As Yeats would explain in an essay that links the truths of celestial spirits to those of mediums - a link also made in Fragment II - those whom Swedenborg calls celestial angels are in continuing communication with man. They

commune with men and lower spirits, through orders of mediatorial spirits, not by a conveyance of messages, but as though a hand were thrust within a hundred gloves, one glove outside another, and so there is a continual influx from God to man.24/

By referring only to the "crowns of Nineveh" in his poem, Yeats leaves his options open as to the nature of the celestial

spirits who commune with the poets. In the essays, Yeats informs the image of the crowns of Nineveh with doctrines similar to Blake's notion of the imagination touching both nature and spirit, Plotinus's idea of the world soul and Henry More's Anima Mundi. All of these doctrines remind us that "things below are copies" and thus remind us, too, that Yeats's antipathy to the realists is grounded in his agreement with Blake that the true artist ought to fly "from the painters who studied 'the vegetable glass' for its own sake, and not to discover there the shadows of imperishable beings and substances" ^{25/} Bastien-Lepage studied the vegetable glass for its own sake: "There is only one art," he maintained, "and that is to reproduce Nature". ^{26/} Yeats's response met him head-on:

Goethe has said "Art is art because it is not nature." It brings us near to the archetypal ideas themselves, and away from nature, which is but their looking-glass. ^{27/}

Yeats now has all his cards on the table. Painter and poet have the same subject matter (ut pictura poesis, as Horace put it ^{28/}), the subject matter recurs from generation to generation, and the reason it does so is that it is an expression of man's "deepest instincts", the "archetypal ideas" of the Great Mind. Given these strongly held beliefs, it is no surprise that Yeats was "angry with the indifference to subject, which has been the commonplace of all art criticism

since Bastien-Lepage" when "[s]omebody writing in the Germ had said that a picture of a pheasant and an apple was merely a picture of something to eat" ^{29/}

The realist's neglect of the "archetypal ideas" -- a usage in which Yeats anticipates Jung by eighteen years -- was serious business for Yeats. When he saw a painting of "cocottes with yellow faces sitting before a cafe by some follower of Manet" he was "miserable for days". ^{30/} Nor was this a passing fancy. In the prologue to The Death of Cuchulain, the accents of the "Old Man" are those of Yeats when he "spit[s] three times" on "the dancers painted by Degas". ^{31/} While Julia Cartwright could celebrate the "absolute reality" of the peasants in Bastien-Lepage's Les Foins (The Haymakers), Yeats saw "a clownish peasant staring with vacant eyes at her great boots". ^{32/} Yeats "did not care for mere reality and believed that creation should be deliberate". ^{33/} Thus, when he saw Ibsen's A Doll's House, its "dialogue so close to modern educated speech that music and style were impossible", he "hated the play; what was it but Carolus Duran, Bastien-Lepage, Huxley and Tyndall all over again" ^{34/} And yet, Yeats was "divided in mind" over Ibsen himself because if he had not the same friends as Ibsen, "we had the same enemies." ^{35/}

Yeats was troubled by the same divided mind of "admiration and hate" when he watched Shaw's Arms and the

Man with which his own The Land of Heart's Desire shared a bill.^{36/} The "inorganic logical straightness" of Shaw's play represented the fall of imagination attendant upon God's removal of the spinning jenny from Locke's side. Indeed, Shaw appeared to Yeats in a nightmare as a perpetually-smiling sewing machine.^{37/} Anxious about the enemies of his art, Yeats nonetheless "delighted in Shaw the formiddable man" who "could hit my enemies and the enemies of all I loved, as I could never hit" ^{38/}

The art of Shaw, Ibsen and the realists shared this feature: it had "lost its contact with religion: its images no longer expressed man's deepest thoughts about his own nature and destiny."^{39/} Because art has turned its back on religion, thought Yeats,

[s]ome limiting environment or idiosyncrasy is displayed; man is studied as an individual fact, and not as that energy that seems measureless and hates all that is not itself. It is a powerful but prosaic art, celebrating the 'fall into division' and not the 'resurrection into unity'.^{40/}

For Blake, the function of all art was to bring about a "resurrection to unity",^{41/} to "bring again the Golden Age".^{42/}

In this profound sense, Northrup Frye is right to say that Yeats's idea of the beautiful was "reactionary",^{43/} as he is right to say that the "cult of beauty" sets up "barriers to the conquest of experience by art, and limits the variety of expression in art" ^{44/} However, Frye overlooks Yeats's

insistence on the duty of art to bring its audience close to the archetypal ideas when he suggests that Yeats's aversion to Degas and Ibsen is based on no more than a sense of the beautiful too closely "allied to a sense of propriety." Degas' "interest in thick-bottomed matrons sitting in hip baths" and Ibsen's claim for "venereal disease as a subject for tragedy" do not so much shock Yeats's sense of propriety as they ignore the artist's duty to restore the fallen world in favor of mere depiction of the vegetable glass of nature. Indeed, Yeats's specific complaint against Degas' dancers is that they "might have looked timeless, Ramses the Great", but looked instead like everyday chambermaids.^{45/} Yeats himself would not hesitate to shock the reader's sense of propriety, but his art would remain "a traditional statement of certain heroic and religious truths"^{46/} and would be grounded in the mass, which is to say, in magic, close cousin of the transforming power of imagination:

A great work of art, the "Ode to a Nightengale" not less than the "Ode to Duty", is as rooted in the early ages as the mass which goes back to savage folklore. In what temple garden did the nightengale first sing?^{47/}

Except for an early attachment to "the aesthetic school",^{48/} Yeats maintained a life-long commitment to the idea of the poet as the bearer of a traditional subject matter that recurs from generation to generation. Writing

toward the end of his life, Yeats reaffirmed "that I condemn all that is not tradition, that there is a subject matter which has descended like that 'deposit' certain philosophers speak of."^{49/} This subject matter was "something I have received from the generations." It is, in part, "a part of my own nature" and, in part, the product of vision and dream:

sometimes it has come to me in super-normal experience; I have met with ancient myths in my dreams, brightly lit^{50/}

Finally, invoking the Great Mind and innate ideas in terms of phenomena that stumped Locke but Henry More could explain, the traditional subject matter is "allied to the wisdom or instinct that guides a migratory bird."^{51/}

Yeats had earlier confessed his youthful neglect of the traditional subject matter, saying that "[w]hen I began to write I avowed for my principles those of Arthur Hallam in his essay upon Tennyson."^{52/} Hallam faulted Wordsworth for seeking to "convince" rather than "enrapture" his audience, and praised Keats and Shelley as "poets of sensation"^{53/} who wrote, as Yeats put it "out of the impression made by the world on their delicate senses".^{54/} "Yet", said Yeats, "those delighted senses, when I had got from them all that I could, left me discontented".^{55/} Yeats found a more enduring subject matter in the notion of Shelley's "old Jew" who had ". . . attained to sovereignty and science over those strong and secret things and thoughts which others fear and know not".^{56/}

Yeats learned a similar mastery, and thus a subject matter for his poetry, in the secret doctrines of theosophy and

was attracted to the theosophists because they had affirmed the real existence of the Jew, or of his like, and, apart from whatever might have been imagined by Huxley, Tyndall, Carolus Duran and Bastien-Lepage, I saw nothing against his reality.^{57/}

Yeats's convoluted syntax and the attribution of his own beliefs to Shelley's "old Jew" soften the impact of his recognition that the unholy quartet of Bastien-Lepage and company are a threat to his belief in the traditional subject matter. If Bastien-Lepage, et al. were right, Yeats could not be the poet he wanted to be. Yeats's hostility to Bastien-Lepage might thus be seen as a measure of the strength of his commitment to the contrary view of the artist's role expressed by Blake. As Yeats said in a 1904 letter to George Russell, "I myself sometimes give unbridled expression to my dislikes, moved perhaps by my knowledge of the strength of my likings and my loyalty to them."^{58/} In this context, Yeats's reaction to Bastien-Lepage is an instance of the phenomenon Yeats described in "John M. Synge and the Ireland of His Time":

I have known what it is to be changed by that I would have changed, 'til I became argumentative and unmannerly, hating men even in their daily life for their opinions.^{59/}

The degree of anger directed at Bastien-Lepage suggests that Yeats perceived a particularly menacing threat. In this

regard, it is fair to note that in all fundamental respects, the beliefs Yeats attributes to Huxley, Tyndall, Carolus Duran and Bastien-Lepage were the beliefs of John Butler Yeats, the poet's father.

One need not imagine an Oedipus under (or in) every bed to posit that Yeats's antipathy toward Bastien-Lepage had something to do with relations between fathers and sons. After all, Yeats attributes to his father a summing up of the quintessence of realism - "I must paint what I see in front of me"^{60/} - and says that he argued with his father, "for I had come to think the philosophy of his fellow artists and himself a misunderstanding created by Victorian science, and science I had grown to hate with a monkish hate[.]"^{61/} Realism, Victorian science, and the poet's father are linked together, with hate as the common denominator. Bastien-Lepage might take comfort in the thought that the animus nominally directed at him was a displacement of feelings about the poet's father. Yeats himself suggests such transference when he says that his aversion to the Victorian "myth of progress" was a "form of rebellion against my elders".^{62/}

Yeats also links his father's inattention to the literary element in painting to "young men fresh from the Paris art schools", admirers of Carolus Duran and Bastien-Lepage, to whom he attributes a philosophy identical to his father's: "we must paint what is in front of us."^{63/} Again,

there is tension between father and son that, at least on the surface, involves principles of art but releases expressions of a more personal emotion. Yeats asserts that he hated these young men and thought he was alone in doing so until he discovered a more fundamental struggle in the perennial quarrel of youth which, he found, "is not with the past, but with the present, where its elders are so obviously powerful and no cause seems lost if it seem to threaten that power".^{64/}

Yeats expressly directs his hate at the young men who share his father's views, and then gingerly emphasizes his father's involvement by characterizing the dispute as one between generations. Yeats is describing a struggle for power whose combatants include his father and ideas espoused by his father that threaten his ability to be the kind of poet he wants to be. Yeats is more explicit when dealing with the appeal of occult philosophy and magic. He tells how he was initially held within the orb of Huxley and Tyndall by his father's skepticism,^{65/} and that it "was only when I began to study psychical research and mystical philosophy that I broke away from my father's influence."^{66/}

Whether Harold Bloom is entirely correct to say that a poet's effort to escape influence necessarily induces a struggle analogous to the Freudian oedipal project, he is right to say that a strong poet needs "to clear imaginative space" for himself.^{67/} Yeats was locked in such a struggle,

the struggle involved his father, and it was a violent one. Its violence may have peaked when, on a September night in 1888, the 23 year old poet and his father were discussing Ruskin's Unto This Last. The young poet praised Ruskin; his father, Mill's disciple, took exception. The quarrel ended with father violently throwing son against a picture, the son's head breaking the glass.

Douglas Archibald contends that the incident has been exaggerated.^{68/} Yeats himself tried to downplay it. In a 1921 letter to his sister Elizabeth, he claimed it was purely "abstract and impersonal", no more than "a quite legitimate difference between the ideas of his generation and mine."^{69/} Nonetheless, the experience plainly left a searing imprint. Although not referred to in his published autobiographies, it is the first thing Yeats has to say in his unpublished Autobiography:

I began to read Ruskin's Unto This Last, and this, when added to my interest in psychical research and mysticism, enraged my father, who was a disciple of John Stuart Mill's. One night a quarrel over Ruskin came to such a height that in putting me out of the room he broke the glass in a picture with the back of my head.^{70/}

Moreover, when Yeats adopted the posture of a straight-talking old man, he said simply that his father "threw me against a picture with such violence that I broke the glass with the back of my head,"^{71/} and he specifically discredited his earlier theory that the dispute was no more than a conflict

between generations.^{72/} There is no escaping the conclusion that the autobiographical ragings against Bastien-Lepage masked a deeper struggle.

Yeats's tendency to use the unfortunate French painter as a cover for other disputes is also apparent in the poet's account of his first recollection of meeting Maude Gonne, another occasion that sparked a dispute with his father.^{73/} In the unpublished Autobiography, Yeats said that Maude

vexed my father full always of Mill and humanitarianism, by her praise of war, for she too was of the Romantic movement; I found those uncontrovertible Victorian reasons, that seemed to announce so prosperous a future, a little gray.^{74/}

Yeats seems to be saying that he "too" was of a "Romantic movement" that exalted force for its own sake against gray Victorian progress. In the version published in "Four Years, 1887-1891," there is no reference to Mill and humanitarianism or a Victorian prosperous future, but only the amorphous generalization that "Carolus Duran and Bastien-Lepage were somehow involved"^{75/} Fundamental differences between father and son are being cloaked in generalities about Bastien-Lepage. "Heart mysteries here", as Yeats said of his dramatization of the fight to the death between Cuchulain and his son.^{76/}

Yeats links his father with the objects of his rage so insistently that the pertinence of what the

mordant wit of Freud styled "the family romance"^{77/} cannot responsibly be ignored. Distaste for the apparent presumptuousness of the undertaking must give way to Yeats's repeated invitation to see his hate in terms of his relationship with his father. If the thought of hate for the father whose amiability and liberality of spirit shine through his letters to his son is a disturbing one, there is consolation in the thought that both father and son would likely agree with the wise observation of Freud that "a thing which in consciousness makes its appearance as two contraries is often in the unconscious a united whole."^{78/}

Hans Kohut's analysis of the creative youth's struggle with an idealized image of his father sheds interesting light on Yeats's account of his need to overcome his father's ideas. Kohut posits that as an infant becomes aware of himself as separate from his parents, his early sense of unified perfection splits into a state of twofold perfection: a grandiose sense of himself and an "idealized parent imago". In time, the grandiose self and idealized parent imago should be absorbed into a realistic sense of self and mature ideals and goals. However, if the child's needs for self-esteem are unsatisfied -- a situation that, as Anthony Storr points out, may result in a sensitive child simply from the "intrinsically frustrating" nature of human infancy^{79/} -- the wish for an idealized powerful parent may be split off or repressed, to reappear

in later life in the form of a variety of symptoms, including feelings of excessive self-consciousness, an intense desire to merge with a powerful source of self-esteem, and moments of uncontrollable rage.^{80/} An admired adult may for a time satisfy the needs of the idealized parent imago but, if the adult disappoints, he will thereby set off the lurking rage.^{81/}

The youthful Yeats, about to argue violently with his father over Ruskin, exhibited all the symptoms of lurking narcissistic rage. He was self-confessedly "timid and abashed"^{82/} - so much so in the realm of ideas that he hesitated to meet thoughts that threatened his own and thus revealed only to "various women friends . . . thoughts that I could not bring to a man without meeting some competing thought."^{83/} Fearing that he could not hold to his "opinions among people who would make light of them,"^{84/} he felt drawn to "dominating men like Henley and Morris",^{85/} and raged against Huxley, Tyndall, Carolus Duran and Bastien-Lepage, all of whom shared one trait: they held ideas in common with John Butler Yeats.

In his teens, Yeats had "admired my father above all men".^{86/} Why was his father now linked with so much anger? The answer is suggested by the fact that John Butler Yeats no longer served the young poet's need for dominating men. The poet needed strong ideas strongly-held to resist competing thoughts, like those of the realist painters and Victorian science, that threatened his life as a poet. He sought to

rouse his "will to full intensity" so as to overcome those ideas. Yeats's need for dominating men ultimately found articulate expression when he read Nietzsche at age 37, but the need existed long before that. The need, however, found a father who played with ideas "as a child plays with toys", ^{87/} who breezily admitted that "[m]y will is a sort of haphazard will", ^{88/} and even went so far as to opine to his son that "had Shakespeare had a strong will he would have read for a fellowship in T.C.D. and there would have been no Shakespeare." ^{89/}

John Butler Yeats's "broad acres of cheerful agnosticism", ^{90/} his ready embrace of Huxley and Tyndall, his admitted lack of "deep sincerity" and "human force", ^{91/} were no answer to a budding poet who was naturally "religious", ^{92/} who saw poetry as a form of religion, and needed to overcome ideas that threatened the priest-like role of the poet. As a youngster in Sligo, Yeats did not think he could live without religion, and his father's "unbelief" filled him with "great anxiety". Those emotions still lived in the young poet who spoke of his detestation for Huxley and Tyndall and longed for dominating men to overcome them. Yeats himself faulted his father's failure to meet his need for dominating men in a letter to John Quinn:

It is this infirmity of will which has prevented him from finishing his pictures and ruined his career. He even hates the sign of will

in others. It used to cause quarrels between me and him, for the qualities which I thought necessary to success in art or in life seemed to him "egotism" or "selfishness" or "brutality." I had to escape this family drifting, innocent and helpless, and the need for that drew me to dominating men like Henley and Morris and estranged me from his friends, even from sympathetic unique York Powell. I find even from letters written in the last few months that he has not quite forgiven me.93/

It is unnecessary to adopt all of Kohut's analysis or accept the terminology that John Butler Yeats's failure to correspond to his son's powerful parent imago triggered narcissistic rage. It is enough to note that the young poet who argued with his father over Ruskin and raged against Bastien-Lepage, was tormented by anger and hate and that these emotions were linked with his frustration at what he regarded as his father's "infirmity of will". Whether the origin of these feelings lies in the early relations of child and parents is shrouded -- perhaps not too opaquely -- behind the poet's confession that "I remember little of childhood but its pain" and his conviction that "I have grown happier with every year of life as though gradually conquering something in myself, for certainly my miseries were not made by others but were a part of my own mind."^{94/}

Erik Erikson's fascinating commentary on the relationship between creativity and hatred of a parent sheds further light on the relations between Yeats pere et fils. Erikson

suggests that the "great governor of initiative is conscience", that the "inner voice" of self-observation fosters a radical division within the child, a powerful estrangement that can stimulate initiative.^{95/} However, "initiative brings with it anticipatory rivalry with those who were there first and who may therefore occupy with their superior equipment the field toward which one's initiative is at first directed."^{96/} The effects of this rivalry can be severe where children develop "deep regressions and lasting resentments because the parents themselves do not seem to live up to the conscience which they have fostered in the child."^{97/} Addressing the emotion that is the principal subject of the present inquiry, Erikson observes that:

One of the deepest conflicts in life is caused by hate for a parent who served initially as the model and the executor of the conscience, but who was later found trying to "get away with" the very transgressions which the child could no longer tolerate in himself.^{98/}

The destructive effects of these powerful drives

may not show until much later, when conflicts over initiative may find expression in hysterical denial or in a self-restriction which keeps an individual from living up to his inner capacities or to the powers of his imagination and feeling,^{99/}

This self-restriction sounds remarkably akin to the rage that Yeats described in his 1908 journal as his worst

fault. ^{100/} "The feeling," he said, "is always the same: a consciousness of energy, of creativity, and of transforming power stopped by a wall, by something one must either submit to or rage against helplessly." ^{101/} In a 1904 letter to AE, Yeats had acknowledged that the "weakness" and lack of "will" in his earlier work provoked him to a similar rage. ^{102/} "As so often happens", he wrote, "with a thing one has been tempted by and is still a little tempted by, I am roused by it to a kind of frenzied hatred which is quite out of my control". ^{103/}

Yeats's journal gives several additional clues as to the source of the rage. Although directed at Maude Gonne on the occasion that prompted the journal entry, the rage arose from hearing "ancient enemies of vanity and sentimentality" in the words she spoke. ^{104/} The rage always grows out of vexation involving "Irish things and people" ^{105/} and, in an echo of Yeats's description of the quarrel of youth with its elders, it "always comes from impatience, from a kind of spiritual fright at someone who is here and now more powerful, even if only from stupidity." ^{106/} Finally, Yeats associates ^{107/} the rage with "my old childish difficulty of concentration". In short, the rage involves a powerful Irish elder associated with both a lack of will and Yeats's childish difficulty in learning, someone like the willless John Butler Yeats who

inculcated conscience in his son by flinging the book at him while teaching him to read^{108/} and, as Yeats later remembered, "terrified me by descriptions of my moral degradation" and "humiliated me by my likeness to disagreeable people".^{109/} Because Yeats himself links these early experiences with his father to a felt blockage of his own creativity and the rage that ensued, Erikson's suggestion of the nature of the link takes on added weight.

Moreover, in an interesting essay on Blake, Yeats associates a blockage of Blake's creative powers with Blake's relationship with his own father and Blake's own very energetic hatred. These events in Blake's life inform the highly charged language of Yeats's intriguing image of Blake "beat[ing] upon the wall/'Til truth obeyed his call."^{110/} Hazard Adams is too literal a realist when he says that "actually Blake beat on no walls".^{111/} On the contrary, Blake had an experience similar to that Yeats described in his Journal as "creativity . . . stopped by a wall". In a celebrated letter to William Hayley, Blake wrote that when he visited an art exhibit in London upon his return from the stormy sojourn in Felpham, he sensed a restoration of his creativity, a breaking down of the wall, and a sense of being "drunk with intellectual vision" once again.^{112/} Blake described his wall as the closing off of the light he had enjoyed in his youth "as by a door and by

window-shutters".^{113/} His fulminations had succeeded in beating down the wall.

Yeats knew Blake as an exponent of "enthusiastic hatred"^{114/} and the victim of "many an unsubtle unphilosophical rhapsody of hate when too angry even to hide himself in storm clouds of paradox."^{115/} It is significant that, knowing of Blake's felt creative blockage and his related anger and hatred, Yeats is careful, in this brief introductory essay, to focus on incidents in Blake's boyhood that evoke incidents in the young Yeats's relationship with his own father. For example, the Yeats who long remembered his own difficulties in learning to read and the smart engendered by the book flung by his father, recounts that the young Blake was "beaten by his mother for bringing home so unlikely a story" as that he had found Ezekiel sitting in the open fields. Yeats adds that:

His father noticing how ill he brooked any kind of authority, and to what great anger he was moved by a blow, resolved to spare him the contest that must needs have arisen between his passionate mood and the narrow pedagogy of the time.^{116/}

Finally, Yeats asks whether the blockage experienced by Blake was "caused by the awakening of his anger against the men and women of his time".^{117/}

Yeats knew what it was to quarrel with the men and women of his time. Bloom's theory that the relation of a strong poet with his predecessors is like the relation of son and

father has special pertinence here because the strongest personal influence on Yeats's development as poet and thinker also happened to be his father, who thus merges the roles of predecessor and progenitor. Bloom points to Freud's suggestion that the Oedipal situation might be understood in terms of the son's wish to repay the parents for the gift of life which, as applied to the mother, becomes a wish to give her a child -- one as much like himself as possible -- thereby becoming "the father of himself".^{118/}

Yeats the son overflows with the idea of recreating himself. The idea merges in Yeats with the desire for union with a powerful other, thus producing the familiar Yeats who would recreate himself as his own opposite, and as the opposite of his father. This is the Yeats who declares that "all joyous or creative life is a re-birth as something not oneself" ^{119/} The someone not himself will not suffer from his father's "infirmary of will", but will rouse "the will to full intensity." ^{120/} Most importantly, the creation of the self will take place through art. The key to this fundamental break-through lies in the fact that when Yeats found his "transforming power" of creativity blocked by the ideas of his father, and rage at those ideas, he learned that "genius is a crisis" that links the poet's "trivial daily mind" with his "buried self, that is the mask of his daily life." ^{121/} Yeats transforms hatred

into creativity. Rage propels the poet away from the hated ideas and toward his own opposite.^{122/}

Yeats describes this process in general terms when he says that a creative release is brought about through the poet's confrontation of "the greatest obstacle he may confront without despair", Dante's banishment and loss of Beatrice and Villon's thrust into the arms of harlots.^{123/} Their triumph is not merely the creation of art, but the recreation of themselves: "We gaze at such men in awe, because we gaze not at a work of art, but at the creation of the man through that art, the birth of a new species of man, and it may even seem that the hairs of our heads stand up, because that birth, that re-creation is from terror."^{124/} Significantly, the loss of Beatrice was not the only obstacle that stimulated Dante to song. Thus there was room for a Yeatsian obstacle other than loss of Maude. The obstacle most clearly in the mind of the Yeats of "Four Years" was his own "infirmity of will", his own inability to overcome the ideas that threatened him as poet. The struggle to establish his own ideas would provide the impulse to create: "one goes on year after year getting the disorder of one's own mind in order", Yeats wrote his father, "and this is the real impulse to create."^{125/} With new ideas he would be a new person, so much so that, as traced in the next chapter, Yeats could say that the celestial spirit

of creativity would not favor him with a visit "until I begin to make a new personality."^{126/}

The creations of the new Yeats were read by his father -- and not without effect. After rereading his son's The Cutting of an Agate, John Butler Yeats wrote to express his surprise at "how much I owed it -- in fact I have assimilated it so much that I do not now know when I am writing your thoughts and when my own".^{127/} There is truth in the epigram recounted by William Murphy that "John Butler Yeats was one of the few fathers who lived long enough to be influenced by his son."^{128/} In tribute to a mind that was at once steady and flexible, the father would be influenced, but not overcome. For example, the elder Yeats continues to see "art as portraiture",^{129/} but is willing to concede, in a 1914 letter to his son, that a portrait of mother and child "is incomplete art -- so the artists and poets of old invented the Madonna with the divine infant".^{130/} The elder Yeats has moved away from the realists, but stops short of embracing the notion of a recurring subject matter of mother and child as "how all natural or supernatural stories run."^{131/}

While it is true to say, as Ellmann does, that "a change came over the relations of father and son at about the time of these letters,"^{132/} it is also true that the change involved the creation of new selves by both father and son. If the hair on the son's head stood up in terror as he created

a new self from the remains of a personality like his father's, so when his father watched his son's play about Cuchulain's killing of his son, he found it

the most thrilling and enthralling experience
I ever went through. You touched at the same
moment the fountain of joy and tears.^{133/}

Father and son thus share a recognition of the close relation of primal opposites. Knowing that joy and tears, love and hate mingle in the creation of a new poet, both may have appreciated that the son's hate for the ideas of his father is an instance of what Robert Graves called "the single grand theme of poetry" -- the eternal struggle of the poet with his rival -- his other self -- for the favor of his muse.^{134/}

Poets know, says Graves, that the poet is "himself and his other self at the same time".^{135/} Failure to recognize this, Graves teaches, "had led, through dualistic theology to the theory that death, evil, decay and destruction are erroneous concepts which God, the Good, the Right Hand, will one day disprove" ^{136/} Yeats labored under no such conception.

Yeats knew, as Graves says all poets know, that his other self was a part of himself and that each part "must conquer in turn in an age-long and chivalrous war fought for the favor of the White Goddess", the muse.^{137/} The war between these selves gave birth to Yeats's poetry when hate overcame the old self and a new personality emerged.

III

Per Amica Silentia Lunae And The
Self-Distrusting Poems: Inspiration
That Arrives "The Moment I Cease To Hate"

Yeats's intriguing little book, Per Amica Silentia Lunae, published in 1917, tells much about how he transformed angry tension into creative energy, and forged a new self in the process. The book, its two essays and one poem bear four titles, all in Latin and each containing a clue to the meaning of a book that is deliberately presented in the form of a puzzle.

Yeats's appreciation of the puzzling nature of Per Amica's title is apparent from the typescript of the 1925 version of A Vision where Michael Robartes muses "why that title 'through the friendly silence of the Moon', why 'silence' and why 'Moon'?"^{1/} The text of Per Amica stops short of an explicit answer to this question, although Yeats does acknowledge his debt to Virgil's account of the Greeks stealing back to Troy "from Tenedos by the friendly quiet of the silent moon" when he boasts that the thoughts in the second of the book's two essays came from putting himself to school "where all things are seen: A Tenedo tacitae per amica silentia lunae".^{2/} The pertinence of Virgil's language is derived from Yeats's use of the moon, as in The Cat and the Moon, to symbolize the "opposite [that man] seeks perpetually".^{3/} Per Amica Silentia Lunae tells how a poet's striving for inspiration from the spiritual world can be satisfied by a guardian spirit, or "daimon", who brings from the anima mundi the opposite of his chosen man's

psychic life.^{4/} The lunar wisdom of Per Amica is at once the product of, and a guide to, the poet's quest for the unity of being achieved when his mind is united with its opposite through daimonic visitation. Yeats completes the thought in A Vision when he says that "Daimonic man" of phase 17, among whom he counted himself and Dante, achieves unity of being through expression of thought antithetical to his own.^{5/}

The antithetical relationship between man and daimon is reflected in the opposing titles of Per Amica's two essays, "Anima Hominis" ("The Soul of the Man") and "Anima Mundi" ("The Soul of the World"). Yeats's titles, and the content of his essays, anticipate Jung, both in distinguishing between the personal psyche of the poet and the storehouse of creative imagery in the collective unconscious, and in assigning a role to daimons as messengers between the individual mind and the general mind.

"Ego Dominus Tuus", the title of Per Amica's poem, was the message ("I am your master") of the daimonic Lord of Love who appeared to Dante in La Vita Nuova, another book of prose and poetry about the creative process by a man of phase 17.^{6/} But the genius loci of Per Amica Silentia Lunae is no Lord of Love. Although Yeats concedes that "[t]he books say that our happiness comes from the opposite of hate",^{7/} hate reigns as the force of creative energy in Per Amica

Silentia Lunae. Dante himself is presented as receiving his inspiration, not because of his love for Beatrice, but because of the "unjust anger" in his heart.^{8/} This is the side of Dante excoriated by I. A. Richards in his answer to Dante's poem:

Great hater was this poet, trusting above
A source of Hate, his hatred to confirm.^{9/}

Great hatred predominates in Per Amica Silentia Lunae: the creative technique of the daimonic men of phase 17 is illustrated by Yeats's reference to Landor,^{10/} one of the "antithetical men", like Yeats and Dante, who are "violent in themselves because they hate all that impedes their personality."^{11/}

Denizens of phase 17 are not unlike their neighbors at No. 16 who "[a]t one moment . . . are full of hate . . . and at the next produce the . . . mythology of Blake, and discover symbolism to express the overflowing and bursting of the mind."^{12/} Their hate seems necessary to clear a passageway to the overflowing of the general mind and to sweep away threatening ideas that impede the artist's personality. At the opening of "Anima Hominis" Yeats is mired in "hostility that is but fear" of threatening ideas. By the end of "Anima Mundi", however, he is drinking with sweetness images from the anima mundi that arrive "the moment I cease to hate" and begin, instead, "to make a new

personality" ^{13/} Read in tandem, the two essays of Per Amica Silentia Lunae reflect a process in which the hostility generated by Yeats's opposition to threatening ideas gives birth to a two-fold tertium quid, a new poem and a new poet. To illustrate the process, Per Amica's poem, "Ego Dominus Tuus", presents the poet, torn between the opposing voices of self and anti-self, awaiting images from the anima mundi.

The idea of making a new self through conflict with an anti-self was an enduring one for Yeats. That idea was what Yeats had in mind when he recalled that "[i]t was at Coole that the first few simple thoughts that now, grown complex through their contact with other thoughts, explain the world, came to me from beyond my own mind." ^{14/} Yeats was referring to a time in 1897 or 1898 when he and Lady Gregory "had heard many tales of changelings, grown men and women as well as children, who as the people believe are taken by the fairies, some spirit or inanimate object bewitched into their likeness remaining in their stead" ^{15/} "I constantly asked myself," he recalled, "what reality there could be in these tales, often supported by so much testimony."

While pondering this parable of profound psychological change, and during a period in which he experienced "certain half dreams" that came "between sleep and waking", Yeats

woke one night to find myself lying upon my back with all my limbs rigid, and to hear a ceremonial measured voice, which did not seem to be mine, speaking through my lips, "we make an image of him who sleeps," it said, "and it is not him who sleeps, and we call it Emmanuel."^{16/}

Yeats does not explicitly refer to Emmanuel's meaning ("God be with you"), but the message nonetheless is clear: the gods make their own image of the sleeper and somehow inhabit it. That thought, said Yeats, with others "often found as strangely being added to it, became the thought of the Mask, which I have used . . . to explain men's characters."^{17/}

One of the strangely-added thoughts came when Yeats randomly opened Burkitt's Early Eastern Christianity to a page that told of how an "Angel" came to an exiled king's son while he slept and brought him a "mantle" that "had the exile's own form and likeness." This experience confirmed Yeats's belief in the role of spirits in the creation of a new personality, but, as he says, did not explain "my other conviction" that the sleeping exile and the Mask are "antithetical."^{18/} The latter idea, he said, became clear in connection with the thought that everything in the world of Fairy is the opposite of our own world, a principle illustrated

. . . when a countryman told Lady Gregory and myself that he had heard the crying of new-dropped lambs in November - Spring in the world of Fairy, being November with us.^{19/}

Yeats's account of how the ideas that explain the world "came to me from beyond my own mind" emphasizes the

un-Lockean answer Yeats gave to Locke's question -- "How came he by them?" -- as to the origin of ideas. Yeats elaborately shows that his ideas entered his mind other than through his senses. They came from a dream-like state between waking and sleeping, a state he associates with the anima mundi,^{20/} and from folk beliefs whose recurrence at different times and places suggests their innateness. Yeats's pervasively influential belief in an antithetical self is thus grounded in sources at once "beyond my mind" and independent of the senses.

He was thus disposed to be receptive when, at a seance, on July 20, 1915, a spirit who identified himself as Leo Africanus, told him, through the automatic handwriting of the medium, that "[h]e was drawn to me because in life he had been all undoubting impulse . . . [and] I was doubting, conscientious and timid."^{21/} Leo went on to say that he and Yeats were "contrary" and that "by association with me would be made not one but two perfected natures."^{22/}

It is unlikely that Yeats was specifically aware of Jung's teaching that "communications from the 'Beyond' can be seen to be the activities of broken-off bits of the psyche", like an image of a powerful parent.^{23/} Neither was Yeats likely to be aware of Jung's advice that the best way of dealing with such an image (or "complex") is to "objectify" it, by regarding it as an entity in its own right and engaging

it in conversation.^{24/} Yeats nonetheless accepted Leo's invitation to write Leo a letter giving all his doubts about spiritual things "and then to write a reply as if from him to me."^{25/}

Whether or not we call Leo Africanus a powerful parent imago, or, more simply, that combatant in Yeats's mind who represented a powerful will, Leo's message as drafted for him by Yeats, knew its man: "You are sympathetic," Leo told Yeats, "you meet many people, you discuss much, you must meet all of their doubts as they arise, & so cannot break away into a life of your own as did Swedenborg, Boehme & Blake."^{26/} This is the Yeats who still lacks the will to be his own self, to overcome opposing ideas, and who hesitates to express his opinions among people who would make light of them.^{27/} Leo knows that Yeats's problem is not simply an intellectual one, but involves a need to escape the Yeatsian "infirmity of will", and thus tells Yeats that he is "your opposite" not merely because he opposes him in intellect, but in "will" as well.^{28/}

Yeats never published the Leo Africanus manuscript. Instead, in Per Amica Silentia Lunae, he gives us a poetic dialogue between poet and anti-self, and two essays -- "a kind of prose backing to my poetry," as he described them in a letter to his father^{29/} -- dealing with the role of spirits in the creative process, and the need of willful hatred to stimulate their appearance.

The Yeats of the first essay, "Anima Hominis", is the timid figure addressed by Leo. He says that we poets,

unlike rhetoricians, "sing amid our uncertainty".^{30/} His opposite is simple, says Yeats, because he himself is "heterogeneous and confused".^{31/} So heterogeneous is Yeats that when he sets out to make use of his father's dictum that "rhetoric expresses other people's feelings, poetry one's own,"^{32/} his own feelings are so divided that what results is the quintessentially Yeatsian aphorism that "We make out of the quarrel with others, rhetoric but out of the quarrel with ourselves, poetry".^{33/} The poem included with the essays illustrates the aphorism graphically. "Ego Dominus Tuus" presents a quarrel between two voices, Hic (The One) and Ille (The Other). It is one of several Yeats poems whose form bears witness to Yeats's comment that "I even write my poetry by self-distrusting reasons."^{34/}

In "Ego Dominus Tuus", Ille summons his anti-self:

By the help of an image
I call to my own opposite, summon all
That I have handled least, least looked upon.^{35/}

In response to Hic's comment that "I would find myself and not an image", Ille lays bare a self who suffers from Yeatsian infirmity of will. He recognizes that adherence to nineteenth century sincerity has made him, in Leo's word, too "timid", too passive so that he "but half create[s]", when he should create with "the old nonchalance", the sprezzatura of the Renaissance artist:

That is our modern hope, and by its light
We have lit upon the gentle, sensitive mind
And lost the old nonchalance of the hand;
Whether we have chosen chisel, pen or brush,
We are but critics, or but half create,
Timid, entangled, empty and abashed,
Lacking the countenance of our friends.36/

The echo of Wordsworth's "mighty world/Of eye and
ear, - both what they half create,/And what perceive"^{37/}

evokes Locke's doctrine that the intellect simply reflects
what it perceives. In "Anima Hominis", Yeats argues for
escaping the passivity of the mind as Lockean mirror by
means of meditation on a mask:

[O]ur culture, with its doctrine of sincerity
and self-realization, made us gentle and passive
. . . . [t]he Middle Ages and the Renaissance
were right to found theirs upon the imitation of
Christ or some other classic hero. St. Francis
and Caesar Borgia made themselves overmastering,
creative persons by turning from the mirror to
meditation upon a mask.38/

Yeats here merges two ideas. One is the notion of an opposing
spirit as a cure for the personal passivity diagnosed by Leo.
The other is the idea that the poetry of "overmastering,
creative persons" is preferable to that of Lockean minds who
"are but critics, or but half create". The old idea from
Coole of rebirth as something new thus finds its way into
Yeats's poetics in the form of the timid poet's "rebirth as
something not oneself", an idea illustrated both in the essay
and in the poem in terms of Dante's "hunger for the apple on
the bough/Most out of reach".

The first essay is devoted to a discussion of the poet's conscious struggle with his opposite. There is no mention of a Jungian collective unconscious as the source of dreams and creativity. Instead, Yeats refers to the notion of the Freudian "doctors of medicine" who "have discovered that certain dreams of the night . . . are the day's unfulfilled desire",^{44/} and to the related theory that there are "certain men whose art is less an opposing virtue than a compensation for some accident of health or circumstance",^{45/} in other words, the wish fulfillment Freud posited at the heart of creativity.^{46/} Yeats concedes that there may be some -- Synge among them -- whose creative work is no more than wish fulfillment. But they are a minor exception to the great artists whose work is an opposing virtue. Such men are the subject of "Anima Mundi", which rushes immediately to the "general mind" as the source of poetic inspiration: "I have always sought", the essay begins, "to bring my mind close to the mind of Indian and Japanese poets, old women in Connacht, mediums in Soho, . . . learned authors who refer all to antiquity, to immerse it in the general mind" ^{47/}

The question of how the conscious mind of the poet (anima hominis) can tap the resources of the general mind (anima mundi) was still in Yeats's mind when, some months

after the completion of Per Amica Silentia Lunae, Mrs. Yeats's experiences with automatic writing began. The first recorded questions of the Automatic Script focused on just this question.

Yeats asked:

1. What is the relation between the Anima Mundi and the Antithetical Self?
2. What quality in the Anima Mundi compels that relationship?48/

The answer states that Anima Mundi

. . . is the purely instinctive & cosmic quality in man which seeks completion in its opposite which is sought by the subconscious self in anima mundi to use your own term while it is the conscious mind that makes the E[vil] P[ersona] in consciously seeking opposite & then emulating it.49/

The answer accords with Yeats's practice in Per Amica Silentia Lunae of distinguishing between the conscious activity of the anima hominis and the unconscious, mythic or instinctive quality of the anima mundi. In Per Amica Silentia Lunae, the former is characterized by an angry tension between opposites; the latter, when hatred exhausts all personal emotion, consists of sweetly flowing images from the depths of the unconscious.

Much of "Anima Mundi"'s discussion of how the poet gains access to the collective unconscious is clouded with such confusing terminology as "animal spirits", "vehicles" of the soul, and other archaisms out of Henry More. If not understood as an attempt to rationalize the appearance of

Leo Africanus in terms of a respectable philosophy, the essay has a puzzling air of unreality. On the other hand, when Yeats's use of More's terms is informed by the meaning of the terms "vehicle of the soul" and "animal spirits" in More's philosophy, the essay sheds new light on Yeats's theories of poetic creation.

More begins with the notion of an immortal soul. He posits that it is capable of inhabiting three different types of bodies or "vehicles". One is the terrestrial vehicle, the human body.^{50/} The second is the aethereal, in which the soul dwells in eternity.^{51/} These two vehicles, says More, were acknowledged by Aristotle. More and the Platonists believed in a third vehicle or body, the aereal, one that provides a link between man and the hierarchy of spirits. Such a vehicle can accommodate the soul when it leaves the body at death, and bring it into contact with those intermediate spirits through whom, according to Swedenborg, the celestial angels commune with men.^{52/} In other words, the aereal vehicle is exactly the kind of vehicle in which Leo Africanus might reside.

"Animal spirits" are important because they are the means through which the soul acts within the body. In particular, the soul "imagines" through the animal spirits in man which correspond to the spirit of nature in the world.^{53/}

The soul is most at home when imagining. She feels imprisoned in the body, says More, feeling herself "created for a better and purer fate; which she could not attain to, unless she lived out of the Body: which she does in some sort in divine Ecstasies and Dreams" ^{54/} More illustrates the extent to which the soul of the world infuses the imagination during a moment of ecstasy in terms of Yeats's favorite example, of which More says there is "none so famous", namely that of "the Birds making their Nests, and particularly the artificial structure of the Martins nests under the arches of Church-windows." ^{55/} More says that the martins are so "inspired and carried away in a natural rapture by this Spirit of Nature to doe they know not what" ^{56/}

Thus, when Yeats says in "Anima Mundi" that the "dead living in their memories are, I am persuaded, the source of all that we call instinct, . . . and it is the dream Martens [sic] that, all unknowing, are master-masons to the living Martens [sic] building about church windows their elaborate nests", ^{57/} he is affirming his kinship with Henry More and declaring that the process of poetic creation is one in which images from the anima mundi infuse the imagination. Yeats and More are here in accord with Jung who analogizes the archetypes of the collective unconscious to the "migratory and nest-building instincts of birds" ^{58/}

Since the anima mundi includes the dead living in their memories, Leo Africanus in his aerial vehicle can speak to the imagination of the poet. Yeats subtly injects this idea into "Anima Mundi", observing that if, as More teaches, "all our mental images no less than apparitions (and I see no reason to distinguish) are forms existing in the general vehicle of Anima Mundi, and mirrored in our particular vehicle, many crooked things are made straight."^{59/} Leo is but a specific instance of the general rule of correspondence between our specific thoughts and the general mind.

The question of how the individual soul gains access to the general mind is again considered in "A Dialogue of Self and Soul", another poem written "by self-distrusting reasons". "My Soul", knowing that dead ancestors congregate in the anima mundi, urges "Myself" to:

Think of ancestral night that can
If but imagination scorn the earth
And intellect its wandering
To this and that and t'other thing
Deliver from the crime of death and birth.^{60/}

If the Yeatsian intellect could stop wandering between opposing ideas, imagination could "scorn the earth", or, as Blake said in answer to Reynolds, travel to heaven, thus restoring a vision of the unfallen world: deliver from the crime of death and birth. Yeats's wandering mind prompts a similar, if more strongly put, injunction in "The Balloon of the Mind":

Hands, do what you're bid:
Bring the balloon of the mind
That bellies and drags in the wind
Into its narrow shed.61/

Yeats knows the ambivalence of his balloon-like mind, knows, as he says in the letter to AE already quoted, that he is still tempted by the very ideas that would destroy his conception of himself as poet. Yeats penetrates deeply into his own psychological make-up when he says that "we hold down as it were on the sword's point what would, if undefeated, grow into the counter-truth, that when our whole being lives we create alike out of our love and hate".^{62/} Ambivalence temporarily overcome by hate: this is the road to creativity.

To fix his wandering mind on one of two competing ideas, Yeats must hate the other, hold it down at sword's point:

All that our opponent expresses must be shown for a part of our greater expression, that he may become our thrall - be 'enthralled' as they say. Yet our whole is not his whole and he may break away and enthrall us in his turn, and there arise between us a struggle like that of the sexes. All life is such a struggle.63/

Thus Yeats's Ribh is right when he "considers Christian Love insufficient". It is insufficient, at least, for the ambivalent poet who creates out of both love and hate. Hate can serve to bring an end to ambivalence by clearing the soul of threatening ideas.^{64/} Such clearing of the soul is celebrated as the poet's greatest work in another poem containing the two voices of the "self-distrusting" method,

"The Man and the Echo". The man rejects Echo's invitation to "lie down and die" because

That were to shirk
The spiritual intellect's great work,
And shirk it in vain. There is no release
In a bodkin or disease,
Nor can there be work so great
As that which clears man's dirty slate.^{65/}

In contrast to Locke's view of the soul as a tabula rasa to be imprinted with life's experiences, Yeats sees the soul as a tabula abrasa that must be cleaned before it can be delivered from the crime of death and birth. Hatred's cleansing power takes on high purpose.

The task of cleansing the slate belongs to both the living and the dead. As Yeats puts it in "Anima Mundi", "[t]he toil of the living is to free themselves from an endless sequence of objects, and that of the dead to free themselves from an endless sequence of thoughts."^{66/} Sections VIII through XVI of "Anima Mundi" describe how, after death, the soul toils to free itself from a seemingly endless sequence of thoughts. That is why death is "no release", whether by suicide ("bodkin") or natural cause ("disease"), and why the important work of the poet is cleansing of the slate. The degree to which Yeats was troubled by the presence of conflicting ideas in his own soul is illustrated by his sympathy with Hamlet's refusal of "the bare bodkin because of what dreams might come."^{67/} Ambivalent Hamlet lacked the cleansing power of Ribh's hatred.

Yeats poised between love and hate is a textbook example of Anthony Storr's observation "that creative people are distinguished by an exceptional degree of division between opposites, and also by an exceptional awareness of this division".^{68/} "Without contraries is no progression", was the way Blake put it, adding that "Attraction and Repulsion, Reason and Energy, Love and Hate, are necessary to human existence."^{69/} "All creation", said Yeats, "is from conflict, whether with our own mind or that of others."^{70/} The role of internal conflict in the creative process is described in the dialogue between the Soul and the Heart in Section VII of the poem aptly named "Vacillation",^{71/} another of the "self-distrusting" poems. The poem contains what Yeats described in a letter to Dorothy Wellesley as "an argument that has gone on in my head for years".^{72/} In the conversation, the Soul makes three statements, and the Heart three responses. Each merits elaboration.

The conversation begins with the Soul's advice: "Seek out reality, leave things that seem." A good Platonist like Yeats would interpret the advice of the Soul as an invitation to leave this world of appearances, the cave of shadow and echo, in favor of the really real world of pure form. The Heart responds with a question that sums up the views of the born poet who realizes that the tensions of this world, however bedeviling, are nonetheless the stuff of his poetry: "What, be a singer born and lack a theme?"

The Soul responds that there is more to existence than poetry; in particular, there is the solace of the release of tension, the purgation that the angel brought Isaiah in the form of a burning coal.^{73/} The Soul puts it this way: "Isaiah's coal, what more can man desire?" The Heart responds, seeing the poet silenced: "Struck dumb in the simplicity of fire." An otherwise confusing passage in "Anima Mundi" explains, and is explained by, the notion of the poet "Struck dumb in the simplicity of fire." In "Anima Mundi", Yeats says that:

There are two realities, the terrestrial and the condition of fire. All power is from the terrestrial condition, for there all opposites meet and there only is the extreme of choice possible, full freedom . . . [b]ut in the condition of fire is all music and all rest.^{74/}

In other words, the terrestrial world in which the poet lives is the world of opposites, the world in which he creates out of love and hate. In the purely spiritual world there is "the simplicity of fire", but, there being no tension between opposites, there is no creativity; the poet is struck dumb. The Soul urges: "Look on that fire, salvation walks within." The Heart foresakes salvation in favor of the poet's traditional subject matter, the fall of man and the possibility of restoration of the unfallen world. The Heart sums it up this way: "What theme had Homer but original sin?"

Yeats follows Homer and his "unchristened heart", mired in the here and now, loving and hating, and creating out of the tension. Ambivalent Yeats might be mired

indefinitely midway between love and hate unless he could escape family infirmity of will. History taught him that Dante was stirred to creativity by hunger for the apple on the bough most out of reach. Folklore and dream taught him that he could be born anew as someone different. Leo came to him because Leo's impulsiveness complemented his own timidity. Summing it all up in the passage of "The Trembling of the Veil" quoted in Chapter II, Yeats said that there are "personifying spirits" who bring the soul to crisis, ^{75/} and "the will to full intensity" ^{76/} by bringing "their chosen man to the greatest obstacle he may confront without despair". ^{77/} That crisis is genius, the crisis that joins "our trivial daily mind" to anima mundi, the "age-long memoried self . . . that teaches the birds to make their nest". ^{78/}

Not prepared to be quite so explicit in "Anima Mundi", Yeats says simply that the Daimon who opens the door to anima mundi is drawn to his opposite. ^{79/} The "Daimon" is clearly the "personifying spirit" or "Gatekeeper" of "The Trembling of the Veil". Infirm of will, Yeats attracts a Daimon of overmastering will who brings him to the crisis of his own ambivalence: his hate for the ideas of his lovable father, his attraction to ideas that would destroy him as poet. The overmastering voice of the Daimon gives vent to the hatred within Yeats for the forces that threaten him: Yeatsian infirmity

of will, ideas inimical to his role as poet, and the notion of himself as permanent son, unable to establish himself in his own right as did Swedenborg, Boehme and Blake. Hatred clears the soul, making it receptive to images from the anima mundi.

Jung disparages terminology similar to that used by Yeats, calling such terms as "guardians of the threshold" the "jargon of theosophy".^{80/} Nonetheless, he explains that by giving these broken-off bits of the psyche a persona and engaging them in dialectic, we make their content conscious, and "by making them conscious we convert them into bridges to the unconscious."^{81/} The integration of their contents into the conscious makes a new self.^{82/} As Yeats says in "Anima Mundi", creativity comes when I cease to hate and "begin to make a new personality".^{83/} The new personality is that of the masterful poet who makes a poem out of both the vented anger and the images from anima mundi. Speaking of such men as Dante, and thus implicitly of himself, Yeats allows that "[w]e gaze at such men in awe, because we gaze not at a work of art, but at the re-creation of the man through that art, the birth of a new species of man"^{84/}

The creative -- and creating -- experience of the new man is described by "My Soul" in "A Dialogue of Self and Soul":

Such fullness in that quarter overflows
And falls into the basin of the mind
That man is stricken deaf and dumb and blind,
For intellect no longer knows
Is from the Ought, or Knower from the Known -
That is to say, ascends to Heaven^{85/}

The Plotinian image of the overflowing basin assures us that we are in the presence of the union of the individual and general minds that had been promised earlier in the poem "If but imagination scorn the earth/And intellect its wandering". The Lockean world of sense perception has no part in this union. On the contrary, "man is stricken deaf and dumb and blind". The Cartesian split between mind and matter is healed: intellect no longer knows the Knower from the Known. Moreover, in a state of perfect knowledge, there is no longer tension between the will and its objects, or a need to rouse a congenitally infirm will. Instead, Is and Ought, a pair of opposites identified in A Vision as the will and its objects, a pair complementary to Knower and Known,^{86/} are merged. This state of unity is expressly defined in the poem as an "ascent to Heaven", a return to the unfallen world. The task Blake set for the poet is accomplished.

Descartes and Locke are again the enemy in this Yeatsian emphasis on the role of the collective unconscious in the creation of a poem. Descartes had not only split the world into mind and matter, but had defined mind strictly in terms of conscious thinking, thereby banishing the notion of "factors lying outside but influencing immediate awareness" that had traditionally been taken for granted.^{87/} Indeed, More's fellow Cambridge Platonist, Cudworth, was quick to take issue with philosophers like Descartes "who made the

essence of the soul to consist in cogitation, and again, the essence of cogitation in clear and express consciousness "^{88/}

But Locke sided with Descartes, and Locke prevailed; but only for a while. By the nineteenth century, it was possible for Goethe to warn that "man cannot persist long in a conscious state, he must throw himself back into the Unconscious, for his root lives there . . .",^{89/} and for Nietzsche to teach that "every extension of knowledge arises from making conscious the unconscious".^{90/} L. C. Whyte concludes that the notion of unconscious mental process, which was "conceivable (in post-Cartesian Europe) around 1700 [and] topical around 1800", had become "fashionable around 1870-1880".^{91/} Yeats's linking of the notion of the unconscious with the idea of the general mind reunites ideas that had been separated, and then banished, by Descartes and Locke.

For all the emphasis Yeats put on the influx of the contents of anima mundi, he nonetheless insisted -- ultimately -- on the poet's responsibility for his art. More and Jung both suggest that the mind of the artist is overwhelmed by the contents of the collective unconscious. More's martins are so carried away they know not what they do. Jung's artist is subject to the "tyrannical might" of the unborn work,^{92/} much like Blake who said the authors of Jerusalem were "in Eternity",^{93/} and that he wrote it "from immediate Dictation, twelve or sometimes twenty or thirty lines at a time, without Premeditation, & even

against my Will" ^{94/} Yeats himself concludes "Anima Mundi" on a note of uncertainty as to whether he or the anima mundi is doing the creating, "not knowing when I am the finger, when the clay."

Yeats, however, did not overthrow the notion of the artist as passive recorder of sense impressions to assume the role of passive recorder of the contents of the collective unconscious. Ultimately, he defines himself in terms of a strong will and proclaims his own control over the creative process as the "I" who makes and remakes the self through the work. ^{95/}

In fact, he expressly distinguishes himself from the principal early modernists in terms of his own assertion of control over his work. Joyce, Pound and Proust, he suggests, are disciples of a "new naturalism" in literature, which is allied to a "new realism" in philosophy. ^{96/} The new realists solved the problem attendant upon Locke's doctrine of primary qualities by taking all of the qualities, primary as well as secondary, out of the mind and putting them back into nature. Yeats regards this philosophy, with its preference for nature over mind, as a shrinking of the conscious mind and thus sees its counterpart artist as marred by "a consciousness that has shrunk back, grown intermittent and accidental, into the looking glass", leaving "man helpless before the contents of

against my Will"^{94/} Yeats himself concludes "Anima Mundi" on a note of uncertainty as to whether he or the anima mundi is doing the creating, "not knowing when I am the finger, when the clay."

Yeats, however, did not overthrow the notion of the artist as passive recorder of sense impressions to assume the role of passive recorder of the contents of the collective unconscious. Ultimately, he defines himself in terms of a strong will and proclaims his own control over the creative process as the "I" who makes and remakes the self through the work.^{95/}

In fact, he expressly distinguishes himself from the principal early modernists in terms of his own assertion of control over his work. Joyce, Pound and Proust, he suggests, are disciples of a "new naturalism" in literature, which is allied to a "new realism" in philosophy.^{96/} The new realists solved the problem attendant upon Locke's doctrine of primary qualities by taking all of the qualities, primary as well as secondary, out of the mind and putting them back into nature. Yeats regards this philosophy, with its preference for nature over mind, as a shrinking of the conscious mind and thus sees its counterpart artist as marred by "a consciousness that has shrunk back, grown intermittent and accidental, into the looking glass", leaving "man helpless before the contents of

his own mind."^{97/} Rejecting "anything that drives mind into the quicksilver", Yeats will be master in his own house. He will not be counted one with Joyce, Pound and Proust:

One thinks of Joyce's Anna Livia Plurabelle, Pound's Cantos, works of heroic sincerity, the man, his active faculties in suspense, one finger beating time to a bell sounding and echoing in the depths of his own mind^{98/}

Yeats recognizes that he might have seemed a likely candidate for a school that repudiates Locke's distinction between primary and secondary qualities.^{99/} But he would have his repudiation a la Berkeley, and restore all the qualities to mind. If the "new naturalists" have replaced a once-static nature with a flux, the moment has come for some poet to cry "the flux is in my own mind."^{100/} Heir of Berkeley, Yeats raises that cry, at least in those moments when the individual mind unites with anima mundi, when intellect no longer knows the Knower from the Known, precious moments generated by a hatred that clears the soul.

IV

Sibylline Frenzy Blind: Saeva Indignatio

As Gateway To The Wisdom Of The Dead

The use of hate as a wellspring of creative activity did not begin with Yeats. It is at least as old as the process by which the angry frenzy of Dionysiac ritual gave birth to the Greek practice of ecstatic prophecy and the related notion of the divine madness of the inspired poet. Yeats forcefully asserted his place in this tradition when, in "Blood and the Moon", he declared himself the heir of "Swift beating on his breast in sibylline frenzy blind."^{1/}

There was no doubt in Yeats's mind that Swift's frenzy was fueled by hate. Yeats declared that he found in Swift "Irish hatred and solitude, the hatred of human life that made Swift write Gulliver and the epitaph upon his tomb, that can still make us wag between extremes and doubt our sanity."^{2/} Similarly, Dubliner Owen Aherne remarks in "The Tables of the Law" that Swift "made a soul for the gentlemen of this city by hating his neighbour as himself."^{3/}

Nor was Swiftian hate confined within the walls of Dublin. In studying Swift, said Yeats, "I collect materials for my thought and work, for some identification of my beliefs with the nation itself."^{4/} The common bond that linked Yeats, Swift and "the nation itself" was hate. "No people", said Yeats, "hate as we do in whom that past [of English persecution recounted by Lecky] is always alive."^{5/} It is the birthright of Swift and Yeats:

Out of Ireland have we come.
Great hatred, little room,
Maimed us at the start.
I carry from my mother's womb
A fanatic heart.6/

The hatred of human life that made Swift write the epitaph on his tomb is the satirist's hatred of some defect in a humanity whose members he loves enough to be moved to a rage directed at curing the defect. This ambivalence at the heart of Swiftian hate is summed up in the famous letter in which Swift asks Pope to give the world "one lash the more at my request":

I have ever hated all nations,
professions, and communities, and
all my love is toward individuals;
for instance, I hate the tribe of
lawyers, but I love counsellor
such-a-one, and judge such-a-one: it
is so with physicians, (I will not
speak of my own trade,) soldiers,
English, Scotch, French, and the rest.
But principally I hate and detest
that animal called man; although I
heartily love John, Peter, Thomas,
and so forth.7/

This fierce blending of love and hate manifested itself in the "saeva indignatio" of Swift's self-composed epitaph. The Latin epitaph fascinated Yeats. He called it the greatest in human history,^{8/} and provided an English version in "Swift's Epitaph":

Swift has sailed into his rest;
Savage indignation there
Cannot lacerate his breast.
Imitate him if you dare,
World-besotted traveller; he
Served human liberty.9/

Swift's "saeva indignatio" evokes the tradition of Juvenal who, with a keen eye to the inspirational possibilities of indignation, observed that "si natura negat, facit indignatio versum".^{10/} Juvenal, Swift and Yeats all knew that "if nature cannot, indignation will make verses": hatred of some human vice, folly or idea will stir the creative juices, will, in the words of Michael Robartes, provide a "crazy juice that makes the pulses beat".^{11/} Moreover, when Yeats directed his Swiftian hatred at an opposing idea, he had the example, not only of Swift himself, but of Swift's great contemporaries, for, as Yeats recounted it, Berkeley, Burke, Swift and Goldsmith all "found in England the opposite that stung their own thought into expression and made it lucid."^{12/}

The relationship of Swiftian hate to sibylline frenzy is illuminated by history. The Sybil was one of the examples adduced by Socrates of the "prophetic madness . . . which is a divine gift".^{13/} The term sybil originally referred generically to a type of ecstatically-inspired prophetess,^{14/} but Socrates no doubt had in mind the Sibyl whose pre-eminence entitled her to claim the title for herself, the Sybil at Cumae. To be sure, the Sibyl, and Greek prophecy generally, were traditionally associated with Apollo. Nonetheless, there is an undeniably Dionysiac tone to the frenzy exhibited by the Sibyl. Witness, for example, the "foaming" and "raving" mouth, the "wild heart", that attend her "inspired responses" in the Aeneid.^{15/}

Although Socrates lists the "ritual madness" of the Dionysiacs as but one of the four forms of divine madness, its frenzy so infused the otherwise serene Greek consciousness that it can be identified in each of the other three: the prophetic, the poetic and the erotic. Socrates himself grounds poetry in frenzy: poets exhibit "the madness of those who are possessed by the Muses; which taking hold of a delicate and virgin soul, and inspiring frenzy . . ." gives birth to poetry. ^{16/}

The potent Dionysus behind all this frenzy was no stranger to Yeats. He knew Frazer's lively account of Dionysus as dying and rising god, ^{17/} Thomas Taylor's A Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries, ^{18/} and Nietzsche's provocative essay on the opposing impulses of Dionysus and Apollo. ^{19/}

Taylor recounts the story with economy. Young Dionysus, while beholding his image in a mirror, was attacked and "miserably torn in pieces by the Titans", who then boiled, roasted and ate his flesh, but not his heart, which "during his laceration" was snatched away by Pallas and preserved. By a new generation of his immortal father Zeus and mortal mother Semele, Dionysus re-emerged and "afterwards filled up the number of the gods." In the meantime "from the exhalations formed from the ashes of the burning bodies of the Titans, mankind were produced." ^{20/}

These events were re-enacted by the worshipers of Dionysus in the famous nocturnal dance, stirred on, as Rhode recounts it, "by the clash of bronze cymbals; the dull

thunderous roar of kettle-drums; and . . . the 'maddening unison' of the deep-toned flute" ^{21/} "In this fashion", Rhode continues, the worshipers "raged wildly until, with every sense wrought to the highest pitch of excitement and in 'sacred frenzy', they fell upon the beast selected as their victim . . . tore their captured prey limb from limb [and t]hen with their teeth seized the bleeding flesh and devoured it raw." ^{22/}

The Greeks explained these extraordinary phenomena by saying that the souls of the worshipers thus "possessed" were no longer "at home" but "abroad", having left their bodies behind. ^{23/} This, according to Rhode, was the literal meaning understood by the Greek when he spoke of the "ekstasis" of the soul in these conditions of excitement. ^{24/} The released soul "winged its way to union with the god" and was there possessed by the god in the condition of enthousiasmos in which it communes with the god and shares in his powers. One of those powers is the power of prophecy, and it is one whose possessor, unlike the seer as presented by Homer, had no need "to wait for accidental, ambiguous and external signs of the god's will, but, in the state of ecstatic union with the god, could speak with the knowledge of the god himself." ^{25/}

The Dionysian worshiper thus spoke with that certain knowledge derived from the spiritual world for which Yeats longed all his life. Homer himself, if he betrayed no Dionysiac frenzy, knew the desire for inspired knowledge. He appeals to the

Muses for an army list, imploring that "you are goddesses, watching all things, knowing all things; but we have only hearsay and not knowledge."^{26/} E. R. Dodds notes that these "wistful words have the ring of sincerity"; they show a man who "knew the fallibility of tradition and was troubled by it; he wanted first-hand evidence."^{27/} Homer and Yeats, then, share a longing for "evidences". They are not alone. Noting that several Indo-European languages have a common term for "poet" and "seer" (Latin vates, Irish fili), H. M. and N. K. Chadwick observe that throughout the ancient languages of northern Europe, the ideas of poetry, information and prophecy are intimately connected.^{28/} So much is it a part of the poet's function to have special knowledge that the Chadwicks call Hesiod's claim to knowledge of "things present, future and past", -- a claim to which Yeats aspires as a seer of "what is past, or passing, or to come"^{29/} -- a "static description of a seer".^{30/}

Poetry thus emerges as the medium by which the seer shares his inspired knowledge of the spirit world with his fellow man.^{31/} The frenzy of the Dionysians was so irresistible a technique for gaining the special knowledge prized by poets that, by the time of Plato, the notion of the frenzied poet composing in a state of ecstasy was well-known.^{32/} It is at least as old as Democritus who held that the finest poems

were composed with "inspiration and a holy breath", and denied that one could be a great poet sine furore.^{33/}

Yeats is a natural-born member of this fraternity of seekers after inspiration. He could be expected to recognize the presence of Dionysus in the sacrificial victim, and appreciate the communion between worshiper and god in the consumption of the bleeding animal flesh. Nor would symbolist Yeats be slow to appreciate that the physical union represented the underlying spiritual union between the god and the worshiper's soul, an understanding illuminated by Rhode's observation that "[w]henever a cultus of this kind, making its aim and object the evocation of ecstatic raptures, has taken root . . . there we find in close alliance with it . . . a peculiarly vital belief in the life and power of the soul of man after its separation from the body".^{34/} Nowhere was this belief more vital than in the mind of Yeats.

All of this, however, leaves unexplained the presence of rage in the ritual, and its association with creativity. Insight into these heart mysteries might well be expected from the meeting of Greek lucidity and Dionysiac ecstasy that occurred when Euripides wrote his Bacchae. Euripides presents Dionysus as outraged by the fact that the people of Thebes, and particularly his mother's sisters, deny his divinity and offer him no prayers. Thus angered, Dionysus, "To prove my godhead in the eyes of mortal men", stings these

women with madness and drives them frenzied from their homes
in worship of himself.^{35/}

Mircea Eliade observes that "the baccante fanned
their frenzy in order to share in the ordeals and passion
of the god; in the last analysis it was one of the surest
methods of communicating with him."^{36/} Dionysian frenzy is
the equivalent of Yeatsian hatred as an avenue of communication
with the spiritual world. Eliade puts it succinctly:

At the center of the Dionysiac ritual, we always
find, in one form or another, an ecstatic experience
of a more or less violent frenzy: mania. This
"madness" was in a way the proof that the initiate
was entheos, "filled with the god." The experience
was certainly unforgettable, for there was a
sharing in the creative spontaneity and intoxicating
freedom, in the superhuman force and invulnerability
of Dionysus.^{37/}

Yeats knew the anger of Dionysus, the anger of the
believer against the unbeliever. He knew, too, the rage of
the worshipers, rage as a sword's point with which to subdue
a threatening idea. Dionysian frenzy was thus an irresistible
target for the Yeatsian penchant for giving his ideas a local
habitation, for grounding them in his place: "All my art
theories", Yeats wrote to Sturge Moore, "depend upon just
this - rooting of mythology in the earth."^{38/}

There was no more likely candidate for grounding
Greek frenzy in Ireland than Swift "beating on his breast
in sibylline frenzy blind".^{39/} We have already noted that,

after Yeats took up residence in his tower and made its stair "my ancestral stair", ^{40/} he sought hereditary affinity with Swift. Swift's saeva indignatio could not fail to emerge when Yeats, knowing, as he said in "The Tower", that "if I triumph I must make men mad", looked out from his tower in a "rage" for "images, in the Great Memory stored" to succeed to the "frenzy" of Hanrahan. ^{41/}

In the "Letter to Ezra Pound" at the beginning of A Vision, Yeats identifies Swift's indignation -- "the horror that is in Gulliver" -- with the Greek tradition of prophetic madness, and suggests that the poetic rage common to both unlocks the key to "genius itself" by enabling the poet to know his own mind so thoroughly that "Delphi, that rock at earth's navel," speaks through him. ^{42/} Thus when Oedipus "raged against his sons, . . . this rage was noble, not from some general idea, some sense of public law upheld, but because it seemed to contain all life, and the daughter who served him as did Cordelia Lear -- he too a man of Homer's kind -- seemed less attendant upon an old railing rambler than upon genius itself." ^{43/}

Whether or not Yeats knew, as E. R. Dodds says Pythagoras knew, the "northern belief that the 'soul' or 'guardian spirit' of a former shaman may enter into a living shaman to reinforce his power and knowledge", ^{44/} he knew with

the force of his personal experience of Leo Africanus that guardian spirits may show the way to creative genius, and knew as well that the dead living in their memories are the source of poetic inspiration. In short, Yeats knew that Swiftian hate could reinforce his poetic power and knowledge, and knew that, just as the power of Dionysus could be evoked by the anger of his worshipers, Swift could be summoned by hate. Indeed he had observed that his ideal expression was most approximated "when I carry with me the greatest possible amount of hereditary thought and feeling, even national and family hatred and pride."^{45/} Yeats's free-flowing hatred thus emerges, at least in part, as a deliberately stimulated mechanism for exciting poetic inspiration.

The relationship of Swiftian hate to Yeats's poetic creation is the powerful engine that drives "Blood and the Moon", a complex poem in which Yeats asserts a deeply felt claim to kindred with the blood of Swift. A note in The Winding Stair recounts the poet's recollection that "I was roused to write Death and Blood and the Moon by the assassination of Kevin O'Higgins, the finest intellect in Irish public life"^{46/} Yeats admired O'Higgins so much that he would eventually place O'Higgins among Berkeley, Swift and Burke in his litany of "the true Irish people".^{47/} The spilling of O'Higgins's blood was thus an occasion for meditating on the possibilities of communion with the great names of that

litany in terms of the Dionysian practice of communing with a dead hero by consuming his "bleeding flesh".^{48/} Yeats no doubt knew from Frazer's The Golden Bough that drinking the fresh blood of a sacrificial victim was a standard technique for producing inspiration.^{49/} Indeed, in partial answer to, and possible inspiration of, what would become a haunting Yeatsian question, Frazer taught that "[t]he person temporarily inspired is believed to acquire not merely divine knowledge, but also, at least occasionally, divine power."^{50/} "Blood and the Moon" opens with a reference to the "bloody, arrogant power"^{51/} that "Rose out of the race/Uttering, mastering it", and moves quickly to sibylline frenzy and Swift's bloody breast:

Swift beating on his breast in sibylline frenzy blind
Because the heart in his blood-sodden breast had
dragged him down into mankind[.52/]

The reason why Swift's heart -- like "man's" heart generally in "Vacillation"^{53/} -- is "blood-sodden" is explained in Porphyry's essay on the Cave of the Nymphs, that rich account of the double-doored cavern where the spiritual and material worlds meet, where the happy souls ascending from the world into the realm of spirit mingle with the less fortunate souls descending into generation. Thomas Taylor's translation of and commentary on Porphyry's essay was a Yeatsian favorite.^{54/} There Yeats learned that man's heart is blood-sodden because, as Porphyry tells it, when the pure dry souls of the heavens sink into generation, they "are

drenched in moisture" and the moisture is that of blood:
"such souls delight in blood".^{55/} The secondary meaning of
"sodden" suggests that Swift's bloody heart was intoxicated,
a meaning amply borne out by the assertion of Macrobius,
which Taylor appended as a footnote to his translation of
Porphyry's essay, that descending souls experience intoxication,
and with it oblivion, upon the "material influxion" of blood.^{56/}
That is why Swift, like the traveler addressed in Yeats's
version of his epitaph, is "world-besotted".^{57/}

Yeats all but insists that Swift's "blood-sodden"
breast be understood in terms of Porphyry. The presence of
Shelley's tower in the first stanza of "Blood and the Moon"
recalls Yeats's explication, in "The Philosophy of Shelley's
Poetry",^{58/} of the manner in which Shelley's symbols are
informed by Porphyry. The reference in Yeats's essay to
Shelley's "half ruined towers" is echoed in "Blood and the
Moon" where Yeats's own tower is "half dead at the top."^{59/}
Moreover, the balance struck between Swift's blood-sodden
heart and the "honey-pot" of Goldsmith's mind suggests
Porphyry's famous "honey of generation", celebrated in Yeats's
essay on Shelley and in a footnote to "Among School Children",
as, in Porphyry's words, the means by which the soul is
"drawn down" into generation. In Yeats's paraphrase of
Porphyry, Swift is "dragged . . . down into mankind".^{60/}
What drags Swift, however, is not the "intoxication of honey

which", as Porphyry said, "signifies . . . nothing more than the desire of coition".^{61/} Swift, who "almost certainly hated sex",^{62/} was presumably immune. He was dragged down simply by his "heart". The principal attitude of Swift's heart toward mankind was the boiling mixture of love and hate that made up the saeva indignatio that lacerated his breast. Swift is drawn down into generation, not by sexual pleasure, but by the passionate involvement in mankind that drove him to hate that animal called man.

How Swift's hate can draw him down into mankind as effectively as love is also explained by Porphyry: the souls of the dead remain in the cave of the nymphs, and thus subject to recall to earth, until they bid "adieu to the storms of passion",^{63/} and rid themselves of "the triple evil" of "revolt, hatred of humanity, and haughty arrogance."^{64/} Swift, who "hated human life" and was part of the "bloody, arrogant power" of the Anglo-Irish, might be expected to linger a good while in the Cave of the Nymphs whence, unlike the "pure souls [who] are averse from generation", he could be drawn back into contact with the living by inhaling "the vapour of blood".^{65/} "Hence", Porphyry tells us in a passage that explains much about "Blood and the Moon", "the souls of the dead are evocated by the effusion of bile and blood" and are drawn back into contact with the living through a condensed bloody humour "like a cloud".^{66/}

In short, the souls of the passionate dead retain contact with the world of the living so long as they are still filled with hate. The link is an emotional one, symbolized by a cloudy condensation of blood. Because souls of the passionate dead are quickened into communication with the living by their inhalation of "the vapor of blood", the "Odour of blood on the ancestral stair"^{67/} of Yeats's tower can summon Swift. In a more literal age, the worshipers of Dionysus drank the actual blood of a sacrificial victim as a sign of the angry emotions they shared with the departed hero. Blood eventually became, as Yeats and Ellis remark in their edition of Blake, the humour of emotion.^{68/} A poet's boiling blood is thus a vehicle for communing with Swift, sharing his blood, a process emphasized by the reference to "our blood" when, at the end of the second stanza, Yeats distills the essence of the tradition with which he would commune:

Saeva Indignatio and the labourer's hire,
The strength that gives our blood and state magnanimity
of its own desire;
Everything that is not God consumed with intellectual
fire.^{69/}

The ancestral link that Yeats would share with Goldsmith and the Dean, Berkeley and Burke is forged of the Dean's saeva indignatio and the bitter indignation of Burke's Letter To A Noble Lord, his vigorous defense against an attack by the Duke of Bedford and others upon his receipt

of a crown pension. In the Letter, a marked copy of which is in Yeats's library, Burke justifies the pension as compensation for his "long and laborious life",^{70/} and ironically exults in the attack by Bedford's ilk, opining archly that "I have laboured hard to earn, what the noble lords are generous enough to pay."^{71/} The gist of Burke's cri de coeur, which Hazlitt considered the "most splendid in Burke's writing",^{72/} is captured in Yeats's reworking of St. Luke's dictum that "the labourer is worthy of his hire".^{73/}

Yeats also has Burke in mind when he says that "Saeva Indignatio and the labourer's hire" give "magnanimity" to "our blood". It was Burke who taught that "[m]agnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom, and a great empire and little minds go ill together."^{74/} The blood of this tradition has fire in it -- so much so that Berkeley used "intellectual fire" as a symbol for, as Yeats put it in his 1930 diary, "that continuity which holds together 'the perceptions', . . . a substitute for the old symbol God."^{75/} Yeats's conjunction of saeva indignatio, the labourer's hire and intellectual fire sums up the hot blood he would share.

The remainder of the poem explains how savage indignation can lead to wisdom. The process is not self-apparent, but becomes clear when considered in light of the Cave of the Nymphs. The third stanza, which posits a fundamental distinction between the "purity of the unclouded

moon" and the "stain" of the "blood-saturated ground", is the most difficult:

The purity of the unclouded moon
Has flung its arrowy shaft upon the floor.
Seven centuries have passed and it is pure,
The blood of innocence has left no stain.
There, on blood-saturated ground, have stood
Soldier, assassin, executioner,
Whether for daily pittance or in blind fear
Or out of abstract hatred, and shed blood,
But could not cast a single jet thereon.
Odour of blood on the ancestral stair.
And we that have shed none must gather there
And clamour in drunken frenzy for the moon.^{76/}

When the poet clamours in "drunken frenzy for the moon,"^{77/} he is seeking to bridge the gap between blood and the moon. The frenzy is Swiftian poetic rage. It is "drunken" because blood-sodden, world-besotted. The moon for which it clamours is identified in Taylor's comment on Porphyry as symbolic of the wisdom achieved by the soul when it bids "adieu to the storms of passion" and expels the conflicts of desire from its "secret recesses".^{78/} Such wisdom, Taylor tells us, is not achieved "till a long period" when the soul is at last free "from its concrete stains [and becomes] pure."^{79/} Only then, when "all the perturbations of the soul are removed", does she become "wholly intellectual" and pass "into a state divinely prudent and wise."^{80/} Thus, the "purity" of the unclouded moon represents wisdom, and is opposed to the "stain of blood" that characterizes the living:

For wisdom is the property of the dead,
A something incompatible with life; and power,
Like everything that has the stain of blood,
A property of the living[.]^{81/}

The gap between the blood-stained living and the wisdom of the dead -- the purity of the unclouded moon -- can be bridged in the world of the imagination. Taylor's note to Porphyry's essay explains that the "region of the imagination" is represented by the cloud of condensed blood, a "phantasy . . . situated between sense and cognition."^{82/} It mediates between the "cognitive power" of the world of pure intellect and the sense knowledge of the world of the living "in such a manner that its beginning is the end of the cognitive power, and its end is the commencement of the senses."^{83/}

In the realm of imagination, blood is only a cloud whose amorphous borders can accommodate wisdom and power, the living and the dead, stained and pure. The avenue of communication from poet to that cloudy world is the boiling blood of Swiftian hate, the passionate emotion which keeps the dead in touch with the living. Responding to the poet's frenzied clamour, Swift, looking "in glory from a cloud",^{84/} can bring the purity of the unclouded moon to Yeats's tower, without staining the moon with O'Higgins's blood.

So long as Swift's blood boils in Yeats's veins, wisdom is not irretrievably the property of the dead. Like Parnell, Yeats will pass through Jonathan Swift's dark grove, plucking the "bitter wisdom that enriched his blood."^{85/}

The "wisdom"^{86/} of "The Seven Sages" will not be lost on Ireland's "trefoil stained with blood".^{87/}

This view of the poet's frenzied clamouring as a quest for wisdom, for poetic inspiration, depends heavily on Porphyry's use of blood, the condensed vapors of the humour that governs the emotional life, as the link between the living and the passionate dead. The principal tenet of this reading is confirmed by Yeats's own comments in his essay on Shelley, where he relates that the moon "as mistress of the waters . . . governs the life of instinct and the generation of things for as Porphyry says, 'even the apparition of images' in the 'imagination' is through 'an excess of moisture'".^{87A/} Moist blood brings inspiration from the wisdom of dry souls.

Donald Davie does not take account of Porphyry's essay in arriving at his conclusion that the poem is "fascist".^{88/} He argues that the poet's drunken frenzy is a clamouring for the blood-bond between assassin and victim and that "the charge of fascism can be made to 'stick'" when Yeats reserves "innocence" for those who spill each other's blood.

There is nothing in the poem that suggests that the moon represents a blood-bond between assassin and victim. On the contrary, the poem emphasizes the dichotomy between the purity of the moon and the stain of the bloody stair. Nor is there any warrant in the poem for reading the "blood of innocence" that leaves no stain as being the blood of

assassins or victims. On the contrary, the poem is at pains to emphasize that the blood of assassins and victims leaves a stain on the ancestral stair. Reading the poem in terms of Porphyry, one would conclude that blood of innocence, which leaves no stain, must be the purified, condensed blood of the cloudy world of imagination. In all events, however, nothing in the poem reserves the term "innocence" for assassins or victims.

Davie's essay is the passionate testimony of a poet who rightly recoils from an excess of blood in Yeats's poems of the 1930's. The relation of those poems to the charge of fascism is considered in Chapter IX. That charge is not sustained -- does not stick -- with respect to "Blood and the Moon". Indeed, fascism is a good example of the "abstract hatred" that the poem attributes to assassins.^{89/} As discussed in the next chapter, so long as Yeats channelled his hate within the tradition of Swift, his love for the particular rescued him from "abstract hatred". This aspect of Swift's hate, considered above in connection with the "one lash the more" letter to Pope, was emphasized for Yeats in a 1917 letter from his father. Cautioning against hatred without courage, JBY nonetheless allows Swiftian "indignation which is hatred, not only courageous but noble", a rage against "human nature which he beheld enslaving and torturing itself, the author of its own calamities."^{90/}

Yeats learned the lesson well. Not only did he rage at the "abstract hatred" that led to the assassination of O'Higgins but, nearly twenty years later, in a letter to Dorothy Wellesley he remembered the details of the case for Swiftian indignation. He begins by conceding that his correspondent is right to admonish that "we must not hate".^{91/} Then, remembering and invoking Swift, he counters that "we may and sometimes must be indignant and speak it" for "[h]ate is a kind of 'passive suffering' but indignation is a kind of joy".^{92/} Unlike love, hate seeks to change its object.^{93/} Then, in an enantiodromia that would make even Heraclitus gasp, Yeats lays claim to love as the passion of indignation (because one must love the object to bother to change it) and attributes hate to his enemies: our business, he says, is "to set up our love and indignation against their pity and hate."^{94/} "Their hate" is the "abstract hatred" of assassins, a thing apart from the sibylline frenzy of "Blood and the Moon".

The idea of "frenzy" as a technique of obtaining poetic inspiration is more likely to be accepted when it is presented without the imagery of blood. For example, it is clear that the poet is seeking inspiration when, in "An Acre of Grass", he prays for "an old man's frenzy", for

A mind Michael Angelo knew
That can pierce the clouds,
Or inspired by frenzy
Shake the dead in their shrouds;
Forgotten else by mankind,
An old man's eagle mind.95/

This poem is more closely related to "Blood and the Moon" than might first appear. The need to "[s]hake the dead in their shrouds" derives from the teaching of "Blood and the Moon" that "wisdom is the property of the dead".^{96/} Poetic frenzy is necessary to shake the dead, thereby loosening their wisdom from their memories. A frenzied mind can "pierce the clouds", that is, in the terms of "Blood and the Moon", penetrate the world of imagination to the wisdom of the unclouded moon.

Both "Blood and the Moon" and "An Acre of Grass" reflect the recurring Yeatsian belief that the creation of poetry requires collaboration between the living and the dead. This belief flows naturally from Yeats's fundamental tenet that the subject matter of poet and artist is found in the memories of the "passionate dead". The elaboration of these beliefs in "Anima Mundi" and A Vision suggests that Yeats's "Byzantium" is a poem about the process of shaking the dead in their shrouds to loosen their passionate memories and transform memory into images of the poetic imagination. In short, "Byzantium" describes the very process that is at the heart of "Blood and the Moon". "Byzantium" is at once

more intellectualized and more visionary than "Blood and the Moon" -- more intellectualized because it draws upon the extensive philosophical underpinning of "Anima Mundi" and A Vision as to how the individual memories of the passionate dead are converted into the stuff of poetic inspiration in the Great Memory; more visionary because it is an eyewitness account, by a soul that has traveled "out of nature" and witnessed the collaboration between living and dead at first hand. Nonetheless, "Byzantium" preserves the fundamental distinction established in the earlier poem between blood and the moon. The action of the poem takes place under a "starlit or a moonlit dome" in a realm antithetical to "all complexities of mire or blood", a place where the "drunken" -- blood-sodden -- soldiery are abed.^{97/} Ultimately, the poet of "Byzantium" is presented with a choice between blood and moon: he must either return to the "complexities of mire or blood" or, if "by the moon embittered", scorn the complexities of blood.^{98/}

"Sailing to Byzantium" is necessary background to "Byzantium". The former poem presents an ageing poet in search of new inspiration. The need for inspiration is precisely the problem Yeats himself was pondering at the end of "Anima Hominis", just before entering upon "Anima Mundi's" analysis of the role of the dead in poetic inspiration. At the end of "Anima Hominis", Yeats remarks that:

A poet, when he is growing old, will ask himself if he cannot keep his mask and his vision without new bitterness, new disappointment. Could he if he would, knowing how frail his vigour from youth up, copy Landor who lived loving and hating, ridiculous and unconquered, into extreme old age, all lost but the favour of his Muses?^{99/}

Yeats knew from Henry More that the "soul has a plastic power, and can after death, or during life, . . . leave the body for a while" ^{100/} Thus the poet of "Sailing to Byzantium" seeks new inspiration "out of nature", ^{101/} by sending his soul out of his body, as shamans do, to obtain a vision of the spiritual world. Yeats would have his soul "clap its hands and sing" as he knew Robert Blake's did when it departed his body, ^{102/} and would find the impetus, as Landor did, in "loving and hating".

In "Byzantium", the soul is "out of nature". The "starlit or moonlit dome" signifies that, like Ulysses in Taylor's commentary on the Cave of the Nymphs, the soul is "passing . . . from a sensible life, and advancing from darkness to light" and is thus "very properly represented as sailing by the splendour of the stars . . . for starlight corresponds to the light of the mathematical sciences . . . and the stars themselves . . . to ideas." ^{103/} The reference to Babylonian mathematical starlight" in A Vision shows that this passage caught Yeats's eye, and enriches the inference that the starlit or moonlit nature of the dome suggests that the poet of "Byzantium" is in the process of "passing . . . from a sensible life". That

is why he aptly calls it "death-in-life and life-in-death".^{104/}
It is a place where the living poet can meet the passionate
dead.

In a number of passages in "Anima Mundi" and A
Vision, Yeats emphasizes that it is the passionate moments
of the dead that give rise to the contents of anima mundi.
The process of unloosening these passionate moments of memory
that arise out of intensely felt love and hate of the living
is likely to be a turbulent one. For example, in "Anima Mundi",
in a description that echoes Taylor's account of the "perturba-
tions and inordinate desires which yet lurk in the penetralia"
of the passionate dead,^{105/} Yeats says that, after death

[w]e carry to Anima Mundi our memory,
and that memory is for a time our
external world; and all passionate
moments recur again and again, for
passion desires its own recurrence
more than any event^{106/}

These recurring memories are the subject matter of poet and
artist, whose sacred task is to find pleasure in

all that is for ever [sic] passing away
that it may come again, in the beauty of
woman, in the fragile flowers of spring,
in momentary heroic passion, in whatever
is most fleeting, most impassioned, as it
were, for its own perfection most eager to
return in its glory.^{107/}

That is why "the poet and artist [go] to the ring where
everything comes round again."^{108/} That ring is the Great
Memory, repository of images from the individual memories
of the passionate dead, of whom

. . . we can but cry in words Ben Jonson
meant for none but Shakespeare: 'So rammed'
are they 'with life they can but grow in
life with being.'109/

In A Vision, Yeats tells how the passionate dead
relive their memories in a phase he calls "the Dreaming Back."
In "Anima Mundi", Yeats locates "the Dreaming Back" in the
condition of fire, 110/ and posits a fundamental distinction
between earthly life, the terrestrial condition, and the
condition of fire. The gulf between fire and earth must
be bridged if the passionate dead are to animate the living
poet. The gulf is not a void:

Between is the condition of air where images
have but a borrowed life, that of memory
or that reflected upon them when they
symbolise colours and intensities of fire:
the place of shades who are 'in the whirl
of those who are fading' . . . 111/

The underscoring has been added to emphasize that,
in the condition of air -- the Between condition (as Byzantium
is between East and West) 112/ -- shades give rise to images,
coin negotiable by the living poet. This process is what
Yeats sees in "Byzantium":

Before me floats an image, man or shade,
Shade more than man, more image than a shade[113/]

The tortured process by which impassioned memories
are shaken from the dead is described in A Vision in terms
that illuminate "Byzantium":

I think of a girl in a Japanese play whose
ghost tells a priest of a slight sin, if
indeed it was a sin, which seems great

because of her exaggerated conscience. She is surrounded by flames, and though the priest explains that if she but ceased to believe in those flames they would cease to exist, believe she must, and the play ends in an elaborate dance, the dance of her agony.^{114/}

The flames are clearly the flames that "[a]t midnight on the Emperor's pavement flit", and the "dance of her agony" is the

Dying into a dance,
An agony of trance,
An agony of flame that cannot singe a sleeve[,]

that occurs when "all complexities of fury leave".^{115/}

This loosening of the bonds between the dead and their passionate memories, Yeats says in A Vision, "may be compared to a knot that has to be untied or to an oscillation or a violence that must end in a return to equilibrium"^{116/} -- or, one might fairly add, to a flood that must be broken by the "golden smithies of the Emperor".^{117/} Once broken, those "bitter furies", dying into a dance, enter the Great Memory. The process is described in "Anima Mundi" in language that justifies Finneran's recollection of the Elizabethan connotation of "dying" as sexual activity:^{118/}

The dead, as the passionate necessity wears out, . . . perceive . . . harmonies, symbols, and patterns, as though all were being refashioned by an artist, and they are moved by emotions, sweet for no imagined good but in themselves, like those of children dancing in a ring; and I do not doubt that they make love in that union which Swedenborg has said is of the whole body and seems from far off an incandescence. Hitherto shade

has communicated with shade in moments of common memory that recur like the figures of a dance in terror or in joy, but now they run together like to like, and their covens and fleets have rhythm and pattern.119/

In short, the individual memories of the passionate dead become images and, so doing, fuel the collective memory -- "[f]resh images beget". The Great Memory, "a vast luminous sea", as Yeats calls it in "Anima Mundi", 120/ is presented as "that dolphin-torn, that gong-tormented sea". 121/

The sea is "dolphin-torn" because, as often remarked, Yeats knew of the use of the dolphin as an "emblem of the soul or its transit" on Roman tombstones, 122/ and had a visual recollection of dolphins carrying souls of the dead across the sea. 123/ It is "gong-tormented" because Yeats associated the gong of St. Sophia's in Byzantium 124/ with the gong Frazer described "humming in the wind around the sanctuary" at Dodona, 125/ home of the oracle Yeats presents in "Anima Hominis" as an image of the poetic inspiration achieved when the oracle knew that "another's breath came and went within his breath . . . and that his eyes were upon the instant fixed upon a visionary world: how else could the god have come to us in the forest?" 126/ In sum, the fourth and fifth stanzas of "Byzantium" describe the transformation of the memories of the passionate dead into universalized images of the Great Memory, and present the Great Memory as the source of poetic inspiration.

The second stanza presents the poet gaining access to the Great Memory in a frenzy that leaves him breathless:

For Hades' bobbin bound in mummy-cloth
May unwind the winding path;
A mouth that has no moisture and no breath
Breathless mouths may summon[.127/]

"Mummy-cloth" must be unwound because the dead must be shaken in their shrouds to loosen their passionate memories for, as Henry More taught, when "unbound" the soul "can well convert/Herself to other thoughts."^{128/} The unwinding of the winding path means, in the terminology of "Anima Mundi", that the inspired poet is the recipient of a direct "inflow . . . from the fire" along the "straight path" of direct communication.^{129/} This inflow comes from "[a] mouth that has no moisture and no breath" because the purified souls of the condition of fire are no longer "blood-sodden". They are dry, and, as Porphyry observes, on the authority of Heraclitus, "a dry soul is the wisest."^{130/} The mouths they summon are "breathless" rather than "breathing", as they were in earlier drafts of the poem,^{131/} to suggest the ecstasy of the living poet as he receives an influx from the superhuman.

The breathless poet, like Landor, has reclaimed the favour of his Muses in the midst of some "new bitterness" arising out of his passionate "loving and hating".^{132/} The bitterness associated with poetic creativity figures

prominently in the third stanza of "Byzantium", which presents, but does not resolve, the question whether the poet will choose to remain "out of nature", or return to the blood-sodden world. The bird-like soul of the poet faces a choice. The golden bird

Planted on the star-lit golden bough,
Can like the cocks of Hades crow,
Or, by the moon embittered, scorn aloud
In glory of changeless metal
Common bird or petal
And all complexities of mire or blood.^{133/}

Ellman points out that the cock, as herald of the sun, became the herald of rebirth on Roman tombstones.^{134/} Thus, the golden bird can choose rebirth, crowing like a cock of Hades, or, if "embittered by the moon", remain on its bough, shunning earthly "complexities of mire or blood" in favor of the "glory of changeless metal". Glory once again attaches to the moon, just as in "Blood and the Moon", the moon looks "in glory from a cloud".^{135/} The poet's soul maintains contact with the glory of the moon through "bitterness" for, as Porphyry taught, "its disgustful sensation prevents the soul from sinking into that drowsy oblivion produced by corporeal delight."^{136/} The poet who chooses to maintain communication with "Byzantium", the source of the wisdom of the passionate dead, must also choose bitter Swiftian indignation. It is the necessary pathway to the dark grove where Swift's "bitter wisdom" can enrich his blood.^{137/} The lesson was not lost

on Yeats. Writing to Olivia Shakespeare in 1928, he confessed that, upon re-reading "The Tower" he was "astonished at its bitterness", but recognized that its bitterness "gave the book its power and it is the best book I have written."^{138/} He might fairly have claimed, as well, that he put on Swift's knowledge with his power.

V

"An Intellectual Hatred Is The Worst": The
Fall, The Antinomies And Abstract Ideas

There is more than a little irony in the air when Yeats, diligent student and vocal champion of hatred, prays that his daughter may "think opinions are accursed" because "an intellectual hatred is the worst".^{1/} This surprising indictment of hate is a product of the deepening of Yeats's thought that accompanied his marriage in 1917 and the birth of his children in 1918 and 1921. Focusing his continuing reverie over love and hate on the relations between men and women, Yeats came to see hate as the product of a fragmentation of primal emotion occasioned by the fall. The poet's duty of restoring the unfallen world thus took on the sacred task of re-integrating love and hate. The powerful poetry created in pursuit of this goal is considered in this chapter and the next.

Yeats's prayer that his daughter shun intellectual hatred is grounded in the poet's assessment of the ill effects of such hatred on another woman, specifically that "loveliest woman born", Maud Gonne:

An intellectual hatred is the worst,
So let her think opinions are accursed.
Have I not seen the loveliest woman born
Out of the mouth of Plenty's horn,
Because of her opinionated mind
Barter that horn and every good
By quiet natures understood
For an old bellows full of angry wind?^{2/}

The irony of his denunciation of intellectual hatred did not escape Yeats. He tries to deal with it in "The Death

of Synge", but manages only to explain that intellectual hatred is not so much bad per se, as it is bad for women:

I fear some new absorption in political opinion [for Maud]. Women, because the main event of their lives has been a giving themselves and giving birth, give all to an opinion as if it were some terrible stone doll to women opinions become as their children or their sweethearts, and the greater their emotional capacity the more do they forget all other things At last the opinion is so much identified with their nature that it seems a part of their flesh becomes stone and passes out of life Women should have their play with dolls finished in childish happiness, for if they play with them again it is amid hatred and malice.^{3/}

On its face, Yeats's definition of "intellectual hatred" as a specifically feminine characteristic is offensive and untenable. However, considered in light of Yeats's belief that the psyche is split in two, and that its halves may be characterized as masculine and feminine, this definition emerges as the more fruitful proposition that intellectual hatred is only part of the whole, a "partial mind" -- in fact, the masculine part of a feminine mind.

The doctrine of masculine and feminine halves of the psyche is inchoate, but "evades the intellect", in Per Amica Silentia Lunae where Yeats, in the course of struggling to articulate the theory of the anti-self or "Daimon", wrestles with the inarticulable notion that the male's anti-self is feminine:

When I think of life as a struggle with the Daimon . . . my imagination runs from Daimon to sweetheart and I divine an analogy that evades the intellect. I remember . . . that it may be 'sexual love,' which is 'founded upon spiritual hate,' is an image of the warfare of man and Daimon; and I even wonder if there may not be some secret communion, some whispering in the dark between Daimon and sweetheart.^{4/}

The point is made with greater clarity in the 1925 version of A Vision. In a section bearing the alluring title "The Daimon, The Sexes, Unity of Being, Natural and Supernatural Unity", Yeats suggests that every mind is really two minds, one existing in the light, the other hidden in darkness. "These two minds (one always light and one always dark, when considered by one mind alone), make up man and Daimon . . ." who "face each other in a perpetual conflict or embrace."^{5/} The Daimon is "of the opposite sex to that of man."^{6/} Moreover, the relationship between man and Daimon is mirrored in "[t]he relationship of man and woman, insofar as it is passionate,"^{7/} A man's feminine Daimon "is in possession of the entire dark side of the mind", the side associated with the unconscious.^{8/} A woman's unconscious is occupied by her male Daimon.

Yeats subscribed to the "message of Blake", as he and Ellis summarized it, that the division into male and female is symbolic of the "divisions of mind", the "shrinkage of consciousness" that constituted "'the fall'".^{9/} This fragmentation of primal unity affected both intellect and

emotion, splitting knower from known and bifurcating unified instinct into love and hate. The result, said Yeats and Ellis, is "[p]erpetual war", the struggle between the "antinomies" of love and hate, male and female, conscious and unconscious.^{10/}

These ideas endure. Jung suggests that the splitting of consciousness from the unconscious is "an eternally repeated event symbolized by the fall of the angels and the disobedience of the first parents"^{11/} Like Yeats, Jung saw the split of consciousness from the unconscious in terms of sexual division. Jung thought of the male consciousness as characterized by "Logos" (discrimination and cognition); the male unconscious or "anima" by feelings of sentiment and resentment.^{12/} The female consciousness, on the other hand, is characterized by "Eros" (the connective quality); the female unconscious or "animus" by "opinion".^{13/} Although Yeats was unaware of Jung's terminology,^{14/} when he characterizes "intellectual hatred" -- attachment to an opinion as if it were some stone doll -- as feminine, he is implicitly relying on distinctions similar to those made by Jung. "Intellectual hatred" has all the earmarks of the animus. Moreover, if Yeats does not explicitly describe the strong feelings of the anima, his angry reaction to the animus embodies them. Indeed, his comments on Maud Gonne's attachment to her opinions perfectly illustrate Jung's observation that a man cannot "converse with an animus for five minutes without becoming the victim of his own anima".^{15/}

In Jung's view, animus and anima ought to operate as archetypes containing all one sex's ancestral experience of the other, filters through which the opposite sex is perceived: man's eternal image of the feminine and woman's of man.^{16/} When, however, the conscious and unconscious minds are out of harmony, the animus and anima "confront the conscious mind in personified form and behave rather like systems set off from the personality, or like part souls."^{17/} Jung believed that such personifications can be dissolved and converted into bridges to the unconscious by listening to them, thereby freeing their contents from the unconscious and, as Jung says, using Yeats's symbol of darkness and light, "bring[ing] these contents into the light."^{18/} Bringing the anima into the light -- letting it speak -- is thus the first step in exorcising "intellectual hatred". That is why Yeats found that articulating and expressing his hatred opened the door to the creative power of the collective unconscious which Yeats, using Henry More's name for the world soul, referred to as the anima mundi.^{19/}

Ideas similar to the Jungian animus and anima, and grounded in Yeats's notion of a struggle like that of the sexes between the self and anti-self, play an important role in a number of the poems that precede "A Prayer for My Daughter" in the slender volume entitled Michael Robartes And the Dancer. "An Image From a Past Life" is informed by the

idea that the anima contains man's ancestral experience of the female. The "image of poignant recollection" that so discomposes "He" in that poem, is, as "She" recognizes, part of the anima. That is why, using the same word Yeats used to denote the feminine element when, in Per Amica Silentia Lunae, he mused over "some whispering in the dark between Daimon and sweetheart", "She" diagnoses the problem as being that "a sweetheart from another life floats there."^{20/}

In "Michael Robartes and the Dancer", "He" must have a notion like the anima in mind when "He" warns "She":

But bear in mind your lover's wage
Is what your looking-glass can show,
And that he will turn green with rage
At all that is not pictured there.^{21/}

Michael Robartes is, in effect, warning the dancer that her lover will not see her as she really is, but will see her through his looking-glass, the anima, and will rage at things that are not pictured in her own looking-glass.

This fundamental division, and the possibility of reconciliation outside time -- when the world ends -- are the subject of "Solomon and the Witch":

Maybe the bride-bed brings despair,
For each an imagined image brings
And finds a real image there;
Yet the world ends when these two things,
Though several, are a single light,
When oil and wick are burned in one.^{22/}

Blake expressed the same idea when he said the contraries are united "Beneath the bottoms of the Graves".^{23/}

On this side of the grave, humanity lives in a state of division. Moreover, all life's divisions are interconnected. Life "There" before the fall had been a unity, but "Here below", as William Inge put it in a study of Plotinus owned by Mrs. Yeats,^{24/} "we see the unity broken up into parts which by reason of their imperfection are strange or hostile to each other. Hatred reigns rather than love."^{25/} Reason itself, "teeming with intellectual variety",^{26/} contains inherent "contrarieties".^{27/} In sum, intellectual hatred is a necessary product of intellect; both flow from the fall into division.

For Yeats, the most divisive manifestations of intellect were "abstract ideas" which, as Berkeley forcefully reminded him,^{28/} were introduced into human thought when Locke shrank consciousness by separating mind from matter. Yeats obliquely suggests the sexual division attendant upon this shrinkage of consciousness in "Fragments" by saying that when "Locke sank into a swoon/ . . . God took the spinning-Jenny/Out of his side".^{29/} Just as Eve proceeded from Adam, the abstract ideas that led to the industrial revolution proceeded from Locke. The divided and divisive character of Locke's "abstraction" became for Yeats so potent a symbol of the fragmentation of primary emotion into love and hate that "abstraction" itself became a recurring object of Yeatsian hate. "I had learned from Blake," said Yeats, "to hate all abstraction"^{30/} - an observation that illustrates its own content: fragmented, abstract ideas attract fragmented emotion.

Swift illustrated the same process in the famous letter to Pope in which he contrasted his love for individuals with his hatred for that abstract animal called man.^{31/}

Forever seeking links between self and nation, and already an accomplished hater of abstraction, Yeats divined in Swift's letter "an Irish hatred of abstraction."^{32/} With such an unlikely pair of allies as Swift and Blake, Yeats could not fail to make divisive "abstraction" a focus for his antipathy to fragmented consciousness. He used it as well to develop the possibilities for reconciliation that eventually animate "A Prayer for My Daughter".

This much-pilloried "abstraction" had varied shades of meaning in the Yeatsian lexicon but, true to the word's root meaning as something drawn from the concrete object, all Yeatsian usages connote an element of artificial separation. Writing in 1922, and looking back to the "Four Years 1887-1891," Yeats recalls that, even at that early date, he had begun "to pray that my imagination might somehow be rescued from abstraction."^{33/} Abstraction was here perceived as both the fragmentation of one art from another and, more fundamentally, a fragmentation of the organic unity of society, an "isolation of occupation or class or faculty."^{34/} Yeats would be an Irish Homer -- not merely a poet, but the poet of his people, the single voice of a unified body politic. He would unify Ireland by creating an image, albeit, as might be expected

from this inveterate wearer of masks, an image that was the opposite of the prevailing national personality.^{35/}

Looking back from a vantage point near the end of his life, Yeats held to the same vision, recalling and repeating his admiration for a quality of the poets associated with Thomas Davis and The Nation: "they were not separated individual men; they spoke or tried to speak out of a people to a people; behind them stretched the generations."^{36/} The aging poet goes on to recall:

I knew, though but now and then as young men know things, that I must turn from that modern literature Jonathan Swift compared to the web a spider draws out of its bowels; I hated and still hate with an ever-growing hatred the literature of the point of view. I wanted, if my ignorance permitted, to get back to Homer, to those that fed at his table. I wanted to cry as all men cried, to laugh as all men laughed^{37/}

This articulation of his goal reveals the unexpressed relationship Yeats saw between a fragmented culture and the fall. Yeats's desire "to cry as all men cried, to laugh as all men laughed" is a wish to reunite the conscious and the unconscious -- to restore the unfallen world -- by activating an archetypal image. As Jung put it, when the "unsatisfied yearning of the artist reaches back to the primordial image in the unconscious which is best fitted to compensate the inadequacy and one-sidedness of the present,

it is as though chords in us were struck that had never resounded before
At such moments we are no longer

individuals, but the race; the voice
of all mankind resounds in us.^{38/}

We cry as all men cried.

Achieving unity between the people and a national
culture expressive of the people - a form of the elusive
"unity of being" - became a principal Yeatsian goal.

Abstraction is the enemy of such unity. It gives rise to
fixed ideas separated from their origins, to "images created
not for their own sake but for the sake of party".^{39/} Such
abstractions are "no part of wisdom but the apologetic
of a moment, a woven thing, no intricacy of leaf and twig
. . . ." ^{40/}

Hatred for abstraction stirs the poet to work.

He reveals in his journal, for example, that ". . . I always
rouse myself to work by imagining an Ireland as much a unity
in thought and feeling as ancient Greece and Rome and Egypt

. . . ." ^{41/} A further indication of the nature of such a
state of "unity of being" is afforded by Yeats's observation
that unity of being also existed in early Byzantium where
"religious, aesthetic and practical life were one" and
artists "spoke to the multitude and the few alike". ^{42/}

At about the time Yeats was writing "Four Years,"
Richards and Ogden were publishing the results of their study
of the influence of language on thought, and pointing out that,
because abstractions are formed by a "process of selection

and elimination," there is nothing in reality corresponding to the abstract thought.^{43/} Beliefs in the reality of what are only abstractions are thus rightly recognized as "dangerous impediments" to sensible living and thinking.^{44/} The message of Richards and Ogden was no revelation to the student of Swift. Gulliver had long ago reported on the ingenious invention of the Academy of Lagado "that since words are only names for things, it would be more convenient for all men to carry about them such things as were necessary to express the particular business they are to discourse on".^{45/}

Nor was Yeats a stranger to the injuries done in the name of abstractions:

After a while, in a land that has given itself to agitation overmuch, abstract thoughts are raised up between men's minds and Nature, who never does the same thing twice, or makes one man like another, till minds, whose patriotism is perhaps great enough to carry them to the scaffold, cry down natural impulse with the morbid persistence of minds unsettled by some fixed idea. They are preoccupied with the nation's future, with heroes, poets, soldiers, painters, armies, fleets, but only as these things are understood by a child in a National School, while a secret feeling that what is so unreal needs continual defence makes them bitter and restless.^{46/}

Such bitterness dogged Yeats's contemporaries, like Con Markiewicz, whose mind

Became a bitter, an abstract thing,
Her thought some popular enmity[,]^{47/}

and Maud Gonne:

I thought my dear must her own soul destroy
So did fanaticism and hate enslave it.48/

Although women serve as the specific examples in "On a Political Prisoner" and "The Circus Animals' Desertion", the disease described therein affected the nation as a whole:

We had fed the heart on fantasies,
The heart's grown brutal from the fare;
More substance in our enmities
Than in our love; O honey-bees,
Come build in the empty house of the stare.49/

Because an "intellectual hatred" based on the "fantasies" of abstract ideas results from a fragmentation of consciousness that affects both sexes, the men of 1916 suffered its ill effects as much as the women:

Hearts with one purpose alone
Through summer and winter seem
Enchanted to a stone[.]50/

Although there is an unmistakable undertone of Swift in Yeats's indignation at the bitterness engendered by rigid adherence to abstract ideas, there is also a distinctly Romantic tinge to his objection to the intrusion of "abstract thoughts . . . between men's minds and Nature." Was not the reunion of mind and nature, a redemption from a fall into disharmony, the "high argument"^{51/} of Wordsworth's poetic enterprise?

Swift ascribed to the political world a similar pattern of unity followed by a fall into division. In the Introduction to his Swift-haunted play, "The Words Upon The Window Pane," Yeats summarizes the argument advanced by Swift

in the Discourse of the Contests and Dissentions Between the Nobles and Commons in Athens and Rome that "[a]ll States depend for their health upon a right balance between the One, the Few and the Many," the One being the executive, the Few, the aristocracy, and the Many, the many.^{52/} The "right balance" prevails until the Many involve themselves in

the work of the State and every man Jack is 'listed in a party'; becomes the fanatical follower of men of whose characters he knows next to nothing, and from that day on puts nothing into his mouth that some other man has not already chewed and digested.^{53/}

The disharmony Yeats attributes to abstract ideas - accursed opinions - is the very opposite of that "unity of being" where "artists spoke to the multitude and the few alike." It is, instead, the province of "the literature of the point of view." Consciously linking himself to Ireland through Swift and his contemporaries in "that one Irish century that escaped from darkness and confusion",^{54/} Yeats announces that, in Swift's Discourse,

I divine an Irish hatred of abstraction likewise expressed by that fable of Gulliver among the inventors and men of science, by Berkeley in his Commonplace Book, by Goldsmith in the satire of The Good-Natured Man, in the picturesque, minute observation of The Deserted Village, and by Burke in his attack upon mathematical democracy.^{55/}

This is not Yeats's only definition of the heroes of Georgian Ireland in terms of the theme of an Irish hatred of abstraction. Goldsmith, for example, is lauded elsewhere

for "his delight in the particulars of common life that shocked his contemporaries".^{56/} Berkeley is praised for his belief in perception, that abstract ideas are mere words^{57/} The reference to Burke's "attack on mathematical democracy" recalls Burke's rejection of the abstractions of French democracy in favor of a view of the state as a living organism analogous to a tree: "haughtier-headed Burke that proved the State a tree".^{58/}

Yeats's Corbet in "The Words Upon The Window Pane" completes the web that enmeshes Swift, Burke and abstraction by arguing that the sentiments in Swift's letter to Pope are the result of his realization that the abstractions ultimately criticized by Burke would frustrate his own hopes for a return to unity in the political sphere. Corbet explains that Swift admired the unity that prevailed in the Rome of Brutus and Cato and had hoped to recreate "such an order and such men,"

but the movement passed and he foresaw the ruin to come, Democracy, Rousseau, the French Revolution; that is why he hated the common run of men, - 'I hate lawyers, I hate doctors,' he said, 'though I love Dr. So-and-so and Judge So-and-so' - that is why he wrote Gulliver, that is why he wore out his brain, that is why he felt saeva indignatio, that is why he sleeps under the greatest epitaph in history.^{59/}

Corbet might have added that Swift's indignation at the fragmented consciousness of fallen man is apparent in the contrast between the emotional yahoos, who hate one another more than they hate any different species, and the

abstractly rational houyhnhnms who, for all their rationality, do not love.^{60/} Corbet must have those thoughts in mind when he asks: "Was Swift mad? Or was it the intellect itself that was mad?"^{61/} Here Swift and Yeats are united in enmity to "intellectual hatred." They share common ground as well in the nature of the "human liberty" lauded in "Swift's Epitaph".^{62/} "What was this liberty, asked Yeats, "bought with so much silence . . .?"^{63/} Not surprisingly, it was exactly what Yeats was trying to achieve in making himself into the authentic voice of an Ireland that achieved unity of being: the right of the "bent and current of a people" to "express itself as it would through such men as had won or inherited general consent".^{64/} The service of liberty by which Yeats dared to imitate Swift was apparent in his hope "that we might be the first in Europe to seek unity as deliberately as it had been sought by theologian, poet, sculptor, architect, from the eleventh to the thirteenth century".^{65/}

Such unity seemed the only effective antidote to a national state of mind that, like the individual mind without traditional culture, "is only powerful in hate".^{66/} Yeats lamented that the political class in Ireland has cultivated "hatred as the one energy of their movement,"^{67/} and argued that journalists could, instead, from his work, Lady Gregory's and parts of Synge, build up a powerful

historical and literary nationalism - and with this consequence:
"They could then bid the people love and not hate".^{68/}

This goal of "unity of being" wrapped in a national culture holds for Yeats the possibility of redemption that Wordsworth sought in the reunion of mind and nature. If such unity is yet to be achieved in the life of the nation, the poet of "A Prayer For My Daughter" sees hope for the individual soul to return to a state of primal unity, to redeem itself, to "recover radical innocence." This, in fact, is the poet's prayer for both himself and his daughter.

As he paces before his daughter's cradle, Yeats confesses that he "knows that to be choked with hate/May well be of all evil chances, chief." Yeats believed that he had learned to escape hate's bitterness, at least temporarily, by reintegrating it with love. For example, remembering the Irish national hatred for England, Yeats recognizes that "there are moments when hatred poisons my life" ^{69/} But at such moments, he has learned to escape hatred for the abstraction "England" by reminding himself of the particular:

Then I remind myself that though mine is the first English marriage I know of in the direct line, all my family names are English, and that I owe my soul to Shakespeare, to Spenser and to Blake, perhaps to William Morris, and to the English language in which I think, speak, and write, that everything I love has come to me through English; my hatred tortures me with love, my love with hate. I am like the Tibetan monk who dreams at his initiation that he is eaten by a wild beast and learns on waking that he himself is eater and eaten.^{70/}

The monk's dream reunites love and hate into the eater and the eaten, and thus reconciles the tense irony of the Swift-Yeats hatred of their own humanity, their savage indignation at what the rational animal's rationality does to him. Again driving home his link with Swift, Yeats sees his self-torturing condition as "Irish hatred and solitude, the hatred of human life that made Swift write Gulliver and the epitaph upon his tomb, that can still make us wag between extremes and doubt our sanity."^{71/}

For himself, Yeats sought "purification" of hatred's poison in the creation of poetry, "the discovery of style" -- the shaping power that mingles the contraries of love and hate in the unity of a poem.^{72/} Hate may be necessary to stimulate his creativity -- "set him dreaming" -- but it is consumed in the creative process -- "vanishes in the dream".^{73/} Thus it is a triumph of style when Yeats rids himself of poison by mingling his hatred of abstract England with his love of particular persons and things English.

Yeats made a similar point in his journal, asserting that the "kind of Jacobin rage" that threatened his writings ultimately "helped me, for the knowledge of it has forced me to make my writings sweet-tempered and, I think, gracious."^{74/} I escaped rage "as a writer", he said, through my sense of style. Is not one's art made out of the struggle in one's soul? Is not beauty a victory over oneself?^{75/}

This intriguing Yeatsian commentary on the role of rage in his writing shows how his creative process illustrates Jung's injunction that the anima be integrated into consciousness by allowing it to speak. Yeats implicitly adopts a similar view when he says that the man of phase 17 "rages against all that destroys Mask and Image . . .,"^{76/} but can convert rage into the stuff of creativity if "the Daimonic mind" - the "anima" - is permitted to flow through the events of life, thereby creating "unity of being" and "a very personal form of heroism or of poetry."^{77/} The term "unity" suggests the reintegration of the bifurcated psyche, a reunion that also returns fragmented love and hate to a single source. Yeats captures the essence of the latter union when he says that ecstasy is "an emotion born when we love that which we hate knowing that it is fated."^{78/}

In "Poetry and Tradition," written in the wake of his visit to Urbino, site of the conversations immortalized in Castiglione's The Book of the Courtier, Yeats equates the poet's "shaping power" with the "courtesy and self-possession" he will eventually seek for his daughter.^{79/} Style and courtesy are but different aspects of the shaping power of the free mind to restore unity to a disintegrated emotional life. The courteous have "the freedom of the well bred" -- "a continual deliberate self-delighting happiness."^{80/} Thus, Yeats's prayer for his daughter that "In courtesy I'd have

her chiefly learned" emerges as no diminished status for a second sex, but a call to an essential discipline that rids the soul of hate, and restores the "self-delighting" freedom of the well bred:

Considering that, all hatred driven hence,
The soul recovers radical innocence
And learns at last that it is self-delighting,
Self-appeasing, self-affrighting,
And that its own sweet will is Heaven's will;
She can, though every face should scowl
And every windy quarter howl
Or every bellows burst, be happy still.^{81/}

The equation of the "radical innocence" of primal unity with the soul's "self-delight" is firmly rooted in Neoplatonism. Proclus, in the commentary on Plato's theology that Yeats knew in Taylor's translation,^{82/} explains that, whereas the vicious man sees his own baseness within, the worthy man "is able to associate with, and love himself."^{83/} Such a soul is "self-delighting":

[T]he worthy man perceiving himself beautiful rejoices and is delighted, and producing in himself beautiful conceptions, gladly embraces an association with himself. For we are naturally domesticated to the beautiful, but hastily withdraw ourselves from deformity. Hence, if the world possesses virtue adapted to itself, in its intellectual and psychical essence, and in the perfection of its animal nature, looking to itself, it loves itself, and is present with, and sufficient to itself.^{84/}

The idea of primal unity as a state of "self-delight" was a Yeatsian favorite. He used it again in "Meditations in Time of Civil War", where he associates it with the Plotinian

notion that the universe rises from its principles out of its own self-delight. Yeats made good use of MacKenna's reminder that the Plotinian universe "springs" from the intellectual principle, that

[m]any metaphors are used to indicate how the universe rises from its principles - cast down like light from the sun, flowing forth like water from a well, branching out like a tree from the root.85/

Some of the Plotinian metaphors beautifully illustrate the "self-delight" of the well bred in "Ancestral Houses":

Surely among a rich man's flowering lawns,
Amid the rustle of his planted hills,
Life overflows without ambitious pains;
And rains down life until the basin spills,
And mounts more dizzy high the more it rains
As though to choose whatever shape it wills
And never stoop to a mechanical
Or servile shape, at others' beck and call.

Mere dreams, mere dreams. Yet Homer had not sung
Had he not found it certain beyond dreams
That out of life's own self-delight had sprung
The abounding glittering jet[.]86/

This "self-delight" of the primal unity -- radical innocence -- can be recovered when all hatred is driven hence.

Both Swift and Yeats knew the tension between love for the individual person and hatred for abstract humanity. Swift sums it up in the letter to Pope; Yeats lived it, loving Maud Gonne, but hating the tendency of abstract "women" to "give all to an opinion as if it were some terrible stone doll." By focusing on the concrete sleeping child as he paced in the "excited reverie" of "A Prayer For My Daughter", Yeats managed to resolve the tension into a hope for personal

salvation grounded in courtesy, the shaping power of the free mind to banish abstract hatred.

If Yeats exalts courtesy over intellect in his prayer for his daughter, there is no reason to assume that he deprecates his daughter, and not the intellect, the faculty of abstraction. When Yeats summed up a lifetime's search for knowledge in the aphorism that "Man can embody Truth but he cannot know it", he contrasted that kernel of wisdom with the observation that "The abstract is not life and everywhere draws out its contradictions".^{87/} In "A Prayer For My Daughter" Yeats speaks for himself as well as his daughter when he exalts the embodiment of truth over knowledge of it.

The superiority of the embodiment of truth to knowledge of it is a theme that also animates "Michael Robartes and the Dancer", another poem about opinion, a woman and a looking-glass. This time the woman is not Yeats's daughter, but Maud Gonne's.^{88/} Yeats is present as lover in the guise of Robartes. The voice is that of Yeats when Robartes argues that "Opinion" -- to which, according to Yeats, women adhere as if it were some stone doll -- "is not worth a rush", but is, in fact, the "half-dead dragon" of the lady's thought that daily "dug its claws and shrieked and fought" with St. George in the altar-piece that has captured the attention of Robartes and the dancer.^{89/} The implicit suggestion that the lady is in the grip of "intellectual hatred" is furthered by a passage in A Vision to which Yeats invites attention by observing in a note that many of the poems in this volume

were written "as a text for exposition of my philosophy" ^{90/} That philosophy, as it was concurrently being articulated in A Vision holds that the "beautiful women" of Phase 16 risk an intellect reduced to "nothing . . . but the fixed idea and some hysterical hatred [which] see one side as all white, . . . the other side all black" ^{91/} Yeats completes the identification between the "hysterical hatred" of A Vision and the "half-dead dragon" of the lady's thought with a fertile question: "what but a dragon could dream of thwarting a St. George?" ^{92/}

The fact that the lady's thought takes the form of a half-dead dragon emphasizes that it is something outside herself -- what Yeats would call her daimon, Jung would call her animus, and both would recognize as the product of a split between the individual consciousness and a collective unconscious. The dragon, as Jung shows, is a traditional symbol of the negative aspects of the unconscious and frequently appears as the demon to be slain by a hero who thus merges the conscious and unconscious minds. ^{93/} Yeats knew the dragon of intellectual hatred, both as animus and anima: "I fought the dragon for a long time", he recounts in a draft of "Michael Robartes and the Dancer". ^{94/} He records a triumph over the dragon in "Her Triumph" in which she "who did the dragon's will until you came" ^{95/} learns, in effect, that her own sweet will is heaven's will.

The dancer of "Michael Robartes and the Dancer" might be willing to concede an affinity between the half-dead dragon of her thought and the "intellectual hatred" of "A Prayer for my Daughter", but will not readily accede to schooling in courtesy as the only antidote. She poses this pointed question:

And must no beautiful woman be
Learned like a man?^{96/}

The dancer's question overlooks the truth she embodies: that "all beautiful women" may not only achieve a return to primal unity if they would "banish every thought", but may "lead us to the like" as well.^{97/} This is strong medicine, and Robartes knows it. He supports his pronouncement with a "Latin text", the contents of which suggest that it is Ficino's Latin translation of Plotinus.

Both Taylor and MacKenna, whose English translations Yeats knew, relied heavily on Ficino. Taylor's selections were available to Yeats before the composition of "Michael Robartes and the Dancer" in 1920. Mrs. Yeats's copy of Taylor, inscribed with her name and the date "July 1913", bears a pencil marking at the beginning of Ennead VI. 9, 4, a passage on which Robartes no doubt relied for support.^{98/} That passage, as summarized in the Preller-Ritter Conspectus, printed in the first volume of MacKenna's translation, which Yeats read in 1918,^{99/} argues for banishing thought in favor of an actual "Presence" of the Eternal Ideas:

Our greatest difficulty is that consciousness of The One comes not by knowledge, not even by such an intuitive Intellection as possesses us of the lower members of the Intellectual Order, but by an actual Presence superior to any knowing. The Soul, when it deals with matters of knowledge, suffers a certain decline from its Unity, for knowing is still an act of reasoning, and reasoning is a multiple act, an act which leads the Soul down to the sphere of number and multiplicity. The Soul, therefore, must rise above knowledge,100/

Moreover, in a text that supports Robartes at every turn, Plotinus taught that, unlike the divisive snare of conscious thought, corporeal beauty -- he instances the great beauty of Helen -- can lead the soul to recall the divine beauty within itself 101/ -- one of the "Presences" that, as Yeats said, adopting MacKenna's capital "P", "passion, piety or affection knows". 102/

Yeats's first draft of "Michael Robartes and the Dancer" merges these two ideas in the quintessentially Plotinian notion that there is great wisdom in the body because of its temporary union with the soul -- a union that Taylor characterized as "composite" in the translation owned by Mrs. Yeats. 103/ Taylor explained that the soul can regain a state of blessedness by recalling the Beauty of primal unity, thereby "loosen[ing] the bonds of sympathy through which she is united to the body" and beginning to reascend to the One. That is why, in the final poem, Robartes has principles to prove that "blest souls are not composite". 104/

Plotinian doctrine as to the role of feminine beauty in loosening the bonds by which the soul is imprisoned in the body was the heart of the Florentine Academy's philosophy that "[b]eauty is the proof of the world's unalterable participation in the idea".^{105/} No one learned -- or taught -- this doctrine better than Pietro Bembo. His lyrical encomium to beauty as the true trophy of the soul's victory made a lasting impression on Yeats. Yeats was fond of remembering how, as "the Duchess and her people talked/ The stately midnight through"^{106/} on the last of the four nights of conversation recounted in Castiglione's Book of the Courtier, they were entranced by Bembo's doctrine: female beauty is the source of imaginative power to conceive an even greater beauty that leads the soul to ecstatic vision of the divine beauty within itself, a beauty indistinguishable from the highest good that "bringest severed matters into one".^{107/}

These are the principles that Yeats hoped would prove Robartes right. The result was not assured. Only sometimes were Yeats's women beacons on the path to recovery of radical innocence. They could as easily be the shrill voice of the animus. The deep conflict in Yeats's mind on the subject of beautiful women perfectly accords with his belief that consciousness itself is conflict. The fruitful results of Yeats's continuing effort to resolve that fundamental antinomy are considered in the next chapter.

VI

Sexual Love and Spiritual Hate: The Antinomies
Resolved in the Beatific Vision

In the dedication to the 1925 version of A Vision Yeats lamented that the book was not really finished because he had said "little of sexual love" and "nothing about the Beatific Vision".^{1/} By the time he published the final version in 1937, Yeats had discovered a solution to the book's apparent failure to address these two subjects. He simply announced that the book was, in a symbolic sense, about nothing else. First, all its dichotomies represented the split of sexuality into male and female: "all the symbolism of this book", he said, "applies to begetting and birth, for all things are a single form which has divided and multiplied in time and space."^{2/} Second, sexual love, the yearning for sexual reunion, is a longing for a return to primal unity, the divine One, the Beatific Vision. That is why, as Yeats said in the final version of A Vision, "the natural union of man and woman" is "a symbol of that eternal instant where the antinomy is resolved."^{3/}

Because "the antinomy" is unresolved in the temporal world, the relations between men and women in Yeats's poetry are fated to illustrate the workings of that other antinomic pair, love and hate. The very existence of the sexes is at once a product of the conflict that is consciousness^{4/} and a sign of the eternal struggle between Love and Strife that Empedocles installed at the heart of existence.^{5/} A similar notion of sexual conflict as symbolic of a basic

psychic tension lies at the heart of Jung's observation that the existence of male irrational moods and female irrational opinions seems doomed to endure, thus ensuring "that the Empedoclean game of the hate and love of the elements shall continue for all eternity."^{6/}

Yeats often used the division of the sexes as an illustration of the fragmentation of primal unity that introduced hate into the world. His master here was Blake. Blake presents the division into sexes as a cataclysmic event:

All Eternity shudder'd at sight
Of the first female now separate.^{7/}

Blake's shuddering eternity echoes in Yeats's "He and She", where the taking on of a separate voice by She is an event at which "[a]ll creation shivers".^{8/}

For Blake, the fall into sexual division is also a fall into divided emotions:

"Once man was occupied in intellectual pleasures &
Energies,
"But now my Soul is harrow'd with grief & fear &
love & desire,
"And now I hate & now I love & Intellect is no more.^{9/}

It is in this fallen state that Albion is

. . . bound in the bonds
Of spiritual Hate, from which springs sexual love
as iron chains.^{10/}

As a result of the "divisions & shrinkings" attendant upon the fall, Los, who should be united to Enitharmon, finds himself continually at odds with her. Los's Spectre, his

"reasoning power" in Blake's terminology, the dragon of his thought, revels in Los's status as the "victim of . . . love/And hate", and rejoices that:

"The Man who respects Woman shall be despised
by Woman,
"And deadly cunning & mean abjectness only shall
enjoy them.
"For I will make their places of joy & love
excrementitious,
"Continually building, continually destroying
in Family feuds.11/

In the context of his use of the word "divisions" and the reference to Los's "scatter'd" love, Blake seems to have in mind the root sense of excrementitious as a process of sifting, a sense also suggested by Spectre's explanatory reference to a continuous building and destruction.

Yeats's ever-alert ear picked up the term and found it well suited to Crazy Jane's response to the Bishop's advice that she

Live in a heavenly mansion,
Not in some foul sty.12/

Jane's response plays on both the notion of excrement as the product of a sifting or fragmentation and on the tension-creating irony that, as Freud said -- remembering Augustine's dictum that the organs of reproduction are located "inter urinas et faeces" -- "the excremental is all too intimately and inseparably bound up with the sexual."^{13/} Jane puts it this way:

'Fair and foul are near of kin,
And fair needs foul,' I cried.

* * *

'A woman can be proud and stiff
When on love intent;
But Love has pitched his mansion in
The place of excrement;
For nothing can be sole or whole
That has not been rent.'^{14/}

Jane's cryptic and highly charged reply makes clear that she associates an absent state of unity -- soleness or wholeness -- with sexuality. She recognizes, but cannot fully articulate, a close link -- fair and foul are near of kin -- between a desire for sexual coupling and a desire for a return to the heavenly mansion. Perceiving her present state of divided sexuality as incomplete, she feels herself as having been "rent" -- thus evoking the theory advanced by Aristophanes in The Symposium that humans were originally double beings, of double sexuality, until Zeus, fearful of the power of such beings, "cut the members of the human race in half, just like fruit which is to be dried and preserved, or like eggs which are cut with a hair."^{15/} Since then each of us is but a half^{16/} of a person and each is forever seeking his missing half.

That is why the pair who found each other in "Summer and Spring"

Knew that we'd halved a soul
And fell the one in t'other's arms
That we might make it whole.^{17/}

Jane's recognition that copulation reflects a desire for a return to unity that can only be satisfied in death was

a favorite Yeatsian theme. He observed in a conversation with John Sparrow at Oxford that Dryden's translation of Lucretius's De Rerum Natura was "the finest description of sexual intercourse ever written because it showed the difficulty of two becoming a unity".^{18/} When Yeats said in A Vision that sexual union was a symbol of the antinomy resolved, he was quick to add that:

It is not the resolution itself. There is a passage in Lucretius translated by Dryden, to the great scandal of his enemy Collier, which is quite conclusive.^{19/}

Dryden's translation beautifully captures both the longing for union and its ordained frustration:

Nor when the Youthful pair more clossely joyn,
When hands in hands they lock, and thighs in thighs
they twine
Just in the raging foam of full desire,
When both press on, both murmur, both expire,
They gripe, they squeeze, their humid tongues
they dart,
As each wou'd force their way to t' others heart:
In vain; they only cruze about the coast,
For bodies cannot pierce, nor be in bodies lost:
As sure they strive to be, when both engage,
In that tumultuous momentary rage,
So 'tangled in the Nets of Love they lie,
Till Man dissolves in that excess of joy.^{20/}

Yeats caught the essence of this passage in the dictum that "the tragedy of sexual intercourse is the perpetual virginity of the soul".^{21/} Less cryptically, Yeats observed to Sparrow that:

Sexual intercourse is an attempt to solve the eternal antinomy, doomed to failure because it takes place only on one side of the gulf. The gulf is that which separates the one and the many, or if you like, God and man.^{22/}

Jane put it more simply:

'Love is all
Unsatisfied
That cannot take the whole
Body and soul' [.23/]

Jane knew that love could be satisfied -- could take the whole -- only after death, i.e., "[i]f Time were but gone". ^{24/} Yeats's musicians sang the same message in his Deirdre:

What's the merit in love-play,
In the tumult of the limbs
That dies out before 'tis day,
Heart on heart, or mouth on mouth
All that mingling of our breath,
When love-longing is but drouth
For the things come after death? ^{25/}

Crazy Jane, Lucretius and the musicians of Deirdre all share the idea that the love instinct and the death instinct are close cousins because the longing for union in love can only be satisfied outside life. Using the verb that Crazy Jane would eventually employ, Freud linked these ideas of love and death in the theory that "living substance was at the time of its animation rent into small particles, which since that time strive for reunion by means of the sexual instincts". ^{26/} Freud all but says what Crazy Jane struggles to articulate: that birth and death are linked in copulation, an experience that simultaneously offers the promise of new earthly life and depicts, however temporarily, the joining together of the sexes that characterized the happy union before man's entry into the world. Norman O. Brown makes the link explicit:

Birth, copulation and death equated . . .
the crux is the equation of coming out

and going in; forwards and backwards,
progression and regression; life and
death.^{27/}

Crazy Jane, Sheba and the woman of "A Last Confession"
make this equation between love and death, an equation
founded on the idea that, in the world of time, fragmented,
excrementitious hate is split off from an encompassing emotional
unity. As Foragel says in The Shadowy Waters, "love is war,
and there is hatred in it".^{28/} It is this fragmented character
of love in the world of time that leads Crazy Jane, in "Crazy
Jane on the Day of Judgment", to think that her love would not
be "all/Unsatisfied" on the day of judgment, that is, in
eternity, or, as she puts it, "[i]f Time were but gone."^{29/}
Yeats could have been writing of himself when he wrote that
for Blake, "the last judgment [was] no high session of a personal
law-giver, but the 'casting out' of 'nature' and 'corporeal
understanding'".^{30/} Sheba, too, knows that satisfaction lies
outside nature. She longs for a perfect union, but knows that

Yet the world ends when these two things,
Though several, are a single light,
When oil and wick are burned in one.^{31/}

When the world ends, on the day of judgment, when time is gone --
that is when reunion can occur. Then will the soul recover
the delight of radical innocence:

I gave what other women gave
That stepped out of their clothes,
But when this soul, its body off,
Naked to naked goes,
He it has found shall find therein
What none other knows,

And give his own and take his own
And rule in his own right;
And though it loved in misery
Close and cling so tight,
There's not a bird of day that dare
Extinguish that delight.^{32/}

The reunion of male and female restores the soul to that special state of beatitude for which Yeats reserved the word "delight". Then the soul is no longer "rent", but "whole", and thus free of the "straining" described so beautifully by Lucretius. As Ribh put it in "Ribh at the Tomb of Baile and Aillinn":

There is no touching here, nor touching there,
Nor straining joy, but whole is joined to whole;
For the intercourse of angels is a light
Where for its moment both seem lost, consumed.^{33/}

An appreciation of the way in which Yeats used the relations between men and women as symbolic of all the antinomies of life resolves much of the confusion that otherwise swirls around what Yeats calls "Blake's old thought" that "sexual love is founded upon spiritual hate".^{34/} Critical comment on this paradox has ranged from Kathleen Raine's belief that "Yeats was almost alone in understanding why for Blake 'sexual love' was 'spiritual hate'".^{35/} to Harold Bloom's conviction that "Yeats wrongly believed that Blake had founded sexual love on spiritual hate"^{36/} Bloom argues that Yeats fails to see that the "spiritual hate" to which Blake refers when he says, in the passage quoted above, that Sexual Love springs from spiritual Hate "is not between

men and women, but between Albion and his Sons, or between what man was before his fall and the Zoas or warring faculties into which he has broken up after his fall."^{37/} This interpretation is by no means self-apparent from Blake's syntax and, in any event, Blake often enough makes the point elsewhere that there is a fundamental opposition between lovers. In fact, in their edition of Blake, Yeats and Ellis reserve their comment respecting "the strange paradox, continually recurring in Blake, that sexual love springs from spiritual Hate" for their analysis of the later passage in Jerusalem in which Los's Spectre rejoices in the contentiousness between Los and Enitharmon.^{38/}

In any event, the important question for present purposes is what the aphorism meant for Yeats, and Yeats leaves little room for doubt that there was a definitive declaration beneath his suggestion that "it may be 'sexual love', which is 'founded upon spiritual hate,' is an image of the warfare of man and Daimon", the latter of whom could be found "whispering in the dark" with man's sweetheart.^{39/} It is precisely because man's daimon is his opposite, his missing half, that love for man is hate for his daimon. How could it be otherwise for beings who live each other's lives and die each other's deaths? In context, the idea that sexual love is founded on spiritual hate is no shallow cynicism, but simply another way of expressing the fundamental tension at the heart of existence that causes

man and Daimon to "face each other in a perpetual conflict or embrace."^{40/}

In Yeats's Ireland conflict dominated over embrace, hatred over love. Yeats saw the dominance of hatred in contemporary Irish thought as a threat to imaginative life and, true to Blake and the esoteric tradition, located both cause and effect in sexual abstinence:

Hatred as a basis of imagination, . . . helps to dry up the nature and make the sexual abstinence, so common among young men and women in Ireland, possible. This abstinence reacts in its turn on the imagination, so that we get at last that strange eunuch-like tone and temper. For the last ten or twenty years there has been a perpetual drying of the Irish mind with the resultant dust-cloud.^{41/}

No longer was Ireland the "majestic and radiant maiden"^{42/} of the Aishling poems. She was, instead, "an old bellows full of angry wind".^{43/} Indeed, Irish life seemed to Yeats to stand in fundamental opposition to the Renaissance of Castiglione and Bembo, where feminine beauty and thoughts of love were the stimulus to imaginative life. Yeats's duty as poet, indeed as the poet of his nation, was to seek a solution.

Thus, in 1925, when he finished the first version of A Vision and felt himself relieved from the injunction of his "communicators" that he read no philosophy, he delved deeply into Bembo's master Plotinus.^{44/} "I read for months every day Plato and Plotinus", he wrote to Sturge Moore in

March 1926.^{45/} In May of that year he reported to Olivia Shakespeare from Thoor Ballylee that he had "but two books" with him, Baudelaire and MacKenna's Plotinus.^{46/} Plotinus presented an antidote to an imagination nourished by hatred in the doctrine that "[o]ne who was a lover and philosopher in pain of love toward beauty" would delight in things of beauty, reaching in each case for the source of that loveliness, and then reaching for whatever was above that again, so that he would eventually reach "the Principle whose beauty is self-springing"^{47/} And yet, lamented Plotinus, "[a]ll human beings from birth onward live to the realm of sense", forgetting the world of self-springing beauty whence they came.^{48/} What better place to reminisce about that pre-natal beauty, gradually lost from birth onward, than among school children? Yeats's visit to St. Otteran's school in February 1926^{49/} crystallized his immersion in Plotinus into the beautiful reverie of "Among School Children", a poem whose debt to Plotinus has been obscured, perhaps by Donald Torchiana's claim for the priority of Gentile's influence.^{50/}

As soon as the poet of "Among School Children" has situated himself among the children, he follows the injunction of Plotinus by turning his thoughts to feminine beauty, an aversion that, not surprisingly, leads to thoughts of Maud Gonne's Ledaean body:

I dream of a Ledaean body, bent
Above a sinking fire, a tale that she
Told of a harsh reproof, or trivial event
That changed some childish day to tragedy -
Told, and it seemed that our two natures blent
Into a sphere from youthful sympathy,
Or else, to alter Plato's parable,
Into the yolk and white of the one shell.^{51/}

Yeats believed that meditation on feminine beauty
had rescued Dante's hate-driven imagination.^{52/} Reflection
on the hate-nourished imagination of Ireland must have
brought to mind Dante's account of how, from the moment
Beatrice first appeared before his eyes, love governed his
soul and imagination,^{53/} and, as Joseph Campbell puts it,
transferred the appetite of the poet's heart "from the forms
of mortal sense to those of reason moving toward divine
intelligence^{54/} -- just as Plotinus promised.

Yeats's meditation on feminine beauty, however,
focuses, not on unity, but on sexual division -- Plato's parable
of the split of the sexes and our consequent longing for the
missing half. Although school room recollections of a painful
childhood -- "a harsh reproof"^{55/} -- remind him of a temporary
reunion with Maud in "youthful sympathy", that union was but
an exception to the general rule that the sphere of unity has
been split into "two natures". Thus, meditation on Maud's
beauty does not lead to a vision of a higher beauty. Instead,
"[h]er present image floats into the mind -" no beautiful
young girl, but "[h]ollow of cheek as though it drank the

wind/And took a mess of shadows for its meat"^{56/} - a reminder that change is a fundamental fact of life and that we know only changing images; not permanent reality. This thought, according to Inge's commentary on Plotinus in Mrs. Yeats's library, was a form of "the first and last problem of philosophy:

The relations of the eternal and the temporal, of reality and appearance, of Spirit and Matter, or, to use the favorite antitheses of Plotinus, of Yonder and Here, constitute the first and last problem of philosophy. To the earlier Greek thinkers the greatest crux was the reconciliation of change and permanence. It was not till much later that the debate took the modern form of a war between idealism and materialism.^{57/}

Plato's reconciliation of change and permanence implicates the war between idealism and materialism by positing that changing nature is a reflection of a permanent idea:

Plato thought nature but a spume that plays
Upon a ghostly paradigm of things [^{58/}]

Because Yeats never strays for long from the concrete, these heady thoughts are interrupted by the idea that even Plato, Aristotle and "[w]orld-famous golden-thighed Pythagoras" were subject to the fact of change: "Old clothes upon old sticks to scare a bird",^{59/} a line that echoes Yeats's comment in a letter to Olivia Shakespeare that "even the greatest men are owls, scarecrows, by the time their fame has come."^{60/}

Old scarecrow or not, Plato introduced the key idea of "image" into the "relations of the eternal and the temporal." This Platonic notion of the temporal world as an

image of the eternal is illustrated by Plotinus in terms of sculpture. He argues that "bronze and wood are shaped into what we see by means of an image introduced by sculpture", but "the reality of statute" exists apart from its material appearance.^{61/} Statues are images that "keep a marble or a bronze repose", images like those the nun in the long school room worships. Such images are products of the temporal world's effort to reflect the eternal. The poem might have remained limited by images, by what we can see in the temporal world of the eternal. However, in a great imaginative leap, Yeats jumps outside the temporal world and looks back on it from the eternal -- the unconscious, the Cave of the Nymphs, where the souls of the unborn gather. To do so, he relies on the accounts of Plotinus and Porphyry, both of whom, according to Porphyry, had achieved a vision of the eternal world. Informed by these accounts, Yeats can view the temporal world from the point of view of the eternal. "Among School Children" considers the differences between the two worlds in terms of three favorite Yeatsian subjects: sexual union, the paradigm of all unions and divisions; the creative process, the poet's effort to achieve unity of being; and the process of human knowing, source of the fundamental Yeatsian question of how a divided consciousness can know anything for sure.

In the temporal world, the young mother-to-be sees sexual union as a promise of reacheived unity. Thus she bruises

body to pleasure soul, gripping and squeezing in that "tumultuous momentary rage" described by Lucretius, the "straining" recalled by Ribh, which, as Crazy Jane laments, is "all unsatisfied". Viewing the same sexual act from outside the temporal world -- "from the side of the discarnate spirit approaching generation", as Kathleen Raine puts it,^{62/} -- the soul sees itself as "betrayed" by "honey of generation", dragged down from unity into multiplicity by sexual pleasure:

What youthful mother, a shape upon her lap
Honey of generation had betrayed,
And that must sleep, shriek, struggle to escape
As recollection or the drug decide,
Would think her son, did she but see that shape
With sixty or more winters on its head,
A compensation for the pang of his birth,
Or the uncertainty of his setting forth?^{63/}

Yeats's note reminds us that, before entering generation, those souls drink a cup of oblivion, a "drug", that destroys the recollection of pre-natal beauty.^{64/} Once it has entered generation, the soul must either "sleep" or "struggle to escape" depending upon whether it remembers the beauty left behind or remains drugged -- "As recollection or the drug decide."^{65/} This meaning is clearer in a draft of line 3 "And must sleep or struggle to escape", which, as Thomas Parkinson points out "presents two alternative modes of conduct, sleep and forgetting of past glory (the 'drug' of the later versions of line 4) or a struggle out of generation and toward remembered blessedness ('recollection' in line 4)."^{66/} The word "shriek" was plainly added from an earlier draft, "And

that shrieks out and struggles to escape".^{67/} Less clearly, that earlier draft has its roots in Blake's "Book of Thell", where Thell, contemplating betrayal into generation, "shrieks" and escapes.^{68/}

The place where the souls facing betrayal into generation congregate -- Porphyry calls it "The Cave of the Nymphs" -- is of particular interest to the poet because the images to which the poet struggles to give birth gather there as well. In a note to "An Image From a Past Life", Yeats suggests that "images that affect passion or affection" are preserved in a state analogous to "the state immediately preceding our birth".^{69/} Those images, too, resist betrayal into generation. Enticing them into poetry is hard work. As early as the 1906 poem "Adam's Curse", Yeats knew that the essence of the poet's task was "labour". It is Adam's curse that:

there is no fine thing
Since Adam's fall but needs much labouring.^{70/}

In the temporal world, all beautiful creations, even the feminine beauty that Neoplatonism enshrined at the heart of imaginative life, is the product of labour. As "[t]hat beautiful mild woman" put it in "Adam's Curse":

'To be born woman is to know -
Although they do not talk of it at school -
That we must labour to be beautiful.'^{71/}

A hard-working poet would thus be anxious to hear a report from Plotinus as to the nature of creativity "There",

in the eternal world. Plotinus recounts that "There", unmarred by Adam's curse, creation is emanation, the overflowing of a pool: "Not a laboring in the task, but . . . administering serenely by little more than an act of presence".^{72/} Or, as Plotinus put it elsewhere, the One creates by "engendering in its own likeness by a natural process."^{73/} Yeats's account of creativity in the eternal world is heavily indebted to Plotinus:

Labour is blossoming or dancing where
The body is not bruised to pleasure soul,
Nor beauty born out of its own despair,
Nor blear-eyed wisdom out of midnight oil.^{74/}

The bliss that reigns There is the product of a unity so fundamental that even in creation the One engenders "in its own likeness", the kind of engendering that can occur only where male and female are united and body is exempt from the bruising sexual efforts to achieve unity that Lucretius had recognized as designed "to pleasure soul".

"Among School Children" teaches that the images of sexual reunion that lead a mother to betray a soul into generation are illusory. They would break her heart "did she but see that shape/With sixty or more winters on its head".^{75/} But what of the images of eternity, like those that "keep a marble or a bronze repose"? They offer great promise.

And yet they too break hearts - O Presences
That passion, piety or affection knows,
And that all heavenly glory symbolize -
O self-born mockers of man's enterprise[.76/]

The full meaning of these central lines turns on the identity of "the Presences". Parkinson, who has clearly given this question much careful thought, concludes that "the 'Presences' can only be taken to mean the statues and children that are knowable by passion, piety, or affection" ^{77/} This reading, however, seems inconsistent with the divinity of the Presences suggested by the capitalization of the word in line 5 and their description as "self-born" in line 8, an echo of the Plotinian "self-springing" Principles, the ideas of Beauty and Good referred to in the note in MacKenna's Plotinus quoted in the preceding chapter.

Significantly that note spelled Presence with a capital "P", and pointed out that "consciousness of The One comes not by knowledge, . . . but by an actual Presence superior to any knowing", a Presence of Beauty and Good "springing from This as the daily light springs from the sun". ^{78/} The note in MacKenna thus suggests that the "Presences" are infusions of the eternal into the world of time, the self-springing Principles as experienced by humanity. Parkinson splits the worlds of time and eternity apart when he suggests the possibility "that in line 5 the poet is apostrophizing the temporal images, in line 8 the essences that they imperfectly embody". ^{79/} In fact, Yeats uses the Presences as images in the best Platonic sense -- as mediators between the worlds of time and eternity.

These self-springing Presences inhere, to some degree, in all of what Plotinus calls the "imitative arts", among which he numbers not only sculpture -- the art of images that keep a marble or a bronze repose -- but the art of dancing.^{80/} The imitative arts, he says, are largely earth-based, but still have some Presence of Beauty and Good because

. . . any skill which, beginning with the observation of the symmetry of living things, grows to the symmetry of all life, will be a portion of the Power There which observes and meditates the symmetry reigning among all things in the Intellectual Cosmos.^{81/}

Yeats could hardly ignore this suggestion that dancing contains something of "the symmetry of all life", the unity of being he sought so ardently. Thus, he follows Plotinus's teaching, and meditates on the dance as a means of achieving that consciousness of the One in which "[w]e neither hold an object nor trace distinction; there is no two."^{82/} Alas, Yeats sees not one, but two: dancer and dance.

The ultimate lesson learned among school children is that, even in meditation upon great art, the unity of the divine mind escapes us. It is in the nature of human consciousness to separate, to make distinctions. Plotinus teaches that in the divine mind there is "no distinction between Knower and Known",^{83/} this being a form of thinking and speaking created by "the habit induced by our condition" which tempts us "to distinguish, There too, the thinker from the thought."^{84/}

We "cannot help speaking in dualities, seen and seer, instead of, boldly, the achievement of unity."^{85/} That is why, Here, in what Plotinus (in a passage marked by Yeats) called "the chorus-dance of life", we cannot help distinguishing dancer and dance.

In its Plotinian context, "Among School Children" is every bit the "meditation on love, death, art, and the relation among these," that Lionel Trilling found in the "Ode on a Grecian Urn".^{86/} The meditation is, in the end, heartbreaking. The Presences are "mockers of man's enterprise". Though man meditate on feminine and other beauty as he will, though he bruise body to pleasure soul, he is, as Yeats put it in the conversation at Oxford, doomed to failure because the antinomy cannot be resolved in this life. Yeats's poem thus illustrates what Trilling divines as the essence of Keats's assertion that truth is beauty: "the enormously complex belief that the self can so develop that it may, in the intensity of art or meditation, perceive even very painful facts with a kind of pleasure"^{87/}

Granted that the "Presences/That passion, piety or affection knows" are bound to break hearts in the temporal world, the question remains whether the soul can ultimately achieve some form of happiness in the eternal world. From his earliest poetry to his latest, Yeats considered this question in terms of the soul's quest for "joy". The very first poem

preserved in Collected Poems, "The Song of the Happy Shepherd", begins with a lament for lost joy:

The woods of Arcady are dead,
And over is their antique joy[.88/]

Fifty-two years later, the poet was still lamenting the absence of joy:

Seventy years have I lived,
Seventy years man and boy,
And never have I danced for joy.89/

Whether that joy would be found beyond the tomb was a question Yeats believed was posed by "[a]ll that I have said and done":

All that I have said and done,
Now that I am old and ill,
Turns into a question till
I lie awake night after night
And never get the answers right.90/

The one question that remained unanswered is this: "Shall we in that great night rejoice?"^{91/}

In the gripping first section of "Vacillation" Yeats poses the same question by asking, in the context of the resolution of all the antinomies of life, "What is joy?"

Between extremities
Man runs his course;
A brand, or flaming breath,
Comes to destroy
All those antinomies
Of day and night;
The body calls it death,
The heart remorse.
But if these be right
What is joy?92/

In view of his indictment of the "strange eunuch-like tone and temper of the mind nourished on hatred", Yeats

was likely to notice Frazer's account of the joy experienced by the worshipers of Attis, who severed their genitals that the Great Mother goddess, Cybele, the earth, might be impregnated with their vitality.^{93/} Section II of "Vacillation" seems to arise out of Frazer's further account that, when buried images of Attis were resurrected, thus promising the same for his followers, "the sorrow of the worshipers was turned to joy".^{94/} If Attis's promise of resurrection does not fully answer the question of Section I - "What is joy?" - it comes close. At least his worshipers know "not grief":

And he that Attis' image hangs between
That staring fury and the blind lush leaf
May know not what he knows, but knows not grief.^{95/}

The message of Attis, then, was essentially analogous to that of Christ: the promise of resurrection. But the poet of "Vacillation" declines to "become a Christian man and choose for my belief/What seems most welcome in the tomb" -- a belief in resurrection from the dead. Yeats's personal belief is set forth in A Vision where, after describing the various states after death, he cautions that no

. . . state between death and birth should be considered as a reward or paradise. Neither between death and birth nor between birth and death can the soul find more than momentary happiness; its object is to pass rapidly round its circle and find freedom from that circle.^{96/}

It is probably this passage that prompted A. G. Stock to conclude that ". . . Yeats's cosmography has no final Paradise".^{97/} However, Stock overlooks the fact that Yeats

admitted the possibility of the soul's escape into "the Thirteenth Cone", which he described as the place of "deliverance from birth and death".^{98/} The numerical designation of the Thirteenth Cone indicates that it lies outside time, beyond the twelve cones of the lunar months. In fact, says Yeats, this cone is a sphere, the sphere of ultimate reality.^{99/} It only appears to be a cone^{100/} when seen by man because temporal knowledge of the eternal is imperfect.

The entire system of A Vision, Yeats said, was based upon the belief that the sphere of ultimate reality, which is neither one nor many, nor love nor hate -- "concord nor discord" as Yeats put it -- falls in human experience into a series of antinomies.^{101/} The Thirteenth Cone, then, is the sphere where the antinomies are resolved, where love and hate are reunited. That is why, when Yeats reached his temporary union with Maud in the second stanza of "Among School Children", "it seemed that our two natures blent/Into a sphere" ^{102/}

It is no accident that Yeats's efforts to describe this paradisiacal state of ultimate reality are confusing. The state is "of necessity unintelligible to all bound to the antinomies": "My instructors have therefore followed tradition by substituting for it a Record where the images of all past events remain for ever [sic] 'thinking the thought and doing the deed'." ^{103/} This description of the

elusive Thirteenth Cone as the "Record" makes clear its affinity with the Great Memory where, as early as the 1901 essay "Magic", Yeats placed the people of past days, likewise "thinking the thought and doing the deed".^{104/} Yeats used this same term, the "Record", in a 1921 note to "An Image From A Past Life" in which he maintained that "images that affect passion or affection" are preserved in the Record, there analogized to both the state immediately preceding birth, and "the Spiritus Mundi", defined as "a general storehouse of images which have ceased to be a property of any personality or spirit."^{105/}

Through all these various circumlocutions runs a common thread insisting that the ultimate source and destination of images of passion and affection lies outside the conscious mind in the general mind or, as Jung would put it, the collective unconscious. The note in Michael Robartes and the Dancer suggests that the Anima Mundi is also the source of images of piety, images the poet of "Among School Children" links with those of passion and affection. In that note Yeats posits that "the Beatific Vision", the ultimate object of piety, will be found in the "Record" after love and hate are reintegrated into a single emotion. Specifically, Yeats says that ultimate beatitude will be found when "emotion is exhausted - call it desire, hate or what you will . . ."^{106/} -- a formulation which

suggests that desire and hate are merely separate aspects of the ultimate, unified emotion. When earthly loves and hates have been exhausted and primal "natural instinct" is restored, the Beatific Vision is possible:

It is therefore only after full atonement or expiation, perhaps after many lives, that a natural deep satisfying love becomes possible, and this love, in all subjective natures, must precede the Beatific Vision.107/

Yeats said it more simply in his "card file" of communications from his instructors. There he simply opined that "B.V. comes from being free of Hatred".108/ "Among School Children" and "A Prayer For My Daughter" have as their objective the great Blakean task of restoring the unfallen world where love and hate are reunited. Unmixed beatitude is possible when, in a return to primal unity, hate is re-submerged in love. All the antinomies are resolved in that serene unity where ultimate reality knows itself and is known in a single act: "like some great dancer, the perfect flower of modern culture, dancing some primitive dance and conscious of his or her own life and of the dance".109/ The antinomy at last resolved, the conscious mind no longer insists on separating the knower from the known. The question posed at the end of "Among School Children" fades into meaninglessness; the mind at rest in unity no longer strives to know the dancer from the dance.

VII

"Hatred of God May Bring the Soul to God":

Yeatsian Hatred as Gnostic Virtue

The privileged moments in which Yeats forged a reintegration of love and hate gave way all too quickly to traditional Yeatsian preoccupation with hate. Hatred continued to play so central a role in Yeats's psychic life that, in "Ribh considers Christian Love insufficient", Yeats undertook a major confrontation and justification of his own hatred. When Ribh asks the penetrating questions that open the first two stanzas -- "Why should I seek for love or study it?" and "Why do I hate man, woman or event?" -- there is little doubt that Yeats is inquiring into his own emotional life. The inquiry merits quotation in full:

Why should I seek for love or study it?
It is of God and passes human wit.
I study hatred with great diligence,
For that's a passion in my own control,
A sort of besom that can clear the soul
Of everything that is not mind or sense.

Why do I hate man, women or event?
That is a light my jealous soul has sent.
From terror and deception freed it can
Discover impurities, can show at last
How soul may walk when all such things are past,
How soul could walk before such things began.

Then my delivered soul herself shall learn
A darker knowledge and in hatred turn
From every thought of God mankind has had.
Thought is a garment and the soul's a bride
That cannot in that trash and tinsel hide:
Hatred of God may bring the soul to God.

At stroke of midnight soul cannot endure
A bodily or mental furniture.
What can she take until her Master give!
Where can she look until He make the show!
What can she know until He bid her know!
How can she live till in her blood He live!1/

Part of Ribh's apologia for his hatred can be traced to a passage in Yeats's journal of the ideas of one of his "communicators":

He insisted on being questioned. I asked about further multiple influx. He said 'hate God,' we must hate all ideas concerning God that we possess, that if we did not absorption in God would be impossible . . . always he repeated 'hatred, hatred' or 'hatred of God' . . . said, 'I think about hatred.' That seems to me the growing hatred among men [which] has long been a problem with me.

The soul has to enter some significant relationship with God even if this be one of hatred. [2/]

These ideas find their way into the poem, but fall far short of a complete explication of the esoteric symbol and doctrine that Ribh, a monk whose Christianity came "perhaps from Egypt", ^{3/} can only have learned from the Gnostic beliefs common to both the Egyptian monks Yeats studied in Burkitt's Early Eastern Christianity and the Hermetic writings he knew in the translation of his friend G.R.S. Mead. ^{4/} The degree to which Gnostic doctrine helps to unravel Ribh's puzzling vocabulary is apparent, for example, from considering the poem in light of the basic Gnostic doctrine that there is a divine spark in man which, if reawakened by a ray of light from God, can cast off the garments of body and soul, and begin the path of re-ascent to God. ^{5/} There is no mistaking the fact that an exploration

of Ribh's Gnostic beliefs will enrich understanding of his argument that his hate is a light, his thought a garment, and his soul a bride.

The image of the soul as a bride cloaked in the garment of thought is at the core of the poem:

Thought is a garment and the soul's a bride
That cannot in that trash and tinsel hide[.]

Bloom considers these "the most Blakean lines I know outside of Blake", and glosses them with the declaration of Blake's Milton:

To bathe in the Waters of Life; to wash off the
Not Human
I come in Self-annihilation and the grandeur
of Inspiration
To cast off Rational Demonstration by Faith
in the Saviour
To cast off the rotten rags of Memory by
Inspiration
To cast off Bacon, Locke and Newton from
Albions covering
To take off his filthy garments, and clothe
him with Imagination
To cast aside from Poetry, all that is not
Inspiration.6/

Blake's ringing declaration clearly informs Ribh's determination to use his hatred to cast off ideas that prevent him from knowing God on Yeatsian terms, but does little to answer the exclamatory questions with which Yeats's poem concludes. The answers to these questions depend on the meaning of the expectant bride who, at the poem's close, awaits the knowledge and power of her Master. A closer scrutiny of the Gnostic sources shared by both Blake and Yeats is necessary to a full understanding of the soul as bride.

The difficulty of union between the bride-like soul and her divine Master is a basic tenet of Gnosticism. Unlike the God of the Christian creed, who is both "father almighty" and "maker of heaven and earth", the Gnostic deity is completely alien to the universe which he "neither created nor governs" and to which he is completely alien.^{7/} The world is the work of lesser powers who do not themselves know God and obstruct knowledge of him in the cosmos, the very structure of which "serves to separate man from God, not merely by spatial distance but by active demonic force".^{8/} Yeats's "Demon and Beast" reflects his knowledge of the demons and beasts who separate man from God, and Ribh is moved by the difficulty of knowing God when he declines to seek for love or study it. Love is essentially unknowable: "It is of God and passes human wit."

Ribh's soul can know God only if it is "freed" from the body. The image of the soul as imprisoned in a body is at least as old as the Orphics. Ribh, however, introduces a new idea, and it is clearly a Gnostic one: man's essence, his divine spark fallen from heaven, is trapped not only by the body, but by the mind as well. That is why Ribh seeks delivery from mind as well as sense, why soul cannot endure either a bodily or a mental furniture, why it shuns trash and tinsel.

Such a release of the "inner man" from the bondage of the world and his return to the divine realm of light is the goal of Gnostic striving. The first step on that journey is knowledge ("gnosis") of the alien God and of man's own divine origin. Thus Hermes taught that the man who learns that he himself is of Light and Life and only "happen'st to be out of them" shall return again to Life.^{9/}

Hermes also taught -- and Ribh learned -- that the soul that finally returns to life, the true self, "hath no garment", having cast off both body and mind or psyche, and freed itself of all the spiritual forces that battle for its possession.^{10/} Because they thought of the soul as a receptacle which gives birth to thoughts, Gnostics -- like Ribh, who calls the soul a bride, -- came to think of the soul as feminine, the mother of her thought and emotion: thought is "brought forth as offspring of the mind", as Hermes put it, "good thoughts when the mind is impregnated by God, and bad thoughts when it is impregnated by some daemon" ^{11/}

The idea of the soul as a battleground for combat between competing spiritual forces appears in "Demon and Beast", where Yeats presents his natural state as one of tension between the demon of his hatred and the beast of his desire. The poem celebrates a temporary release:

For certain minutes at the least
That crafty demon and that loud beast
That plague me day and night
Ran out of my sight;

Though I had long perned in the gyre,
Between my hatred and desire,
I saw my freedom won
And all laugh in the sun.^{12/}

Moreover, Yeats made clear that the idea of his soul as a battleground for a fight between demon and beast grew out of the Gnostic-tinged Christianity of "that exultant Anthony" whose life, as vividly recounted by St. Athanasius, was one long struggle with the demonic and beast-like guises in which Satan tested him.^{13/} For St. Anthony, the struggle led to victory: ". . . the demons rather fled from him, and the wild beasts, as is written, kept peace with him".^{14/}

Yeats associated the sweetness of his own temporary triumph over hatred and desire with the sweetness engendered by the asceticism of St. Anthony's monks:

O what a sweetness strayed
Through barren Thebaid,
Or by the Mareotic sea
When that exultant Anthony
And twice a thousand more
Starved upon the shore
And withered to a bag of bones!^{15/}

F.A.C. Wilson has shown how the demon and beast imagery is illuminated by reference to the address of Diocles to the monks of St. Anthony's fellowship at Antinoe.^{16/} As reported in Palladius's Lausiac History, which Yeats knew,^{17/} Diocles

told us [that] . . . 'intelligence separated from the thought of God inevitably falls into concupiscence or anger' and he said concupiscence was beast-like and anger demoniacal.^{18/}

This is pure Gnosticism. It clearly echoes the teaching of Hermes that the demons desist from those who have a ray of God shining on them.^{19/} The rest, like Yeats in "Demon and Beast", are led by demons into "loving and hating",^{20/} or, in the terms that Yeats would adopt in "The Spur", "cease not irrationally to rage and lust" ^{21/} Only when the demons are expelled can the soul "unite with the spirit as bride with bridegroom".^{22/}

Ribh knows all this. He also knows that the Gnostic God experiences passions,^{23/} like Jaweh of the Fifth Book of Deuteronomy, who proclaimed that "I . . . am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the father upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me."^{24/} Ribh could not help but be captivated by this explicit statement that the Deity's reaction to hatred of God is jealousy. Yeats had learned much about hate from his own jealousy:

My dear is angry that of late
I cry all base blood down
As though she had not taught me hate
By kisses to a clown.^{25/}

The idea of a jealous God suited Yeats perfectly. It accorded with his fondness for Nicholas of Cusa's conception of God as the coincidentia oppositorum,^{26/} a conjunction

that, although Nicholas never faced up to it, ^{27/} implies a streak of hate to match God's love. Ribh-Yeats, recognizing that he and God share common emotional ground, seizes upon the idea of divine hatred and, in answer to the question "Why do I hate man, woman or event?", responds that hate is a spark of divine light his jealous soul has sent as a reminder of his divine origin. By allowing the divine spark of hate to purge his soul of all else, Ribh opens himself to ecstatic experience of God, gnosis, knowledge of himself as divine in origin and goal. In this startling re-casting of the Christian God -- the love Ribh finds insufficient is specifically identified as Christian -- Ribh experiences jealousy as the divine presence, and hatred as herald of the bridegroom who will impregnate his soul with divine knowledge. According to Hermes, the silence of Ribh's purged soul is the womb within which, when impregnated by the will of God -- his power -- the rebirth of man as God takes place. ^{28/}

The Gnostic moment of ecstasy, "a being known by as well as knowing God", ^{29/} echoes, or is echoed in, "Leda and the Swan". The reader is thus compelled to wonder whether, when Ribh put on God's power, he put on divine knowledge as well. Yeats's answer is affirmative. In his 1930 diary, he recounts that men went to St. Anthony for information "about their spiritual states, what was about to happen and why it happened, and St. Anthony would reply neither out of

traditional casuistry nor common sense but from supernatural power".^{30/}

The source of St. Anthony's power and knowledge was his asceticism. In his address to the monks, as recounted in St. Athanasius's Life, he advises that

. . . if we care some day to know the future, let us be pure in mind. For I feel confident that if the soul is pure through and through and is in its natural state, it becomes clear-sighted and sees more and farther than the demons. It then has the Lord to reveal things to it.^{31/}

This power of prophecy is what Yeats had in mind when he said that the monks of the Thebaid "skimmed the 'unconscious'".^{32/}

Ribh, too, is an ascetic, and attributes his ecstatic knowledge to ascetic practices. When he experiences a vision at the tomb of Baile and Aillinn, it is "water, herb and solitary prayer" that make his eyes "open to that light".^{33/}

The various Gnostic cults embraced either the asceticism of Ribh, or the libertinism of Crazy Jane. Both were ways of subverting the commandments which their secret wisdom recognized as a part of "the great design upon our freedom".^{34/}

Ribh is no libertine. Nonetheless, a number of critics, apparently confounded by Ribh's attention to the sexual activities of angels and of the divinity itself, attribute this aspect of his thought to the fact that the "Supernatural Songs" were written shortly after Yeats's Steinach operation in 1934.^{35/} But graphic sexual imagery is hardly a new

element in Yeats's poetry in 1934. Witness, for example, Crazy Jane of 1929-31. What is new is the emphasis on asceticism as an avenue to poetic knowledge.

Moreover, it is not the result of personal prurience, but a necessary consequence of Ribh's Gnosticism, that his ecstatic vision reveals a divinity that, in Scholem's fertile phrase, is "a procreative life force dynamically active in the universe."^{36/} "Ribh in Ecstasy" recounts the ecstatic vision of the divinity Ribh achieves by enlarging his hate:

What matter that you understood no word!
Doubtless I spoke or sang what I had heard
In broken sentences. My soul had found
All happiness in its own cause or ground.
Godhead on Godhead in sexual spasm begot
Godhead. Some shadow fell. My soul forgot
Those amorous cries that out of quiet come
And must the common round of day resume.^{37/}

Ribh's report is true to his Gnostic convictions, such as the belief that, except in privileged moments of ecstasy, the soul forgets its divine origin. Moreover, the lesson of Ribh's ecstasy goes to the heart of the Gnostic experience, the central core that so commended itself to Jung and modern psychology. This is the idea of self-knowledge as knowledge of God implicit in Ribh's exultation that "My soul had found/ All happiness in its own cause or ground." Finally, Ribh's vision of God presents the Gnostic Creator begetting in sexual spasm. This vision was shared, as Yeats knew from Burkitt's Early Eastern Christianity, by Syriac Christianity which,

"before the influence of Greek theology made itself felt",
regarded the Holy Spirit as feminine, the mother of humanity. ^{38/}

Ribh no doubt has Burkitt in mind when he denounces Patrick:

An abstract Greek absurdity has crazed the man -
Recall that masculine Trinity. Man, woman, child
(a daughter or a son),
That's how all natural or supernatural stories
run. 39/

Ribh expresses his preference for the esoteric tradition when
he grounds his argument on the Hermetic principle that "things
below are copies":

Natural and Supernatural with the self-same ring
are wed.
As man, as beast, as an ephemeral fly begets,
Godhead begets Godhead,
For things below are copies, the Great Smaragdine
Tablet said. 40/

Ribh's reference to the "ephemeral fly" is a reminder
that this same Gnostic doctrine informs "Long-Legged Fly",
another poem arising out of the strong association in Yeats's
mind between the poet's creativity and the Gnostic idea of
creation as sexual spasm. Whitaker has noted that the mind
"moving on silence" "Like a long-legged fly upon the stream"
echoes the movement "upon the face of the waters" of the
Creator in the first chapter of Genesis. ^{41/}

It is no coincidence that Yeats bypasses the Jaweh
of Genesis 2, who creates only a male Adam, in favor of the
Elohim of Genesis 1 who, having proposed "Let us make man in
our image", creates man "male and female". ^{42/} The Gnostics

not only preferred the Elohim version of the creation of humanity, but thought of the creation of the cosmos itself as a sexual spasm engendered within the great "Power Silence" when male Mind causes the "conception" of the female "Great Thought", thus "producing all things". This is "The Great Announcement" of Simon Magus as recounted in Mead's Fragments Of A Faith Forgotten.^{43/} Given the likelihood that Yeats knew Mead's book,^{44/} and appreciated that, as Burkitt suggests, the Gnostic cosmogenesis is "a process analogous to that by which new notions came into our minds out of the unknown activities of our conscious selves",^{45/} the Mind moving upon Silence like a long-legged fly upon the stream cannot be other than a Yeatsian echo of Gnostic descriptions of divine and human creativity, an echo that repeats itself in the poem at three critical moments in history.

The silence awaiting the long-legged fly is like the soul cleared of demon and "loud beast" awaiting her Master at the close of "Ribh considers Christian Love insufficient". Again, this is the state of receptivity that Yeats found himself able to achieve by using his hatred, which he thought of as rising up out of his feminine, dark or unconscious half, to create a state of receptivity to creative impulse, a kind of negative capability awaiting a Zeus-like influx from the spiritual world. For Ribh and Yeats, the insufficiency of Christian Love derives from its failure to take account of the roles of femininity and hatred

in divine creativity and, inferentially, things below being copies, in the creative life of poets.

A similar point is made in the second half of "Ribh denounces Patrick". The logic of the first half of the poem -- things below are copies and thus there must be a feminine element to the Trinity -- would seem to argue for a humanity mirroring the Trinity and consisting of only three persons: man, woman, child. The second half of the poem deals with the unsettling multiplicity of the human family, an anomaly Hermes explained by the difference between human "love", separated from hate, and the divinity's "Love", in which hate is integrated. "[T]he cause of death is love, though Love is all", said Hermes, and "when he said this, His Forethought . . . effect[ed] their couplings and their generations founded".^{46/} In lines "the point" of which, according to a Yeatsian letter, "is that we beget and bear because of the incompleteness of our love",^{47/} Ribh, echoing Hermes, finds the incompleteness or insufficiency of human love to lie in its failure adequately to copy the divine:

Yet all must copy copies, all increase their kind;
When the conflagration of their passion sinks,
 damped by the body or the mind,
That juggling nature mounts, her coil in their
 embraces twined.

The mirror-scaled serpent is multiplicity,
But all that run in couples, on earth, in flood
 or air, share God that is but three,
And could beget or bear themselves could they
 but love as He.^{48/}

The complete love that Ribh holds up as a model is one that knows the uses of hate.

Ribh's argument that hatred is a virtue is of a piece with the general Gnostic tendency to attribute positive value to the opposites of traditional virtues. So, too, is Ribh's idea of God as an entity in which the great antinomies (love and hate, good and evil, male and female) continue to exist as separate elements rather than as aspects of a reintegrated primal unity. There is more than a little Nietzsche in these aspects of Ribh. The monk would be quite at home with the philosopher's rejection of "that desideratum of former times 'peace of soul', the Christian desideratum",^{49/} and would share the philosopher's belief that in a "strong and natural species of man, love and hate" must co-exist.^{50/}

These shared ideas of Ribh and Nietzsche proceed from their common notion of the soul as what Martin Buber, in the course of criticizing the same idea in Jung, calls "the unification of an all-encompassing wholeness of the opposites",^{51/} a notion so Gnostic in origin that Jung's description of the process of individuation -- "the bridal union of opposite halves" -- is, as Buber points out and Ribh could confirm, pure Gnosticism.^{52/} Ribh is subject to Buber's Jung-directed criticism that his idea of the soul leaves no room for any arbiter between the opposites of good and evil, love and hate.

Whether Yeats must be held to have accepted all Ribh's Gnosticism is another question. The views range from the ipse dixit of James Lovic Allen -- Yeats was "a thoroughgoing Gnostic"^{53/} -- to its opposite in M.C. Flannery's assertion -- "Yeats simply was not a Gnostic"^{54/} -- with Bloom somewhere in the middle -- Yeats "was always a kind of Gnostic".^{55/} This is quibbling over labels. The fact is that, in "Supernatural Songs", Yeats made use of Gnostic symbol and doctrine to express his traditional beliefs in new ways through Ribh, whom Henn aptly calls Yeats's "last and greatest Mask".^{56/} The major contribution of Ribh to Yeats's catechism is a new vocabulary for exploring something Yeats already knew: intense experience of his own hatred brought him into contact with an element within himself that communed with a world of spirit -- what Yeats called the anima mundi and Jung the collective unconscious. In the Gnostic terminology favored by Ribh, Yeats's hatred kept him "sober" and guarded against the "drunkenness of ignorance" in regard to his spiritual origin.^{57/} As Yeats put it, again using Gnostic imagery, in "A Drunken Man's Praise of Sobriety", his hatred served as a "pretty punk" that could keep him aware of his divine spark, that he might "stay a sober man/Although I drink my fill".^{58/}

Unlike Gnostic Ribh, however, Yeats recognizes that, once the pretty punk of his hatred has stimulated

creative energy, a responsible poetic intelligence must preside over the creation of a new work and a new self. The respective roles of the hatred and the poetic intelligence that must triumph over the hatred are apparent in a passage Yeats marked in his copy of Common's selections from Nietzsche and Yeats's marginal comment on that passage. In the marked passage, Nietzsche argues that it is necessary for the noble man "to have enemies", ^{59/} an imperative with which Yeats, great hater of opposing ideas and their proponents, was quick to comply. However, Yeats qualifies his assent by observing that

[t]his implies that victory achieves its end not by mere overcoming but because the joy of it creates friends - it is a new creation. Victories of mere brute force do not create.^{60/}

Ribh's pretty punk of hatred is the beginning, and sometimes a necessary beginning, of the Yeatsian creative process, but the victory of a new creation requires that the hate be no more than an obstacle that must be overcome.

VIII

Objects Of A Hatred That Seeks Its Own Infinity:

Materialism And The Idea Of Progress

T. H. Huxley was an abiding object of Yeatsian hate. Yeats "detested" that great Darwinian.^{1/} Yeats's ability to express his antipathy for Huxley in so many creative ways gives fruitful content to his dictum that "[a]ll movements are held together more by what they hate than by what they love"^{2/} Yeats's hate for Huxley binds together many strands of his thought. For example, it is the common point for which F.S.L. Lyons was looking when he sought a firmer pinpointing of the connection between Yeats's interest in folklore and his forays into the occult.^{3/} Chapters I and II show how Yeats turned to the occult for evidence of a spiritual world when Huxley deprived him of the "simple-minded religion" of his childhood.^{4/} Huxley also stimulated Yeats's interest in folk belief because Huxley threatened not only the specific beliefs of Yeats's youthful religion, but also his more generalized belief in the interweaving of the spiritual and material worlds. Although Darwin had refused to commit himself as to the origin of life, Huxley resolutely took the view, seconded by Tyndall in his Belfast address of 1874, that life itself arose on earth through a series of progressive chemical changes.^{5/} If Huxley's Darwinism sent Yeats to the occultists, his materialism sent the poet into libraries "and at last down into Connacht to sit by turf fires" in search of a tradition of belief in the spiritual world's involvement in the material.^{6/}

The importance of this search is reflected in "Poetry and Tradition" where Yeats, listing the three types of men who have "made all beautiful things", counts "countrymen" alongside aristocrats and artists because they have contributed their beliefs.^{7/}

Belief in a spiritual world -- "freedom, God, immortality"^{8/} -- was essential to Yeats's conception of art: "[a]ll symbolic art should arise out of a real belief."^{9/} Moreover, the belief should be shared by poet and audience. That is why, when reading Shelley and Keats's Endymion, Yeats found himself "wishing for and trying to imagine . . . a crowd of believers who could put into all those strange sights the strength of their belief and the rare testimony of their visions."^{10/} In the absence of such belief, Yeats was certain "that there are many who are not moved as they would be by that solitary light burning in the tower of Prince Athanase, because it has not entered into men's prayers nor lighted any through the sacred dark of religious contemplation."^{11/}

These comments on Shelley and Keats emphasize the extent to which a tradition of belief was not merely congenial to Yeats personally, but essential to his art. Yeats, in effect, adopted as an artistic doctrine the ideal of faith articulated in the fifth century by Vincent of Lerins that "quid ubique, quid semper, quid ab omnibus creditum est."^{12/}

Thus the Huxley who had deprived Yeats of his religion threatened his poetry as well when he consciously placed himself in opposition "[t]o those who admit the authority of the famous Vincentian dictum that the doctrine which has been held 'always, everywhere and by all' is to be received as authoritative" ^{13/} Huxley took his text from Kant: philosophy is not a vehicle for discovering truth; it "has only the modest merit of preventing error." ^{14/} In other words, Huxley was a true son of Francis Bacon -- "Little Bacon", as Blake called him, whose "first principle is Unbelief" ^{15/} -- and thus a true enemy of Yeats. Whether or not Yeats may accurately be called a Gnostic, ^{16/} he was clearly a seeker after the kind of immediate knowledge of spiritual truth accurately defined as "gnosis". The distance between Huxley and Yeats is thus accurately measured by the fact that Huxley coined the term "agnostic" to describe his attitude toward religious belief. "It came into my head," he said, "as suggestively antithetic to the 'Gnostic' of Church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was so ignorant" ^{17/} In remarks well calculated to enrage someone of Yeats's sensibilities, Huxley went on to allow that "the process of breaking away from old beliefs is extremely unpleasant", ^{18/} and insisted that evidence of objective reality "is to be obtained only by the use of the methods of science" ^{19/}

Yeats maintained his allegiance to the school of Lerins. Upon abandoning a youthful flirtation with the ideas of Huxley, he "began occasionally telling people that one should believe whatever had been believed in all countries and periods, and only reject any part of it after much evidence, instead of starting all over afresh and only believing what one could prove."^{20/} In the same tradition, he proposed to an early meeting of the Dublin Hermetic Society "that whatever the greatest poets have affirmed in their finest moments was the nearest we could come to an authoritative religion"^{21/}

The search for belief led Yeats directly to folklore. In the 1880's, Yeats's conviction "that there must be a tradition of belief older than any European church and founded on the experience of the world before the modern bias" led him and his uncle George Pollexfen "to study the visions and thoughts of the country people".^{22/} In 1897, when Yeats began collecting folklore at Coole, his object was "to find actual experience of the supernatural."^{23/} If he did not find actual experience of the supernatural, Yeats found what, in the school of Lerins, was the next best thing: an unshakeable belief in the existence of the supernatural. "The Irish countryman," he reported in 1900, "certainly believes that a spiritual race lives all about him."^{24/} Moreover, the spiritual race took an active interest in the affairs of the temporal. Yeats found "a war between the living and the dead,

and the Irish stories keep harping on it".^{25/} Most important, he found the universality of belief he was looking for:

" . . . the soul always believes in these, or in like things."^{26/}

Indeed, the stories collected in The Celtic Twilight, were a monument to the power of belief. Yeats likened them to AE's account of the magician who threw a rope ladder in the air, and then sent climbing up it all manner of men and beasts: they were "a parable to show how man mounts to the infinite by the ladder of the impossible."^{27/} If Yeats was not as accomplished as the White Queen, who practiced believing impossible things -- sometimes believing six impossible things before breakfast^{28/} -- Harold Bloom is nonetheless right to say that "Yeats did not suffer from any lack of credulity."^{29/} Bloom is also on sound ground in relating this Yeatsian attitude to Blake:

Blake asserted that anything possible to be believed was an image of truth. Yeats bettered him in finding it possible to believe anything whatever, if it were sufficiently marvelous and made enough of a gap in nature. This generosity of spirit is unmatched among modern poets, and perhaps unmatched in tradition since the days of Sir Thomas Browne.^{30/}

In an 1893 review, Yeats himself had invoked Blake as a prelude to inquiring whether the emerging books of folklore were not bringing an affirmation of the existence of God "and testifying to the ancient supremacy of the imagination."^{31/} Answering his own question, and striking a blow for Blake

against not only Huxley, but the Bastien-Lepage, Carolus Duran "bundle of sticks" as well, Yeats concluded that "[i]magination is god in the world of art, and may well desire us to come to an issue with the atheists who would make us naught but 'realists', 'naturalists' or the like."^{32/}

This Yeatsian drawing of the lines between the imagination and believers, on one side, and atheists and realists on the other, shows how important a tradition of belief was in Yeats's theory of the poetic process. The stuff of folk belief, with its recurring insistence on the supernatural, would provide the element missing from the realism of writers and painters who simply reported what they saw. That is why Yeats could say in The Celtic Twilight that "[a]fter all, imaginative impulse -- the quintessence of life -- is our great need from folklore."^{33/} To the reader of "The Celtic Element in Literature" in 1897, it would have seemed that folk beliefs were the only source of an imaginative influx that could save literature from the realists. "[L]iterature dwindles to a mere chronicle of circumstance," Yeats said in that early essay, "or passionless fantasies, and passionless meditations, unless it is constantly flooded with the passions and beliefs of ancient times"^{34/} In a footnote appended in 1924, Yeats alludes to the possibility of a new influx from the anima mundi, confessing that "I should have added as an alternative that the supernatural may at any moment create new myths, but I was timid."^{35/}

Even the folk beliefs collected in the 1890's were themselves suggestive of a collective mind. Yeats and Lady Gregory "came upon visionaries of whom it was impossible to say whether they were Christian or Pagan, found memories of jugglers like those of India . . ."; in short, they found claims made for the spiritual world in the west of Ireland that paralleled the claims made the world over. Yeats was thus convinced that he and Lady Gregory "had got down, as it were, into some fibrous darkness, into some matrix out of which everything has come" ^{36/}

The message Yeats distilled from folk belief seemed to provide universal answers to his particular needs. As recounted in Chapter II, the youthful Yeats in search of a tradition of belief was self-confessedly "timid and abashed", and, angered by his father's infirmity of will, longed for ^{37/} "dominating men" who could overcome Huxley and Tyndall. It should come as no surprise, then, that the most attractive aspect of folk belief for Yeats was the strength of conviction with which it was held. "There was a doubter in Donegal," begins one of the tales of The Celtic Twilight, ^{38/} in a reference to the exception that proves the rule. Although "[f]or a time he prospered in his unbelief", the tale ends with "Donegal . . . avenged upon its doubter" when the latter, not fearing to spend a night alone in the doubted ghost's room, was viciously "kicked out by his own boots", it not being

recorded, says Yeats, "whether the invisible being was the ghost or one of the Sidhe" ^{39/}

Unlike the doubters and skeptics of the school of Huxley, the people in the tales Yeats collected never "entangled their feet with the sorry net of 'maybe' and 'perhaps'". ^{40/} Instead, they enjoy "unmixed emotions"; it is "one of the great troubles of life that we cannot" ^{41/} "There is always", he laments, "something in our enemy that we like, and something in our sweetheart that we dislike." ^{42/} It seems no mere accident that the young poet, torn between love for his skeptical father, and hate for the skepticism of Huxley, admires the "unmixed emotions" of the people of folk tales, and longs to "love and hate with as good heart as the Sidhe do" ^{43/}

Yeats adds a significant gloss to this passage when, in "The Celtic Element in Literature", he opines that the "hater who hates with too good a heart soon comes also to hate the idea only; and from this idealism in love and hatred comes, as I think, a certain power of saying and forgetting things, especially a power of saying and forgetting things in politics, which others do not say and forget." ^{44/} Hatred that escapes ambivalence expresses itself to the limit, and so dissipates itself. Such was the case, Yeats suggests, among the personages of the old Irish tales, who did not "weigh and measure their hatred". ^{45/} The nurse of O'Sullivan Bere, for example, recounts Yeats,

prays that the bed of his betrayer may
be the red hearth-stone of Hell for ever.
And an Elizabethan Irish poet cries:
'Three things are waiting for my death.
The Devil, who is waiting for my soul and
cares nothing for my body or my wealth;
the worms, who are waiting for my body
but care nothing for my soul or my wealth;
my children, who are waiting for my wealth
and care nothing for my body or my soul.
O Christ, hang all three in the one noose.'^{46/}

"Such love and hatred," Yeats concludes, "seek no mortal
thing but their own infinity," and thus "soon become love
and hatred of the idea."^{47/} It is like the love of the
lover in AE's poem who says "A vast desire awakes and grows
into forgetfulness of thee."^{48/}

In sum, the influx of passion and belief that Yeats
thought necessary to save literature from realism was an
amalgam in which the belief was belief in a spiritual world
and the passion was unbounded love and hate. In this context,
it becomes apparent that, when Yeats "dreamed of enlarging
Irish hate", he dreamed of a beneficent enlargement that
might transform a narrow, personalized hatred into unbounded
hatred of the idea. This was the kind of animus that great
hater Blake had in mind when he counselled anger directed
against "states" of mind rather than individuals.^{49/}

The idea Yeats offers as the focus of Irish hate
is the materialism he associated with Huxley. "Ruskin and
Morris had spent themselves in vain," Yeats thought, "because
they had found no passion to harness to their" opposition

to the materialism they found at the heart of English life. In the folk beliefs of Ireland, however, Yeats found "unwasted passion and precedents in the popular memory for every needed thought and action."^{50/} In sum, Yeats's dream of "enlarging Irish hate, till we had come to hate with a passion of patriotism what Morris and Ruskin hated",^{51/} was a dream of transforming Irish hatred of England into hatred of the materialism of English culture that Morris and Ruskin hated.

That this is the meaning of the cryptic comment on "enlarging Irish hatred" in "Poetry and Tradition" is apparent from the more straightforward statement in Yeats's "Plans and Methods" for the 1900 season of the Irish Literary Theatre: "I myself throw the blame for that decline of the spiritual and intellectual energies of which . . . Ruskin and Morris [were convinced] upon that commercialism and materialism on which these men warred; and not upon race as do certain of my countrymen."^{52/} In sum, Yeats would marry traditional hatred of England with the countrymen's passionate belief in the spiritual world to produce a passionate hatred of materialism.

The significance of folk belief was no youthful fancy. Yeats's belief in a spiritual element in man that corresponds to a spiritual element outside man remained at the core of his beliefs throughout his life. Moreover, he continued to validate this belief by reference to its prominence in folk

tales, and to apply it as a fundamental doctrine of his art. All of these aspects of Yeats's thought are still driving him as late as "Under Ben Bulben", a poem he was revising at his death.^{53/}

The importance of belief, Yeats's perennial antidote to Huxley's skepticism, is apparent in the title -- "Creed" -- of the prose draft of "Under Ben Bulben".^{54/} The draft begins with the words "I believe" and goes on to make clear that the poet believes in life after death, and that he shares this belief with the folk, "the men upon the road":

I believe what the old saints
a thousand years before Christ, sitting under
the palms, like the old saints about
the Mareotic sea. From eternity
through eternity to eternity man moves.^{55/}

The "men upon the road" are joined, in the third prose draft, by "country men" who, as described in The Celtic Twilight, see the fighting men and their fine women coming down the mountain at Drumcliff and Rosses:

I believe as did the old sages
who sat under the palm trees
the banyan trees, or among
those snow bound rocks,
a thousand years before Christ
was born; I believe as did the
monks of the Mareotic sea,
as do country men
who see the old fighting men
& their fine women coming out
of the mountain, moving from
mountain to mountain[.56/]

Examination of the drafts thus makes clear that the reference to the horsemen of Ben Bulben in the first section

of "Under Ben Bulben" reflects the grounding of Yeats's creed in the folk beliefs he collected in "The Celtic Twilight". The universality of those beliefs is illustrated by the fact that they are shared by people as far removed from each other as the country men of the west of Ireland and St. Anthony's monks of early eastern Christianity, who figured in "Demon and Beast"^{57/} and who reappear "Round the Mareotic Lake" in "Under Ben Bulben".^{58/} These beliefs, with the "I believe" altered to "Swear", appear in the final poem as follows:

Swear by what the sages spoke
Round the Mareotic Lake
That the Witch of Atlas knew,
Spoke and set the cocks a-crow.

Swear by those horsemen, by those women
Complexion and form prove superhuman,
That pale, long-visaged company
That air in immortality
Completeness of their passions won;
Now they ride the wintry dawn
Where Ben Bulben sets the scene.

Here's the gist of what they mean.^{59/}

The second section of the poem states the gist of what they mean -- a recurring life after death -- and relates this belief to both Irish folklore -- "And ancient Ireland knew it all" -- and to Yeats's belief in the anima mundi, the "human mind" into which grave-diggers thrust their buried men:

Many times man lives and dies
Between his two eternities,
That of race and that of soul,
And ancient Ireland knew it all.
Whether man die in his bed
Or the rifle knocks him dead,

A brief parting from those dear
Is the worst man has to fear.
Though grave-diggers' toil is long,
Sharp their spades, their muscles strong,
They but thrust their buried men
Back in the human mind again.^{60/}

The degree to which Yeats posited ancient Irish sources for his beliefs in the life of the soul after death and in the anima mundi is dramatically illustrated by his startling observation that "[a] modern man, The Golden Bough and Human Personality in his head, finds much that is congenial in St. Patrick's Creed as recorded in his Confessions, and nothing to reject except the word 'soon' in the statement that Christ will soon judge the quick and the dead."^{61/} Despite the modern references to The Golden Bough, with its hint that St. Patrick's Creed will be compatible with recurring resurrection myths, and Frederick Meyer's Human Personality And Its Survival of Bodily Death, with its equally up-to-date nineteenth century researches into spiritual life after death, the reader is initially nonplussed at Yeats's apparent adherence to a creed that reads as follows:

there is none other God, nor ever was,
nor shall be hereafter, except God the
Father unbegotten, without beginning,
from whom is all beginning, upholding
all things (as we have said); and His
Son Jesus Christ, whom we acknowledge to
have been always with the Father, before
the beginning of the world, spiritually
with the Father, in an ineffable manner
begotten, before all beginning; and by
Him were made things visible and
invisible; and being made man, and,
having overcome death, He was received

into heaven unto the Father. And [the Father] hath given unto Him all power, above every name, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord and God. Whom we believe, and we look for His coming, who is soon about to be the Judge of quick and dead, who will render unto every man according to his works, and hath poured into us abundantly the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the pledge of immortality (pignus immortalitatis), who maketh the faithful and obedient to become the sons of God the Father, and joint heirs with Christ, Whom we confess and worship (quem confitemur et adoramus) one God in the Trinity of the sacred Name.62/

It requires a second look to find the elements in St. Patrick's Creed with which Yeats would be perfectly sympathetic: the existence of a spiritual world before the origin of the material world, the interrelationship of the two worlds -- of "things visible and invisible" -- the continuance of a life after death, and a link between the material and spiritual worlds in the form of Jesus Christ. Further insight into Yeats's reading of St. Patrick's Creed is gained from the ensuing comment in "A General Introduction For My Work" that "my Christ, a legitimate deduction from the Creed of St. Patrick as I think, is that Unity of Being Dante compared to a perfectly proportioned human body, Blake's 'Imagination,' and what the Upanishads have named 'Self'"^{63/}

The reference to Blake's "Imagination" illuminates Yeats's adoption of St. Patrick's belief in Christ as an

element of the spiritual world who entered the world of nature. For, as Yeats and Ellis made clear in the preface to their edition of Blake, Imagination is "the philosophic name of the Savior, whose symbolic name is Christ".^{64/} Imagination is man's link with the eternal. As Yeats and Ellis put it: "[i]n Imagination only we find a Human Faculty that touches nature at one side, and spirit on the other." In this sense, Christ is symbolic of the interweaving of the spiritual throughout the fabric of the material world, a notion so fundamental to Yeatsian thought that the poet can say that "[s]ubconscious preoccupation" with the theme of St. Patrick's Creed "brought me A Vision, its harsh geometry an incomplete interpretation."^{65/}

The conjunction between Christ and Imagination also explains the relationship between priest and poet. As Yeats and Ellis explain it, the priests of the redemption, which consists of a reunification of the universal mind, "are, -- or should be, -- artists and poets" because "[a]rt and poetry, by constantly using symbolism, continually remind us that nature itself is a symbol" and thus hold out the promise of redemption from "nature's death and destruction".^{66/} Redemption is a "return to the Golden Age", when "'all that was not inspiration should be cast off from poetry'".^{67/}

In addition to helping explain how Yeats could find St. Patrick's Creed so congenial, his comments on Blake

illustrate the close relationship between Yeats's own religious beliefs and his theory of art. Yeats's belief in the existence of a spiritual world, and its interweaving with the material world, find direct expression in his belief that poetic inspiration is a form of Platonic reminiscence of the spiritual world. The relationship between belief and poetry is expressed in "Under Ben Bulben". While the first two sections of the poem state Yeats's belief in a spiritual world, sections IV and V articulate the duty of the poet to restore the world of the spirit, to bring again the Golden Age.

Section IV begins by enjoining poet and sculptor to "Bring the soul of man to God". That, after all is what the "great forefathers" of present day artists did until, in the present age of unbelief, artists set themselves no higher task than painting what is in front of them. Those great artists of the past, as Palmer said of Blake in a passage Yeats had quoted in his 1897 essay on Blake, showed us "the drawing aside of the fleshly curtain and the glimpse which all the most holy, studious saints and sages have enjoyed of that rest which remaineth to the people of God."^{68/} Yeats had this notion in mind more than a half century later when, in the course of stating his artistic creed in the fourth section of "Under Ben Bulben", he reminded poets and sculptors that artists like Blake "Prepared a rest for the people of God, / Palmer's phrase"^{69/}

Irish poets, particularly, had retained, and shared with their audience, a belief in a spiritual world. As Yeats said in "A General Introduction For My Work", Irish mythology and legend had "perhaps the unquestioned belief of peasant and noble alike down to the end of the seventeenth century." Thus, in section V of "Under Ben Bulben", Yeats addresses "Irish poets" specifically, urging their adherence to this tradition of belief, and scorn of those who, because they disbelieve in a spiritual world, fail to understand inspiration as reminiscence, and thus suffer "unremembering hearts and heads".^{70/} Yeats's hope for remembering hearts and heads is grounded in the belief expressed in Irish folk literature. Thus, in "A General Introduction", he says that "[i]f Irish literature goes on as my generation planned it, it may do something to keep the 'Irishry' living, nor will the work of the realists hinder" ^{71/} The Irishry who shared this tradition of belief found in it, as Yeats and Matthew Arnold knew, the source of an "indomitable reaction against the despotism of fact."^{72/} That is why Yeats prays in "Under Ben Bulben", that Irish poets will cast their "mind on other days", the days of a tradition of shared belief,

That we in coming days may be
Still the indomitable Irishry.^{73/}

Yeats's election to cast his mind on other days reflects a fundamental decision to oppose himself to the forward-looking Victorian world of progress heralded by Huxley.

Yeats's backward look evokes the question that, when posed in a review some decades later, prompted Frank O'Connor's question: "Is our past so unique that we must always be gazing back lovingly on it?"^{74/} Yeats based his affirmative answer on his belief that Ireland, more than any society since ancient Greece, offered its artists "two passions ready to their hands, love of the Unseen Life and love of country."^{75/} When Yeats urged Ireland to "re-create the ancient arts" by capitalizing on the passion of Irish countrymen for the "Unseen World", he was under no illusion as to the degree to which he was out of step with his contemporaries. "An Englishman", he declared in "Ireland and the Arts", "with his belief in progress, with his instinctive preference for the cosmopolitan literature of the last century, may think arts like these parochial, but they are the arts we have begun the making of."^{76/}

Here, Huxley again emerges as the villain. A firm believer in the idea of progress, he was, as Arthur Koestler put it, "a typical representative of the bouyant and arrogant optimism of the nineteenth century."^{77/} Huxley expressed the relationship between evolution and the idea of progress when, in his 1862 Edinburgh lectures on "The Relation of Man to the Lower Animals", he argued that "thoughtful men, once escaped from the blinding influence of traditional prejudices, will find in the lowly stock whence man has sprung the best

evidence of the splendour of his capacities; and will discern, in his long progress through the past, a reasonable ground of faith in his attainment of a nobler future."^{78/} Yeats resisted this aspect of the idea of progress, the belief, fueled by the notion of natural selection of the fittest, that the history of man on earth is one of continuous advance toward an eventual achievement on earth of human perfection.^{79/} This was the vision that would prompt Tennyson to "Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of change".^{80/}

It was a vision Yeats did not share. Like the Greeks and Romans, like Blake, and like the countrymen of the west of Ireland, he shunned the look forward to a perfect world on earth, in favor of a look backward to the Golden Age from which man had degenerated. The people of The Celtic Twilight were, he thought, "the most innocent of the Golden Age",^{81/} an age that still lived in the country, where men are still in communion with the gods.^{82/} "In Ireland", he reports, "this world and the world where we go after death are not far apart."^{83/}

The loss of belief in the intertwining of these two worlds is what the world calls progress. So said Yeats in his 1900 essay, The Symbolism of Poetry: "How can the arts overcome the slow dying of men's hearts that we call the progress of the world, and lay their hands on men's

heartstrings again, without becoming the garment of religion as in old times?"^{84/} The finger is again pointed at progress in another essay of the same period. In "The Theatre", Yeats directly attacks the notion of the gradual perfection of man on earth:

. . . all life is revelation beginning in miracle and enthusiasm, and dying out as it unfolds itself into what we have mistaken for progress. It is one of our illusions, as I think, that education, the softening of manners, the perfecting of law - countless images of a fading light - can create nobleness and beauty, and that life moves slowly and evenly toward some perfection. Progress is miracle, and it is sudden^{85/}

Here Yeats is comfortably at home with Blake, who denied progression in the arts,^{86/} and Nietzsche, who attacked scientists as enemies of the tragic view, "all died-in-the-wool optimists like their archetype, Socrates."^{87/}

The fact that these attacks on the idea of progress were written in 1900 is no basis for consigning them to a specific phase of Yeats's life. Years later, when he read Wyndham Lewis's Time and Western Man, Yeats felt a "curiously personal feeling of gratitude"^{88/} to Lewis for his attack on "the Time-philosopher as a 'Progress' enthusiast of the most obvious political sort".^{89/} No doubt, he particularly had in mind Lewis's attack on the "evolutionary doctrine of Time" which holds that "it is we who are in the process of making a superior reality to ourselves: we are improving ourselves, in short" and thus supplying "man with new causes

of self-congratulation" ^{90/} Reading this, Yeats felt that Lewis had found "expression for my hatred - a hatred that being half dumb has half poisoned me." ^{91/} The book had given, he wrote to Sturge Moore, "what I could not, a coherent voice to my hatred." ^{92/}

Throughout his life, then, Yeats stood his ground against progress. He had as allies, not only Blake and Nietzsche, but the great Dean as well. In the Battle of the Books, the bee, champion of the ancient writers, is also the champion of Swift when he urges the moderns to henceforth "consider duration and matter, as well as method and art", and inquires which is the nobler, the modern who, "by a lazy contemplation . . . , feeding and engendering on itself, turns all into excrement and venom" or the ancient who "by a universal range, with long search, much study, true judgment and distinction of things, brings home honey and wax." ^{93/} It is worth noting that the ability of the ancient bees to "fill our lives with honey and wax, thus furnishing mankind with the two noblest of things, which are sweetness and light," ^{94/} seems grounded in their preference for universal subject matter, as opposed to, as Yeats put it "that modern literature Jonathan Swift compared to the web a spider draws out of its bowels" ^{95/} The universal subject matter of the ancients still lived, in Yeats's day, amongst the beliefs of the countrymen. His preference for the backward

look toward their beliefs and toward the Golden Age they remembered was a fundamental doctrine of his life and art, and a fundamental cause of his detestation for Huxley.

IX

"The Purging Away of Our Civilization By
Our Hatred": History As Catastrophe

Hatred played a prominent part in the development of the theory of history that occupied so much of Yeats's attention during the last 20 years of his life. It was hatred of the idea of history as an advance toward achievement of human perfection on earth that propelled Yeats to adopt a cyclic philosophy of history that is built on -- and welcomes -- eternally recurring catastrophe. Moreover, Yeats's philosophy installs hatred at the heart of the historical process as part of the endless struggle between love and its opposite that drives history along a cycle in which a love-dominated era is endlessly succeeded by its opposite, and in which creative activity flourishes when hate is ascendant.

Yeats's theory is heavily indebted to Empedocles, who, calling his warring antinomies Love and Strife, pronounced that "boundless time [will never] be emptied of that pair".^{1/} Instead, they "prevail in turn as the circle comes round, and pass away before one another, and increase in their appointed turn."^{2/} Yeats, who would ultimately quote this language in A Vision,^{3/} glossed it in his copy of Burnet's Early Greek Philosophy with a drawing of two interpenetrating cones, the device used in A Vision to represent what he called "the fundamental symbol of my instructors", the gyres, two funnels "formed by circles diminishing until they are nothing", one representing Love, the other Strife, each with its apex in the

other's base.^{4/} One gyre expands as the other contracts and, explained Yeats, as the expanding gyre reaches its widest point and the narrowest its utmost contraction, "they change places, point to circle, circle to point, for this system conceives the world as catastrophic"^{5/}

Yeats postulated the occurrence of a great catastrophe, a sudden influx of Love or Strife giving birth to a new civilization, every 2000 years. The classical civilization of Greece was founded in 2000 B.C. with a violent influx of Strife, which Yeats, remembering that from one of Leda's "eggs came Love and from the other War", symbolized as Zeus's rape of Leda. In Yeats's terminology, a Strife-dominated, "antithetical", or "subjective" age, like that of classical Greece, fosters the assertion of individual personality and creativity. A Love-dominated, "primary" or "objective" age, however, stimulates the growth of institutions and encourages uniform adherence to a code. Such a civilization was inaugurated by the birth of Christ, another injection of "irrational force", the force of "miracle".^{6/} Yeats expected that a new Strife-dominated era would be initiated in the year 2000 with a new subjective influx, "some violent annunciation".

That violent annunciation could not come quickly enough for Yeats. A subjective artist born into an objective

era, he both hated the civilization that surrounded him and hoped he could hurry the influx of Strife by "intensifying" his hatred -- a hope based on Yeats's equation of hate and strife. For example, Yeats reports in the 1936 essay, "A General Introduction For My Work", that, as he surveys the physical form of modern heterogeneity in the discordant architecture and electric signs seen from O'Connell Bridge,

a vague hatred comes up out of my own dark . . . ; in four or five generations this hatred will have issued in violence and imposed some kind of rule of kindred . . . ; all I can do to bring it nearer is to intensify my hatred.^{7/}

Intensifying his hatred had often proved fruitful for Yeats as a means of vanquishing a threatening idea and opening the door to the sweet images of the anima mundi. In this essay, however, Yeats is presenting intensification of his hatred as an agent of change in the physical world, -- the stuff, as Stephen Dedalus would see it, of kinesis, rather than the stasis produced by the artist's arrested apprehension of the beautiful.^{8/} This kinetic function is again reflected in contemporaneous letters in which Yeats puts aside all politics in favor of the "more important" subject of his rage as the vanguard of "the final destroying horde",^{9/} and celebrates "the purging away of our civilization by our hatred".^{10/} The same dark spirit presides in On The Boiler, where the self-confessedly mad orator taunts his audience by proclaiming that the only danger is the possibility

"that there will be no war" but that European civilization will accept decay.^{11/}

The prose and correspondence of Yeats the man seems to exemplify -- and rejoice in -- what Frank Kermode calls "the most terrible element in apocalyptic thinking" -- "its certainty that there must be universal bloodshed."^{12/} Moreover, blood flows freely in the poetry that implicates the cyclic theory of history. A "blood-dimmed tide" is loosed in "The Second Coming",^{13/} "irrational streams of blood are staining earth" in "The Gyres",^{14/} there is "[o]dour of blood when Christ was slain" in "Two Songs From A Play",^{15/} and the hounds of "Hound Voice" stumble along a "blood-dark track".^{16/} Even the swan of "Leda and the Swan" appears as "brute blood of the air".^{17/} Moreover, at least some of this bloody catastrophe seems to be welcomed, as, for example, when "Old Rocky Face" rejoices that irrational streams of blood are staining earth.^{18/}

Discussion of this apparent rejoicing in bloodshed has generally arisen in the context of support or defense of the charge that Yeats was a fascist. However, violence being more a technique of fascism than a doctrine,^{19/} debate over political doctrine tends to obscure the underlying questions of how to account for Yeats's apparent exultation in violent destruction, and how to interpret that exultation when it intrudes into his poetry. For example, Elizabeth

Cullingford effectively answers Conor Cruise O'Brien's charge that Yeats, as politician, was a fascist,^{20/} but leaves unanswered the poignant question underlying O'Brien's essay: how can it be that we are attracted to poems that seem to be built on exultation in violence.^{21/} Nor has there been a comprehensive answer to the related question whether it is possible to separate the poet from the politician. Orwell thought not: "A writer's political and religious beliefs are not excrescences to be laughed away, but something that will leave their mark even on the smallest detail of his work."^{22/}

Orwell's reference to religious beliefs serves as a reminder that the belief at the core of Yeats's theory of history is not political, but religious -- his belief that history is a slow "dying away" from a golden age in which the spiritual and material worlds were woven together.^{23/} Viewed in the context of its origin, Yeats's celebration of catastrophe as renewal is akin to what Mircea Eliade calls "traditional man's" abolition of history in favor of a belief in the periodic regeneration of time.^{24/} As Eliade explains it, such a belief permits the believer to return to the beginning ("in illo tempore"), thereby starting afresh, annulling past time and abolishing history^{25/} -- like Stephen Dedalus for whom history was "a nightmare from which I am trying to awake."^{26/}

In illo tempore, before the nightmare, gods and men intermingled; then "communications between heaven and earth were interrupted and the gods withdrew to the highest heavens."^{27/} Eliade postulates that

the desire felt by the man of traditional societies to refuse history, and to confine himself to an indefinite repetition of archetypes, testifies to his thirst for the real and his terror of losing himself by letting himself be overwhelmed by the meaninglessness of profane existence.^{28/}

Yeats is every bit the "traditional man". He remembers that in Ireland, "in old times" men talked to the gods face to face.^{29/} His study of history heightened a long-standing terror of letting himself be overwhelmed by what Eliade calls "the meaninglessness of profane existence". Indeed, Yeats concedes that he chose the idea of eternal return over the equally valid idea of progress to escape being overwhelmed by the meaninglessness of profane existence: "the eternal circuit", he said, "may best suit our preoccupation with the soul's salvation, our individualism, our solitude." Besides, he added, "we love antiquity and that other idea -- progress -- the sole religious myth of modern man -- is only 200 years old."^{30/}

In a comment that sheds light on Orwell's question as to why so "many of the best writers of our time have been reactionary in tendency",^{31/} Eliade notes that the work of Joyce and Eliot "is saturated with nostalgia for

the myth of eternal repetition and, in the last analysis, for the abolition of time."^{32/} Yeats shares this same nostalgia. Indeed, in "In Memory of Eva Gore-Booth and Con Markiewicz", Yeats explicitly identifies time as the enemy of not only the beautiful, but the innocent as well, and thus would strike a match and blow till time itself was destroyed, and the guilty poet restored to innocence:

The innocent and the beautiful
Have no enemy but time;
Arise and bid me strike a match
And strike another till time catch;
Should the conflagration climb,
Run til all the sages know.
We the great gazebo built
They convicted us of guilt;
Bid me strike a match and blow.^{33/}

This conflagration is plainly not a bloody event in the political world, but a language for expressing the idea of the abolition of time in favor of a return to radical innocence. Yeats's apocalyptic writings of the 1890's had postulated just such a reversal of the Fall in favor of a return to the One:

We are, it may be, at a crowning crisis
of the world, at the moment when man is
about to ascend, with the wealth he has
been so long gathering upon his shoulders,
the stairway he has been descending from
the first days.^{34/}

This less threatening apocalypse was still in Yeats's mind in 1934 when he wondered aloud whether every civilization, "as it approaches or recedes from its full moon" does not "seem as it were to shiver into the premonition of some

perfection born out of itself, perhaps even of some return to its first Source?"^{35/}

"The Statues" is a poem about the possibility of an escape from the eternal circuit and return to the One in terms of the lore of the alchemists in Yeats's early apocalyptic writing who had learned from Eros "how to fashion forms in which a divine soul could dwell."^{36/} The poem begins with the puzzling intelligence that "Pythagoras planned it"; then proceeds to a description of how "his numbers", when embodied in the marble or bronze of Greek sculpture, were responsible for the Greek victory over Persia at Salamis.^{37/} Yeats's elaboration in On The Boiler is well known: "There are moments when I am certain that art must once again accept those Greek proportions which carry into plastic art the Pythagorean numbers Europe was not born when Greek galleys defeated the Persian hordes at Salamis; but when the Doric studios sent out those broad-backed marble statues against the multiform, vague, expressive Asiatic Sea, they gave to the sexual instinct of Europe its goal, its fixed type."^{38/}

Pythagorean numbers were the basic ordering mechanism of the universe, a meaning suggested in "The Statues" by the embodiment of numbers "in marble or in bronze", just as the Presences of "Among School Children" sometimes kept "a marble or a bronze repose".^{39/} In short,

number was the influx that created the classical civilization, the knowledge and power that accompanied Zeus's violent annunciation to Leda, the reason why Yeats could say "Measurement began our ^{40/}might".

In this context, the hauntingly prophetic cadences of "The Statues" portend a fundamental change in the relations between man and the world of pure form even greater than the introduction of ordering number into the chaotic material world by Pythagoras -- the fashioning of forms in which a divine soul could dwell. This possibility is emphasized in the apostrophe to the spirit of Pythagoras in Yeats's prose draft of the poem:

Where are you now? . . . Is it true that
Pearse called on you by the name of Cuchulain.
Certainly we have need of you. . . . Come
back with your Pythagorean numbers.^{41/}

The idea is sustained in the last stanza of the final poem:

When Pearse summoned Cuchulain to his side,
What stalked through the Post Office? What intellect,
What calculation, number, measurement, replied?
We Irish, born into that ancient sect
But thrown upon this filthy modern tide
And by its formless spawning fury wrecked,
Climb to our proper dark, that we may trace
The lineaments of a plummet-measured face.^{42/}

A recovery from the Fall and re-ascent to the One is signaled by Yeats's dramatic introduction of the verb "climb" when the reader would normally expect a descent into darkness.^{43/} It is dark at the climb's destination

because, as Augustine Martin points out, it was in the dark of midnight that, in the first stanza, Greek boys and girls took to the Parthenon to press "[l]ive lips upon a plummet-measured face."^{44/}

The fact that "lineaments" are the subject of the kisses is a clear sign that the climb has led up the hierarchy toward the One by fashioning a form fit for the divine. "Lineaments" is Blake's word for characterizing "forms and features that are capable of being the receptacles of intellect". Yeats knew this so well that he quoted it in his essay on Blake's Illustrations to Dante, where he also identified the "intellect" as one of the "divine essences" reflected in the lineaments of forms that poets and artists could see in "the mind's eye, when exalted by inspiration" ^{45/} In short, the climb toward lineaments referred to in "The Statues" is a process of becoming a fit receptacle for the divine intellect summoned by Pearse -- an ascent from the fallen world.

Read in terms of Yeats's apocalyptic fiction of the 1890's, even the salvific massacre heralded in such late poems as "A Bronze Head" and "Hound Voice" can be understood as the herald of a return to unity with the One, rather than the shedding of blood in the physical world. For example, the narrator of Rosa Alchemica enumerates themes that Yeats returns to in the later poems, when he

recounts that the members of the Order of the Alchemical Rose had acquired secret knowledge pertinent to this task. Not only had Eros "taught them how to fashion forms in which a divine soul could dwell and whisper what it would into sleeping minds", but Ate had taught them how to fashion

forms from which demonic beings could pour madness, or unquiet dreams, into sleeping blood; and Hermes, that if you powerfully imagined a hound at your bedside it would keep watch there until you woke, and drive away all but the mightiest demons, but that if your imagination was weakly, the hound would be weakly also, and the demons prevail, and the hound soon die46/

Read in light of the apocalyptic tradition of Rosa Alchemica, "Hound Voice" can be understood as a poem about the power of the creative imagination -- pictured as a "powerfully imagined . . . hound" -- to overcome the terror wakened in the blood by the progress of the profane world away from the One. To be sure, such a reading is not self-apparent on the face of that enigmatic poem:

Because we love bare hills and stunted trees
And were the last to choose the settled ground,
Its boredom of the desk or of the spade, because
So many years companioned by a hound,
Our voices carry; and though slumber-bound,
Some few half wake and half renew their choice,
Give tongue, proclaim their hidden name -- 'Hound
Voice.'

The women that I picked spoke sweet and low
And yet gave tongue. 'Hound Voices' were they all.
We picked each other from afar and knew
What hour of terror comes to test the soul,
And in that terror's name obeyed the call,
And understood, what none have understood,
Those images that waken in the blood.

Some day we shall get up before the dawn
And find our ancient hounds before the door,
And wide awake know that the hunt is on;
Stumbling upon the blood-dark track once more,
Then stumbling to the kill beside the shore;
Then cleaning out and bandaging of wounds,
And chants of victory amid the encircling hounds.47/

Martin is right to say that "the 'I' says yes,
and with obvious relish, to the bloodshed."^{48/} It is not
necessarily clear, however, that the bloodshed is real,
rather than the badge of a victory by powerfully imagined
hounds over mighty demons of materialist thought who would
pour unquiet dreams into sleeping blood. The case for a
metaphorical reading of the blood is that the poet and the
kindred "women that I picked" share a terrible vision as
they sleep, a vision that could be vanquished by those
who learned from Hermes that unquiet dreams in sleeping
blood can be overcome by a powerfully imagined hound.
Perhaps, however, the raging man of On The Boiler insists
too strongly on a real massacre to permit ungrudging
acceptance of the blood of the contemporaneous "Hound
Voice" as pure metaphor.

This conflict between man and poet as to whether
violence is fact or metaphor is apparent in Yeats's fasci-
nating account of how he came to use the myth of Leda and
the swan to symbolize the "annunciation that founded Greece".
As Yeats recounts,

the editor of a political review asked me for a poem. I thought 'After the individualist, demagogic movement founded by Hobbes [sic] and popularized by the Encyclopaedists and the French revolution, we have a soil so exhausted that it cannot grow that crop again for centuries'. Then I thought 'Nothing is now possible but some movement from above preceded by some violent annunciation.' My fancy began to play with Leda and the Swan for metaphor, and I began this poem; but as I wrote, bird and lady took such possession of the scene that all politics went out of it, and my friend tells me that his 'conservative readers would misunderstand the poem'.49/

As "the politics went out of it", the recurring Yeatsian question about the relationship between power and creativity went in:

Being so caught up,
So mastered by the brute blood of the air,
Did she put on his knowledge with his power
Before the indifferent beak could let her drop?50/

The concluding question is clearly the question about creativity Yeats repeatedly asked himself:

When a man writes any work of genius, or
invents some creative action, is it not
because some knowledge or power has come
into his mind from beyond his mind?51/

In short, the influx at the heart of "Leda and the Swan" is an infusion of knowledge or power into the mind of the poet, and through him, to the creative spirit of the era. The poet's creative process has transformed the man's notion of "some violent annunciation" into a metaphor that captures both the tension of the creative process and the radical change in the spirit of an age that accompanies a new civilization.

In this context, A Vision can be seen as an example of Kermode's suggestion, derived from Focillon, that theories as to the end of the world reflect the projection onto the cosmos of the theorist's own anxieties.^{52/} In A Vision, some violent stirring of the psyche brings creativity, and, best of all, as Helen Vendler points out,^{53/} it does so on a recurring basis. The violent renewal at the beginning of an age postulated in A Vision is a promise of renewed creativity for the poet, a renewal that also implies some sort of violence:

Even the wisest man grows tense
With some sort of violence
Before he can accomplish fate,
Know his work or choose his mate.^{54/}

This "violence" of the wise man need not necessarily exist outside his own psyche. Indeed, tension between an idea and its opposite, self and anti-self, love and hate, is the staple of Yeats's psychic experience. As he said in a letter to Ethel Manin, "I find my peace by pitting my sole nature against something and the greater the tension the greater my self-knowledge."^{55/} Tense violence giving rise to knowledge is the essence of "Leda and the Swan".

It is true that there is blood in the air when Leda meets the swan, but the surprising description of the swan as "the brute blood of the air" need not implicate such blood as stains earth. Melchiori reminds us that, as

related in the Yeats-Ellis commentary on Blake, each of the elements was identified with one of the humours in the occult system of Cornelius Agrippa, and blood, "the emotional life", was linked with air.^{56/} Thus, the divine swan, bird of the air and the heavens, brings an influx to the emotional life, the blood.

There is real blood in "The Second Coming", a poem about the "violent annunciation" that will herald the successor to the Christian era that arrives in the year 2000, but there is nothing in the poem to suggest that the poet welcomes it. The "blood-dimmed tide" that is loosed upon the world at the beginning of the poem is part of a description of a state of anarchy that suggests that "some revelation is at hand":

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide 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.^{57/}

The apparent descriptive nature of the first stanza of the poem, and the consequent reality of the blood as part of real world anarchy, is confirmed by the fact that, in an earlier draft, this part of the poem included a reference to the crumbling of the Russian front in 1917: "the germans are () now to Russia come".^{58/}

In commenting on "The Second Coming", Yvor Winters says that Yeats finds the approaching beast satisfying, that he is Yeats's judgment on all that we regard as civilized and that "Yeats approves of this kind of brutality".^{59/} Unlike the blood, however, the beast seems to be metaphorical. Not only is he part of "a revelation", but he is expressly identified as an "image out of Spiritus Mundi". Winters's assessment of Yeats's reaction to that image must be measured against the remaining text of the poem itself:

The Second Coming! Hardly are those words out
When a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi
Troubles my sight: somewhere in sands of the desert
A shape with lion body and the head of a man,
A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun,
Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it
Reel shadows of the indignant desert birds.
The darkness drops again; but now I know
That twenty centuries of stony sleep
Were vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle,
And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?^{60/}

Winters points to no warrant in the text of the poem for his conclusion that it betrays the poet's approval of brutality. Nor is any support apparent. One need not go as far as Spender's view that the poem shows "courageous acceptance"^{61/} to say that if the poet welcomes a change in civilizations, the change is one that takes place in the imagination. That the locus of the change is the imagination is evident from the fact that the beast appears in the form of a vision out of the collective mind. Moreover, in "Two

Songs From a Play", Yeats views the "first coming" primarily in terms of its effect on the imagination.

The first of the two songs emphasizes the cyclic appearance and reappearance of a new god to dominate a new age:

I saw a staring virgin stand
Where holy Dionysus died,
And tear the heart out of his side,
And lay the heart upon her hand
And bear that beating heart away;
And then did all the Muses sing
Of Magnus Annus at the spring,
As though God's death were but a play.62/

The first stanza of the second song summarizes the rise and fall of three civilizations over six thousand years in five lines, and still has time to attribute the principal change to the "[o]dour of blood when Christ was slain":

The Babylonian starlight brought
A fabulous, formless darkness in;
Odour of blood when Christ was slain
Made all Platonic tolerance vain
And vain all Doric discipline.63/

The first two of the five lines quoted above are explained by Yeats's comment in A Vision that when he tried to imagine the civilization opposite to that of classical Greece that preceded it and was "rejected" by the annunciation to Leda, "I can but see bird and woman blotting out some corner of the Babylonian mathematical starlight."^{64/} The fabulous, formless darkness of the civilization that preceded Platonic tolerance and Doric discipline was repeated in the succeeding Christian era. The turning point was marked by "[o]dour of blood", but there is no exulting in this blood.

Just as "[o]dour of blood" echoes the "odour of blood on the ancestral stair" of "Blood and the Moon", with its many evocations of Porphyry's essay on the Cave of the Nymphs, "mathematical starlight" recalls Taylor's comment on the essay.^{65/} Because both Porphyry and Taylor present the odor of blood as a stimulus to the imagination, it is safe to conclude that Platonic tolerance and Doric discipline are vain because the imagination of the age has changed from subjective to objective -- not because blood has been shed.

In summary, three poems dealing with the influxes to three new civilizations -- the Greek, the Christian and the new era expected to dawn in the year 2000 -- involve blood, but do not support a charge that the poet welcomes universal bloodshed. However, there is no escaping the fact that "Old Rocky Face" of "The Gyres" urges that we "Rejoice", either because, or at least even though, "[i]rrational streams of blood are staining earth" and "blood and mire the sensitive body stain".^{66/} It is thus important that we know who "Old Rocky Face" is. Stallworthy says that it "is generally agreed" that

the Rocky Face of 'The Gyres', the Rocky Voice of 'The Man and the Echo', is compounded of Delphic oracle, Oriental ascetic, the cave-dwelling Ahasuerus, and an echo or recollection of the phrase 'rockie face' in Ben Jonson's poem 'My Picture Left in Scotland'.^{67/}

All of these exotic sources obscure Yeats's hints that the rocky face and voice are speaking to him out of himself. The man of "The Man and the Echo" is plainly standing on a cliff (an "alt" in Irish) and hearing an echo:

In a cleft that's christened Alt
Under broken stone I halt
At the bottom of a pit
That broad noon has never lit,
And shout a secret to the stone.^{68/}

In the first draft of "The Man and the Echo", the echo is identified as "The Alt", and is later addressed, not as "O Rocky Voice" (as in the final poem) but as "O Rocky Void".^{69/} Similarly, "Old Rocky Face" of "The Gyres", whose voice comes "[o]ut of cavern", is identified in an earlier draft as "old cavern man, old Rocky face".^{70/}

Thus "Old Rocky Face" of "The Gyres" is a Yeatsian voice responding to a Yeatsian voice, a typical Yeatsian anti-self making poetry out of the quarrel with the self.

The fact that the anti-self's voice comes out of a cavern suggests that Yeats is evoking his favorite metaphor for the anima mundi, the Cave of the Nymphs. The identification of the cavern out of which "Old Rocky Face" speaks as a metaphorical "cavern of the mind", the anima mundi, is confirmed by reference to Yeats's essay on Shelley's symbolism where he specifically equates Shelley's caverns with "the cave of man's mind" and "the cave of the mysteries we enter at death, for," explains Yeats, "to Shelley as to Porphyry, it is more than an image of life in the world."^{71/}

The term "cavern" is used in the manner of Shelley and Porphyry in "Those Images".^{72/} The voice of that poem enjoins the poet to "leave/The cavern of the mind" in favor of "the five/That make the Muses sing." The distinction between the world of the senses and the "cavern of the mind" is apparent from the poem as a whole:

What if I bade you leave
The cavern of the mind?
There's better exercise
In the sunlight and wind.

I never bade you go
To Moscow or to Rome.
Renounce that drudgery,
Call the Muses home.

Seek those images
That constitute the wild,
The lion and the virgin,
The harlot and the child.

Find in middle air
An eagle on the wing,
Recognise the five
That make the Muses sing.^{73/}

The five "That make the Muses sing" are both the five senses and the lion, virgin, harlot, child and eagle that Yeats identifies in "An Introduction For My Plays" as images of a poetry that turns its back on "psychology" and instead delights in active men.^{74/}

Identification of "Old Rocky Face" as the voice of Yeats's anti-self or daimon is important because it signifies that the views expressed by the voice are not necessarily those of the poet. The voice that comes up out of the cavern is a one-word message, an injunction to

"Rejoice" in the irrational streams of blood that are staining earth. Unlike the attitude toward blood in the other three poems just considered, Rocky Face rejoices in violent catastrophe. But one can definitively attribute the views of "Old Rocky Face" to the poet only on what Jung calls "the naive assumption that we are masters in our own house".^{75/} This assumption, Jung explains, comes about because "we are so in the habit of identifying ourselves with the thoughts that come to us that we invariably assume we have made them."^{76/}

Yeats had no such habit. As discussed in Chapter V, he knew that there are two minds in every mind, one existing in light and one in darkness, and that the daimon "swims up from the dark portion of the mind".^{77/} Yeats knew, too, that the "vague hatred" that he anticipated would lead to violence in four or five generations came "up out of my own dark".^{78/} Thus, Rocky Face's injunction to rejoice in the irrational streams of blood must be recognized as a voice from the dark cave of the mind, the collective unconscious. One may thus legitimately inquire whether the wave of blood that flowed out of the cavern and into the poetry here considered had a source in common with the overpowering visions of blood that engulfed Jung in 1913 and which he attributed to the collective unconscious.^{79/}

Yeats hints at such an explanation in a suggestive comment in "The Tragic Generation" on the prophecy of "the imminence of immense wars" announced by MacGregor Mathers in the 1890's. Recalling that, when evoking spirits, Mathers would spit blood, which he said came from his head, not his lungs, Yeats notes that Mathers's prophecies were soon "repeated by mediums and clairvoyants all over the world", a phenomenon consistent with a source in the Great Mind.^{80/} When Yeats presents a voice in A Vision that, like Rocky Face, welcomes imminent bloodshed, he attributes the sentiment -- not to himself -- but to Michael Robartes, alter ego of Mathers,^{81/} the recipient of bloody prophecies from the collective unconscious. When Robartes enjoins love of war that civilization might be renewed,^{82/} the voice, like that of Rocky Voice, emanates from the cavern of the unconscious. Yeats emphasized this dissociation, claiming in a letter that Robartes will speak "with an energy and a dogmatism and a cruelty I am not capable of in my own person".^{83/} Yeats reserved for himself the more balanced statement that the mixing together of love and strife is not evil, but that evil is the "disturbance of the harmony", the lack of a balanced tension, when "hatred takes possession of all".^{84/}

If Old Rocky Face is recognized as the voice of the collective unconscious, much is made clear. Orwell's suggestion that the poet cannot be considered in isolation

from the political views of the man assumes that the voices emanating from the poet are necessarily his own. To the extent, however, that it is the function of the poet to gain access to the unconscious and give vent to its voice, the poet may be the medium of voices not his own. Yeats recognized this - and his own ultimate responsibility as poet to assert mastery in his own house - when he said that poetry is the product of the quarrel with ourselves and that "all things are made of the conflict of two states of consciousness".^{85/}

With only limited exceptions, Yeats's poetry is the product of a "mixing together of love and strife", the trophy of victory in a conflict between two states of consciousness. Although Rocky Voice asserts himself with intense force, his emotion is usually transformed into poetry. That is why Yeats was able to say that he escaped from his rage as a writer through his sense of style, and to claim that his art was a victory over himself.^{86/} In "Poetry and Tradition" Yeats recognizes his need for violent emotion as a stimulus to creativity. Hatred of his enemy may be necessary to "set him dreaming", says Yeats, because "the twigs of the holy nest are not easily set afire."^{87/} Nonetheless, Yeats also accepts the artist's responsibility for "making and mastering"^{88/} through the "shaping joy"^{89/} that mingles hate with its contrary. When

the artist successfully mingles the contraries, "hate . . . vanishes in the dream."^{90/} Still, the violence stirs beneath the dream, a fact that helps explain the paradox noted by O'Brien of our attraction to poetry like "Leda and the Swan" that has a tense violence at its core. Yeats knew this to the bone. In a revealing letter to Dorothy Wellesley he traced the "passion" of his verse to "the fact that the speakers are holding down violence or madness - 'down Hysterica passio'."^{91/} Recognizing both the violent voice and the duty of the poet to master it, Yeats further observes that "[a]ll depends on the completeness of the holding down, on the stirring of the beast underneath."^{92/}

The difference between a poem in which Yeats permits a voice from the anima mundi to speak directly and one in which style has forged a victory over that voice is illustrated by a comparison between two poems that exist side by side in Collected Poems, "The Gyres" and "Lapis Lazuli". Both have to do with attitudes toward war and violence. The former presents the horror of war -- irrational streams of blood -- and asks "[w]hat matter?". The latter begins with "hysterical women" saying that nothing matters but how to put an end to war. They say so implicitly in the poem itself, and said so explicitly in the first draft.^{93/} The response out of the cavern of the anima mundi in "The Gyres" is simply to "Rejoice" in the destruction. By contrast, "Lapis Lazuli"

concentrates, not on the destruction, but on the creation, the building again that follows a fall. "And those that build them again are gay", says Yeats, evoking the teaching of "Poetry and Tradition" that the poet who masters his emotion is "gay" over it and can "play with it".

"Lapis Lazuli" reflects the wisdom of Heraclitus that every state has a way of becoming its own opposite. As Heraclitus put it:

Living and dead, and the waking and the sleeping,
and young and old are the same, for these by
sudden reversal are those, and those again by
sudden reversal are these.^{94/}

One who has achieved this wisdom would not "love war because of its horror", as at least part of Michael Robartes's statement would have it, although he might tolerate the destruction implicit in creation. While "The Gyres", the poem of only one-half of the struggle within the poet's mind, is subject to the kind of criticism Yvor Winters levels at "The Second Coming" for its apparent rejoicing in violence, the victory of "Lapis Lazuli" merits the encomium of "courageous acceptance" bestowed on "The Second Coming" by Stephen Spender.

In poems like "The Second Coming", "Lapis Lazuli" and "Leda and the Swan", Yeats attends to "the business of the poet" which, as Eliot teaches, is not to find new emotions, but to use "the ordinary ones and, in working them up into poetry, to express feelings which are not actual emotions at all".^{95/} Yeats's late prose, however, often

reflects unmodified emotion, either the Rocky Voice of the collective unconscious or a personal Yeatsian hatred, the reaction of the man to "all that Whiggish world Swift stared on till he became a raging man."^{96/} The rejoicing of the collective unconscious at the prospective destruction of that world found a congenial voice in Yeats who, even as a boy, rebelled against the myth of progress by taking "satisfaction in certain public disasters" and feeling "a certain ecstasy at the contemplation of ruin."^{97/}

That ecstasy, cloaked as the voices of other-worldly "communicators" or the denunciatory rhetoric of a madman, was unleashed in Yeats's late prose. Its hatefulness should not be understated. The very intensity of Yeats's fascination with the destruction of an alien world highlights the magnitude of his triumph when the poet's shaping power transforms those emotions into a language for clarifying and transcending them in poems like "The Second Coming", "Leda and the Swan" and "Lapis Lazuli".

Although Eliot professes that the poet can make do with emotion which he has never experienced, Yeats experienced hate to its core before setting about the business of "working it up" into poetry. In the rare case where the poetry fails, the remnants of hate do him no credit. When he succeeds in making himself hate's master,

he presides over the creation of poetry of "significant
emotion", emotion which, in Eliot's terms, "has its life
in the poem and not in the history of the poet."^{98/}

Conclusion

One of the most extraordinary aspects of Yeats was his nearly inexhaustible capacity to renew himself as a poet. Year after year, from "The Song of the Happy Shepherd" in 1885 to his death in 1939, he found the inspiration, motivation and strength to transform his experience into enduring poetry. In the process, he made and remade himself, doing away with the "bundle of accident and incoherence that sits down to breakfast", and presiding over his own rebirth "as an idea, something intended, complete".^{1/}

Yeats's rivals for the favor of the muse knew the magnitude of this achievement. In his 1940 Abbey Theatre address, Eliot could not help but praise Yeats's "continual development", his ability "to remain always a contemporary".^{2/} In the same year, MacNeice lauded Yeats's vitality, even as he puzzled over the possibility that Yeats thought of hatred as a source of creativity.^{3/}

Yeats himself never doubted the relationship between the two. Time and again he pointed to hate as the passion that cleared the way for an influx of inspiration. In Per Amica Silentia Lunae, for example, he identifies hatred as the necessary precursor of the images from anima mundi that are drunk with sweetness;^{4/} in A Vision, he defines the creative poets of Phase 17 as those who "hate all that impedes their personality",^{5/} and says that inspiration comes when

the poet learns to love that which he hates.^{6/} The products of creative activity are sweet and loving, but they are conceived in hate.

The role of hatred in Yeats's creative process is bound up with his belief that the dead living in their memories were the source of his inspiration. Yeats believed he could tap the distilled wisdom of the race by bringing his own emotions into tune with the passionate dead, thus enabling them to speak through him. This is the principle underlying his theory that a "dramatist can help his characters educate him by thinking and studying everything that gives them the language they are groping for through his hands and eyes . . . and that is why the ancient philosophers thought a poet or dramatist Daimon-possessed."^{7/} Applying this principle against a history rich in pride and hatred, Yeats believed that he most approximated his ideal style when he wrote out of ancestral hatred and pride.^{8/}

These nationalist-based emotions, however, tended to reduce themselves to the inertia of ambivalence. Anglo-Irish to the core, Yeats balanced his hatred for the past of English persecution with his love of the English language.^{9/} "My hatred tortures me with love," he concluded, "my love with hate".^{10/} Relations with Ireland were mired in the same ambivalence. Declining to arrange for English production of his plays, Yeats insisted that he would "write for my own

people -- whether in love or hate of them matters little -- probably I shall not know which it is."^{11/} Synge experienced the same ambivalence. When Yeats, ever pondering the workings of love and hate, asked Synge whether he wrote out of love or hate for Ireland, "that passionate man" could respond only that he had often asked himself the same question.^{12/} Like Cuchulain, Yeats and Synge were cursed "always to mix hatred in the love."^{13/}

When Cuchulain encounters this curse at the Hawk's Well, it is joined to the curse that he will kill his children with his own hand^{14/} -- a conjunction which suggests that the dynamics of the father-son relationship are pertinent to the admixture of love and hate in Yeats's creative life. In fact, the possibility of a son's extinction at the hands of his father lurks beneath the autobiographical writings in which Yeats gingerly, yet methodically, ascribes to his father all the threatening ideas that would snuff out his life as a poet -- Huxley's skepticism, Victorian science, realist painting and the idea of progress.^{15/} Without directly referring to his father -- and thus not directly implicating Freud's teaching that a father is destined to be the first object of his son's hatred^{16/} -- Yeats insists that these ideas must be cleared away in a struggle delicately identified as a quarrel between generations.^{17/} Yeats still avoids saying that his father must be overcome, but the idea lingers, when, in A Vision, he posits a fundamental opposition

between Christ and Oedipus, and identifies the former, who gave his life for his father, with passive acceptance of the beliefs of others, and the latter, who took his father's life, with creative achievement.^{18/}

Yeats plainly needed to triumph over the ideas of his father if he was to protect his belief in the anima mundi as the source of poetic knowledge and power, and to break away into a life of his own as did Swedenborg, Boehme and Blake. He told himself as much in the letter he wrote to express the wisdom of the passionate dead.^{19/} Yet those threatening ideas both fascinated and repelled him; he cast them from himself, but they clung to his idea of his father, his other self. When he would slay them, he found in himself the lack of will he complained of in his father, the inertia of love-tortured hate. This is the familiar Yeats divided into self and anti-self, man and mask, love and hate; believing that consciousness is conflict;^{20/} and longing to make poetry out of the quarrel with himself, but uncertain as to how to resolve the quarrel.

The solution -- no doubt inchoate in Yeats's psyche and apparent in Blake's vehement life -- was articulated by Nietzsche: "We can act as the gardeners of our impulses, and -- which few people know -- we may cultivate the seeds of anger, pity, vanity, or excessive brooding, and make these things fecund and productive, just as we can train a beautiful

plant to grow along trellis work."^{21/} Yeats thus set out to cultivate his hate; to use it productively as a means of breaking the sterile deadlock between love and hate. Fecund hate would be his generative principle -- a besom to clear the soul of threatening ideas, thus nurturing belief in the anima mundi and opening the door to its images. Yeats himself is the real subject when, ascribing primacy to hate, he says of Synge, "he could not have loved had he not hated."^{22/}

The idea of hate as a generative principle is at least as old as Heraclitus who, as Yeats keenly appreciated, celebrated war as "the father of all and the king of all", the ultimate creative force.^{23/} Nonetheless, the notion that creativity should be rooted in hate remains a troubling one. Yeats enlarges our perspective with the insight that an "excess of love" can be just as troubling: it can engender attachment to an opinion as if it were some stone doll,^{24/} and bewilder the lovers till they die.^{25/} The evil is neither love nor hate, but the fragmentation into love and hate of that "unmixed emotion"^{26/} Yeats so admired in the tales of The Celtic Twilight. That is why, in his intriguing 1907 essay "Poetry and Tradition", Yeats insisted that the "nobleness of the arts is in the mingling of contraries", the re-integration of love and hate into unified emotion.^{27/} If hate was necessary to stimulate the creative process -- to "set him dreaming" -- the hate does not ultimately supplant love, but is mingled with it and thus "vanishes in the dream".^{28/}

The wisdom of "Poetry and Tradition" was hard-won. Just a year earlier, still strongly enchanted by his reading of Nietzsche in the early years of the century, a hate-dominated Yeats was gratuitously advising AE that "you gather the weak" about you "because you desire love" -- a desire of which, Yeats boasts, he is curing himself.^{29/}

Fortunately, the ever-influential John Butler Yeats, alert to this tendency, was not so will-less as his son sometimes thought: "As you have dropped affection from the circle of your needs," father forcefully wrote to son in the summer of 1906, "have you also dropped love between man and woman?".^{30/} If this is "the theory of your over-man", the elder Yeats pronounced with finality, "your demi-godship is after all but a doctrinaire demi-godship."^{31/} "Your contempt for women," he added in a follow-up letter, "dishonours you as a man and poet."^{32/}

With this food for thought, and fresh from a visit to Urbino and study of Bembo's encomium to feminine beauty as the stimulus to love of the eternal ideas -- the Presences that passion, piety or affection know -- Yeats was ready to define the poet's task as the re-integration of love and hate. Yeats is no doubt indebted to Nietzsche for showing the way to creative use of hate, but did not achieve completeness as a poet until he counterbalanced Nietzsche with the Neoplatonic love the Florentine academy enshrined at the heart

of the Italian Renaissance. The result was a new man and poet forged in a process in which hatred is first articulated and then mastered. Yeats thought of his creative activity in terms of Sampson's riddle -- "out of the bitter, something sweet." If he and the Irish were "bitter beyond all people of the world", Yeats thought, "we might yet lie -- that [bitterness] declared and measured -- nearest the honeyed comb."^{33/} Hatred half-dumb half-poisoned him;^{34/} declared, it could be measured. Measured, it was mastered, transformed into poetry. In making the poem, the poet ceases to hate, thus making a new self as well. Yeats had this process in mind when he said we gaze in awe at masterful poets "because we gaze not at a work of art, but at the re-creation of the man through the art."^{35/}

In the moment of re-creation, poet and poem embody a reunion of the antinomies of love and hate, masculine and feminine, conscious and unconscious. That is why Yeats's various descriptions of that moment are instinct with the notion of a restored unity of being. That notion is implicit, for example, when Yeats describes the poet's task as uniting the waking and sleeping minds,^{36/} when he tells that inspiration comes when the poet loves what he is fated to hate,^{37/} and when he says that the Daemonic man of Phase 17 achieves unity of being by expressing thought antithetical to his own.^{38/} In these precious moments of "mingling of the contraries",^{39/}

love and hate are so restored to "unmixed emotion" that,
all hatred driven hence, the poet recovers radical innocence,
and thereby restores, if only temporarily, the unfallen world.

FOOTNOTES

Foreward

- 1/ "Ribh considers Christian Love insufficient", CP, p. 330.
- 2/ "Poetry and Tradition", E&I, p. 248.
- 3/ Mem, p. 145.
- 4/ A, p. 122.
- 5/ "Introduction to 'The Words Upon The Window Pane'", Ex, p. 351.
- 6/ Introduction to Poems of William Blake (New York: Modern Library, n.d.), p. xvi.
- 7/ M, p. 301.
- 8/ "Poetry and Tradition", E&I, pp. 249-250.
- 9/ A, p. 77.
- 10/ Ibid., p. 54.
- 11/ A, p. 185.
- 12/ "A General Introduction For My Work", E&I, p. 511.
- 13/ Ibid., p. 526.
- 14/ Ibid.
- 15/ "Ribh considers Christian Love insufficient, CP, p. 330.
- 16/ A Vision, p. 23.
- 17/ T. S. Eliot, "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca", (1927) in Selected Essays (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1932), p. 117 and "Tradition and the Individual Talent", (1919) in Frank Kermode, ed., Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975), p. 44.

Chapter I

- 1/ Frank Tuohy, Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1976), p. 166.
- 2/ C. J. Jung, trans. Richard and Clara Winston, Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York: Vintage, 1965), p. 224.
- 3/ Ibid., pp. 233-37.
- 4/ "Blood and the Moon", CP, p. 268.
- 5/ "The Seven Sages", CP, p. 272.
- 6/ "Introduction to 'The Words Upon the Window Pane'", Ex, p. 345.
- 7/ "The Seven Sages", CP, p. 271.
- 8/ Ibid., p. 272.
- 9/ Jung, CW, IX(i), ¶ 479. See CW, X, ¶¶ 148 et seq.
- 10/ See James Olney, The Rhizome and the Flower (Berkeley: U. Cal. Press, 1980), pp. 4-6.
- 11/ Letters, p. 734.
- 12/ Ex, p. 293.
- 13/ John Locke, "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding", 1690; rpt. in Robert Hutchins, ed., Great Books of the Western World, Locke, Berkeley, Hume (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1977), II, i, 1 (emphasis in original).

- 14/ Ibid., II, i, 2.
- 15/ A, p. 182.
- 16/ Ibid., p. 83.
- 17/ Locke, Essay, II, 1, 25.
- 18/ Introduction to The Oxford Book of Modern Verse, p. xxxiii.
The changing metaphors of mind from mirror to lamp in the development of Romantic thought are summarized with Abrams' customary erudition in M. H. Abrams, The Mirror and the Lamp (New York: Oxford U. Press, 1953), pp. 57-69.
- 19/ James Engell, The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism (Cambridge: Harv. U. Press, 1981), p. 18.
Cairns Craig's elaborate argument that Yeats's art depends on the reader's completion of the poem through a process of "association" does not make Yeats a Lockean or an associationist. See Cairns Craig, Yeats, Eliot, Pound and the Politics of Poetry (Pittsburgh: U. of Pittsburgh Press, 1982). Yeats expected that the reader's contribution to the poem would be derived from the resources of the Great Memory.
- 20/ S. T. Coleridge, Biographia Literaria, Ch IX (1817; rpt. London: Dent, 1980).
- 21/ A, p. 77.
- 22/ Ibid., p. 15.
- 23/ "A General Introduction For My Work", E&I, p. 518.

- 24/ Letters, p. 150.
- 25/ Ibid.
- 26/ Locke, Essay, IV, i, 1.
- 27/ Ibid., IV, xv, 5.
- 28/ Ibid., II, xi, 12; IV, xx, 5.
- 29/ Ibid., IV, xix, 1.
- 30/ Ibid., IV, xviii, 20.
- 31/ Ibid., IV, xix, 10.
- 32/ "The Seven Sages", CP, p. 272.
- 33/ "Blood and the Moon", CP, p. 268.
- 34/ "An Acre of Grass", CP, p. 347.
- 35/ Shakespeare, A Midsummer Night's Dream, V, i, 4-7.
- 36/ Ibid., lines 8-9.
- 37/ Variorum Poems, p. 808.
- 38/ A, p. 124.
- 39/ Ibid., p. 125.
- 40/ "The Second Coming", CP, p. 211. See Ex, p. 393.
- 41/ A, p. 173.
- 42/ Ibid., p. 180.
- 43/ Ibid., p. 125.
- 44/ Ibid., p. 179.
- 45/ Ibid., p. 125.
- 46/ Ibid., p. 126.
- 47/ Letters, p. 210.
- 48/ Ibid., p. 211.

- 49/ Ibid., p. 922.
- 50/ A, pp. 176-77.
- 51/ Ibid., p. 177.
- 52/ Ernst Cassirer, The Platonic Renaissance in England,
tr. by James Pettegrove (Austin: Tex. U. Press, 1953),
ch. 1.
- 53/ H. P. Blavatsky, Isis Unveiled (California, Theosophy Co.
1925), I, 17.
- 54/ Henry More, The Immortality of the Soul, in Henry More,
A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings (1662;
rpt. New York: Garland, 1978), III, xii, 1.
- 55/ Ibid., III, xiii, 9.
- 56/ Plato, Timaeus, trans. R. D. Archer-Hind (London:
Macmillan, 1888), ¶¶ 32-36.
- 57/ Enneads, V, 1, 2.
- 58/ Gershom G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism
(London: Thames & Hudson, 1955), p. 237.
- 59/ Frances Yates, Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition
(London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 86.
- 60/ A, pp. 123-27.
- 61/ H. P. Blavatsky, Isis Unveiled, I, 507.
- 62/ See Yates, p. 150; 381.
- 63/ M, p. 267.
- 64/ A, p. 175, footnote omitted.
- 65/ Ant. Ath. I, v, 2.
- 66/ A, p. 177.

- 67/ Ibid.
- 68/ Letters, p. 588, apparently misdated. See Steve L. Adams and George Mills Harper, eds., "The Manuscript of Leo Africanus", Yeats Annual No. 1 (1982), p. 45 n.71.
- 69/ E&I, p. 28.
- 70/ Ibid.
- 71/ Ibid., p. 35.
- 72/ Ibid., p. 40.
- 73/ Ibid., p. 45.
- 74/ Ibid.
- 75/ Ibid., p. 46.
- 76/ Jung, CW, VII, ¶ 101.
- 77/ E&I, p. 49.
- 78/ Ibid., p. 50.
- 79/ "Ribh denounces Patrick", CP, p. 329.
- 80/ E&I, p. 52.
- 81/ Ibid.
- 82/ E&I, p. 167.
- 83/ Quaritch Blake, I, xii.
- 84/ E&I, p. 117.
- 85/ E&I, p. 111.
- 86/ See, e.g., E&I, pp. 119 et seq.

- 87/ Blake, Complete Writings, p. 458.
- 88/ Ibid.
- 89/ Ibid.
- 90/ Ibid.
- 91/ Ibid.
- 92/ A, pp. 182-83.
- 93/ Ibid., p. 471.
- 94/ CP, p. 240.
- 95/ Northrup Frye, Fearful Symmetry (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1969), p. 126.
- 96/ Ibid., p. 232.
- 97/ E&I, p. 401.
- 98/ See "The Celtic Element in Literature".
- 99/ Ex, p. 435.
- 100/ Ibid., p. 325.
- 101/ Blake, "Annotations to Lavater", Complete Writings, p. 81.
- 102/ Locke, Essay, II, 23, 1.
- 103/ George Berkeley, Commonplace Book in A. C. Fraser, ed., The Works of George Berkeley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), I, 25.
- 104/ Ibid.
- 105/ George Berkeley, The Principles of Human Knowledge (1710; rpt. in Robert Hutchins, gen. ed., The Great Books of the Western World, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Introduction, 24.

- 106/ Ibid., ¶ 11.
- 107/ Ibid., ¶ 15.
- 108/ Ex, p. 325.
- 109/ E&I, p. 402.
- 110/ George Berkeley, Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous in Works, I, 425.
- 111/ "Blood and the Moon", CP, p. 268.
- 112/ Ex, p. 325.
- 113/ George Berkeley, Works, I, 91.
- 114/ E.g., Ex, pp. 333, 348; Senate Speeches, pp. 171-72.
- 115/ E&I, p. 462.
- 116/ Ex, p. 351.
- 117/ Ibid., p. 293.
- 118/ E&I, p. 401.
- 119/ Bertrand Russell, A History of Western Philosophy (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945), p. 606.
- 120/ Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media (New York: New American Library, 1964), p. 38.
- 121/ James Boswell, Life of Johnson (New York: Oxford U. Press, 1933), I, 315.
- 122/ Ex, pp. 358-59.
- 123/ "On the Boiler", Ex, p. 435.
- 124/ E&I, p. 396.
- 125/ Introduction to Oxford Book of Modern Verse, p. xxvii.

- 126/ A, p. 238. Coleridge's statement occurs in his Complete Works, ed. William G. T. Shedd (New York: Harper, 1856), III, 233.
- 127/ Introduction to Oxford Book of Modern Verse, p. xxxiii.
- 128/ Ex, p. 334.
- 129/ John H. Randall, The Making of the Modern Mind (New York: Columbia U. Press, 1926), p. 287.
- 130/ Ibid., p. 407.
- 131/ Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, trans. Jim D. Meiklejohn in Robert Hutchins, ed., Great Books of the Western World: Kant (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952), p. 10.

Chapter II

- 1/ A, p. 157.
- 2/ A, p. 168.
- 3/ A, p. 169.
- 4/ A, p. 190.
- 5/ A, p. 490.
- 6/ A, p. 116.
- 7/ A, pp. 263-264.
- 8/ A, p. 115.
- 9/ "The Song of the Happy Shepherd", CP, p. 7.
- 10/ A, p. 116.
- 11/ Ibid.
- 12/ A, p. 90.
- 13/ A, p. 115.
- 14/ Gustave Courbet, "The Realist Manifesto" in Linda Nochlin, ed., Realism and Tradition in Art 1848-1900, Sources and Documents (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 35.
- 15/ Quoted in Julia Cartwright, Jules Bastien-Lepage (London: Seeley & Co., 1894), p. 19.
- 16/ "Blake's Illustrations to Dante", E&I, pp. 117-18.
- 17/ Courbet, supra, pp. 35-36.
- 18/ Ex, p. 358.
- 19/ CP, p. 241.
- 20/ E&I, p. 158.

- 21/ Arthur O'Shaughnessy, "Ode" in Music and Moonlight (London: Chatto & Windus, 1874), p. 1.
- 22/ Ex, p. 401.
- 23/ E&I, pp. 158-59.
- 24/ "Swedenborg, Mediums and Desolate Places", Ex, p. 308.
- 25/ "Blake's Illustrations to Dante", E&I, pp. 117-18.
- 26/ Cartwright, p. 74.
- 27/ "At Stratford on Avon", E&I, pp. 101-02.
- 28/ Horace, Ars Poetica, in Horace, The Complete Works, ed. C. E. Bennett and J. C. Rolfe (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1958), line 361.
- 29/ A, p. 114.
- 30/ A, p. 54.
- 31/ Collected Plays, p. 694.
- 32/ A, p. 125.
- 33/ A, p. 83.
- 34/ A, p. 279.
- 35/ Ibid.
- 36/ Ibid., p. 283.
- 37/ Ibid.
- 38/ Ibid.
- 39/ "What is Popular Poetry", E&I, p. 226.
- 40/ A, pp. 501-502.
- 41/ Blake, Vala or the Four Zoas, Night the First, line 21, Complete Writings, p. 204.
- 42/ "The Theatre", E&I, p. 167.

- 43/ Northrup Frye, "Yeats and the Language of Symbolism",
in Fables of Identity (New York: Harcourt Brace & World,
1963), p. 220.
- 44/ Ibid.
- 45/ "The Death of Cuchulain", Collected Plays, p. 694.
- 46/ A, p. 490.
- 47/ Ibid.
- 48/ "Art and Ideas", E&I, p. 348.
- 49/ Introduction to Essays and Introductions, p. viii.
- 50/ Ibid.
- 51/ Ibid.
- 52/ "Art and Ideas", E&I, p. 347.
- 53/ Arthur Hallam, "On Some of the Characteristics of Modern
Poetry, and on the Lyrical Poems of Alfred Tennyson, (1831),
in The Writings of Arthur Hallam, T.H. Vail Motter, ed.,
(London: Oxford U. Press, 1943), pp. 185-86.
- 54/ "Art and Ideas", E&I, p. 347.
- 55/ Ibid., p. 348.
- 56/ A, p. 172.
- 57/ Ibid., p. 173.
- 58/ Letters, p. 433.
- 59/ E&I, p. 318.
- 60/ A, p. 82.
- 61/ Ibid.
- 62/ Ex, p. 392.

- 63/ A, p. 115.
- 64/ Ibid.
- 65/ Ibid., p. 91.
- 66/ Ibid., p. 89.
- 67/ Harold Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence (New York: Oxford U. Press, 1973), p. 5.
- 68/ Douglas H. Archibald, "Father and Son: John Butler and William Butler Yeats", The Massachusetts Review (Summer, 1974), p. 482.
- 69/ Unpublished letter from WBY to Lollie, 13 July 1921.
- 70/ Mem, p. 19.
- 71/ "On the Boiler", p. 14.
- 72/ Ibid.
- 73/ A, p. 123.
- 74/ Quoted from Jeffares, W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), p. 59.
- 75/ A, p. 123.
- 76/ "The Circus Animals' Desertion", CP, p. 392.
- 77/ Freud, Standard Edition, XI, 172.
- 78/ Ibid., p. 198.
- 79/ Anthony Storr, The Dynamics of Creation (New York: Atheneum, 1972), pp. 156-57.
- 80/ Heinz Kohut, The Analysis of the Self (New York: International Universities Press, 1971). David Lynch bases his Yeats - The Poetics of the Self (Chicago: U. of Chicago Press,

1979) on Kohut's analysis. He concludes that Yeats's creativity activity resolved "painful unconscious conflict". (Id. at 202.) For this reason -- and perhaps because he does not consider the extent to which Yeats made the conflict conscious in the course of creating -- Lynch draws the further conclusion that Yeats's creativity was "pathological".

81/ Ibid.

82/ A, p. 153.

83/ Ibid.

84/ Mem, p. 33.

85/ W. B. Yeats, Sept. 30, 1921 letter to John Quinn, quoted in B. L. Reid, The Man From New York (New York: Oxford U. Press, 1968), pp. 492-93.

86/ "On the Boiler", Ex, p. 417.

87/ William M. Murphy, Prodigal Father: The Life of John Butler Yeats (Ithaca: Cornell U. Press, 1978), p. 208.

88/ Letter to John Quinn, Oct. 19, 1918, JBY Letters, p. 252.

89/ Letter of Aug. 6, 1906, Ibid., p. 98.

90/ Prodigal Father, p. 137.

91/ J. B. Yeats, Early Memories; Some Chapters of Autobiography (Dublin: Cuala, 1923), p. 92.

92/ A, p. 115.

93/ W. B. Yeats, Sept. 30, 1921 letter cited in n. 85 above.

94/ A, p. 11.

- 95/ Erik H. Erikson, Identity: Youth and Crisis (New York: Norton, 1968), p. 119.
- 96/ Ibid., pp. 118-19.
- 97/ Ibid., p. 119.
- 98/ Ibid.
- 99/ Ibid., p. 120.
- 100/ Mem, p. 137.
- 101/ Ibid., p. 157.
- 102/ Letters, pp. 433-34.
- 103/ Ibid.
- 104/ Ibid., p. 137.
- 105/ Ibid., p. 156.
- 106/ Ibid., p. 138.
- 107/ Ibid., p. 157.
- 108/ A, p. 24.
- 109/ Ibid., p. 32.
- 110/ "An Acre of Grass", CP, p. 347.
- 111/ Hazard Adams, Blake and Yeats: The Contrary Vision (Ithaca: Cornell U. Press, 1955), p. 194.
- 112/ October 23, 1804 letter to William Hayley in Kaynes, p. 852.
- 113/ Ibid.
- 114/ W. B. Yeats, Introduction to Poems of William Blake (New York: Modern Library, n.d.), p. xvi.
- 115/ Ibid., p. xxxvi.

- 116/ Ibid., p. xiii.
- 117/ Ibid., p. xxii.
- 118/ Ibid., p. 201.
- 119/ A, p. 503.
- 120/ Ibid., p. 195.
- 121/ Ibid., p. 272.
- 122/ See, C. S. Lewis, "Psycho-Analysis and Literary Criticism", in Walter Hooper, ed., Selected Literary Essays by C. S. Lewis (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1969), p. 290.
- 123/ Ibid.
- 124/ A, p. 273.
- 125/ June 14, 1917 letter, Letters, p. 627.
- 126/ M, p. 365.
- 127/ Letter of Sept. 9, 1914, JBY Letters, p. 194.
- 128/ Murphy, pp. 171-72.
- 129/ Letter to WBY, Sept. 7, 1914, JBY Letters, p. 192.
- 130/ Ibid.
- 131/ "Ribh denounces Patrick", CP, p. 319.
- 132/ Richard Ellmann, Yeats: The Man and the Masks (New York: Norton, 1978), p. 210.
- 133/ Letter to WBY, quoted in Hone, W. B. Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1942), p. 205.
- 134/ Robert Graves, The White Goddess (London: Faber & Faber, 1977), pp. 422-446.
- 135/ Ibid., p. 446.
- 136/ Ibid.
- 137/ Ibid.

Chapter III

- 1/ A Vision (A), p. xxxii.
- 2/ E.g., M, pp. 336, 339. See Aeneid II, 255.
- 3/ "Introduction to The Cat and the Moon", Ex, p. 403.
- 4/ M, p. 335.
- 5/ A Vision, p. 141. See A Vision (A), p. xxxiv.
- 6/ Dante Aligheri, La Vita Nuova, tr. by Dante Gabriel Rossetti (London: Routledge, n.d.), p. 12.
- 7/ M, p. 365.
- 8/ M, p. 330.
- 9/ I. A. Richards, Beyond (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974), p. 120.
- 10/ M, p. 342.
- 11/ A Vision, pp. 84-5.
- 12/ Ibid., p. 138.
- 13/ M, pp. 325; 365.
- 14/ A, p. 378.
- 15/ Ibid.
- 16/ Ibid.
- 17/ Ibid.
- 18/ Ibid., p. 253.
- 19/ Ibid.
- 20/ E.g., E&I, p. viii.
- 21/ Steve L. Adams and George Mills Harper, eds., "The Manuscript of Leo Africanus", Yeats Annual No. 1 (1982), p. 13.

- 22/ Ibid.
- 23/ Jung, CW, VII, ¶ 293.
- 24/ Ibid., ¶¶ 321-323.
- 25/ Adams and Harper, p. 13.
- 26/ Ibid., p. 28.
- 27/ Mem, p. 33.
- 28/ Adams and Harper, p. 38.
- 29/ Letters, p. 625.
- 30/ M, p. 331.
- 31/ Ibid., p. 335.
- 32/ J. B. Yeats, Letter of April 6, 1913 in Letters to His Son W. B. Yeats and Others (London: Faber & Faber, n.d.), p. 161.
- 33/ M, p. 331.
- 34/ Mem, p. 257.
- 35/ CP, p. 180.
- 36/ Ibid.
- 37/ William Wordsworth, Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye During A Tour, July 13, 1798, in Paul A. Sheets, ed., The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1982), p. 92.
- 38/ M, pp. 333-34.
- 39/ E&I, p. 509.
- 40/ CP, p. 182.

- 41/ John Keats, The Letters of John Keats, ed. M. B. Forman
(London: Oxford U.P., 1935), p. 228.
- 42/ Ibid.
- 43/ CP, p. 183.
- 44/ M, p. 341.
- 45/ M, p. 327.
- 46/ Sigmund Freud, "Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming",
Standard Edition, IX, 143 et seq.
- 47/ M, p. 343.
- 48/ Adams and Harper, p. 5.
- 49/ Ibid. The Evil Persona is not unlike Jung's "shadow"
personality.
- 50/ Henry More, The Immortality of the Soul, in Henry More,
A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings (1662;
rpt. New York: Garland, 1978), II, xiv.
- 51/ Ibid.
- 52/ "Swedenborg, Mediums and Desolate Places", Ex, p. 38.
- 53/ The Immortality of the Soul, II, x and xviii.
- 54/ Ibid., II, xvii.
- 55/ Ibid., III, xiii.
- 56/ Ibid.
- 57/ M, p. 359.
- 58/ Jung, CW, IV, ¶ 728.
- 59/ M, p. 352.
- 60/ CP, p. 265.

- 61/ CP, p. 175.
- 62/ Ex, p. 307.
- 63/ Ex, p. 302.
- 64/ CP, p. 330.
- 65/ CP, p. 394.
- 66/ M, pp. 353-54.
- 67/ M, p. 355.
- 68/ Storr, p. 196.
- 69/ Blake, The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, plate 3, in
Complete Writings, p. 149.
- 70/ A, p. 576.
- 71/ CP, p. 285.
- 72/ Letters, pp. 789-90.
- 73/ Isaiah, vi.
- 74/ M, pp. 356-57.
- 75/ A, p. 272.
- 76/ Ibid., p. 195.
- 77/ Ibid., p. 272.
- 78/ Ibid.
- 79/ M, p. 362.
- 80/ Jung, CW, ¶ 339.
- 81/ Ibid., ¶¶ 321-323.
- 82/ Ibid., ¶¶ 399-405.
- 83/ M, p. 365.
- 84/ A, p. 183.

- 85/ CP, p. 266
- 86/ A Vision, p. 73.
- 87/ Arthur Koestler, The Act of Creation (New York: Dell, 1967), p. 149.
- 88/ Quoted in Koestler, p. 149.
- 89/ Quoted in L. C. Whyte, The Unconscious Before Freud (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), p. 119.
- 90/ Quoted in Koestler, p. 153.
- 91/ Whyte, pp. 160-61.
- 92/ Jung, CW, XV, ¶ 115.
- 93/ William Blake July 6, 1803 letter to Thomas Butts in Blake, Complete Writings, p. 825.
- 94/ April 25, 1803 letter to Thomas Butts, ibid., p. 823.
- 95/ See untitled quatrain, Variorum Poems, p. 778. Cf. "An Acre of Grass", CP, p. 341.
- 96/ E&I, p. 405.
- 97/ Ibid.
- 98/ Ibid.
- 99/ Ibid., pp. 405-06.
- 100/ Introduction to the Oxford Book of Modern Verse, p. xxviii.

Chapter IV

- 1/ CP, p. 268.
- 2/ E&I, p. 519.
- 3/ M, p. 301.
- 4/ Ex, pp. 344-45.
- 5/ E&I, p. 519.
- 6/ "Remorse for Intemperate Speech", CP, p. 287.
- 7/ Harold Williams, ed., The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), III, 103.
- 8/ Letters, p. 776.
- 9/ "Swift's Epitaph", CP, p. 277.
- 10/ Juvenal, Satires, in Juvenal and Persius, trans. G. G. Ramsay (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), I, 79.
- 11/ "The Double Vision of Michael Robartes", CP, p. 194.
- 12/ E&I, p. 402.
- 13/ Plato, Phaedrus, trans. Benjamin Jowett, in Great Books of the Western World: Plato (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1977), ¶ 244.
- 14/ Erwin Rhode, Psyche (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1925), p. 292.
- 15/ Virgil, The Aeneid, trans. C. Day Lewis (Garden City: Doubleday, 1952), Bk VI, 79-102.
- 16/ Phaedrus, ¶ 245.
- 17/ Sir James Frazer, The Golden Bough (1890; rpt. New York: Macmillan, 1951). Yeats refers to The Golden Bough as early as a note to "The Valley of the Black Pig" in The Wind Among the Reeds (1899).

- 18/ Thomas Taylor, A Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries (1790 or 91; rpt. in Kathleen Raine and George Mills Harper, eds., Thomas Taylor the Platonist (Princeton: Bollingen, 1969).
- 19/ Friedrich Nietzsche, The Birth of Tragedy, trans. Francis Golffing (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956).
- 20/ Taylor in Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 408.
- 21/ Rhode, p. 257.
- 22/ Ibid.
- 23/ Ibid., p. 259.
- 24/ Ibid.
- 25/ Ibid., p. 260.
- 26/ Homer, Iliad, II, 484ff.
- 27/ E. R. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational (1951; rpt. Boston: Beacon, 1957), p. 81.
- 28/ H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, The Growth of Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1932-40), I, 637.
- 29/ "Sailing to Byzantium", CP, p. 218.
- 30/ Chadwick, p. 625.
- 31/ N. K. Chadwick, Poetry and Prophecy (Cambridge: U. Press, 1942), pp. 27-28.
- 32/ Plato, Laws, ¶ 719c.
- 33/ Democritus, frs. 17, 18, cited in Dodds, p. 82.
- 34/ Rhode, p. 263.
- 35/ Euripides, Bacchae, ll. 1-54, trans. Henry Birkhead

- in L. R. Lind, ed., Ten Greek Plays (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1957).
- 36/ Mircea Eliade, A History of Religious Ideas, trans. Willard R. Trask (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), I, 366.
- 37/ Ibid., p. 368.
- 38/ Yeats-Moore Letters, p. 114.
- 39/ "Blood and the Moon", CP, p. 268.
- 40/ Ibid.
- 41/ "The Tower", CP, p. 218.
- 42/ A Vision, p. 28.
- 43/ Ibid.
- 44/ Dodds, pp. 143-44.
- 45/ Ex, p. 293.
- 46/ Variorum Poems, p. 831.
- 47/ "On the Boiler", p. 30.
- 48/ Rhode, p. 257.
- 49/ The Golden Bough, VIII, 381.
- 50/ Ibid., p. 385.
- 51/ CP, p. 267.
- 52/ "Blood and the Moon", CP, p. 268.
- 53/ CP, p. 285.
- 54/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 296.
- 55/ Porphyry, "Concerning the Cave of the Nymphs", in Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 303.

- 56/ Ibid., pp. 310-11.
- 57/ "Swift's Epitaph", CP, p. 277.
- 58/ E&I, pp. 78 et seq.
- 59/ E&I, p. 86 and CP, p. 267.
- 60/ CP, p. 268.
- 61/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 307.
- 62/ Ex, p. 334.
- 63/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 339.
- 64/ Ibid., p. 329.
- 65/ Ibid., p. 328.
- 66/ Ibid., p. 304.
- 67/ CP, p. 269.
- 68/ Quaritch Blake, I, 257.
- 69/ CP, p. 269.
- 70/ Edmund Burke, "Letter to a Noble Lord", in Edmund Burke Selected Works, W. J. Bate, ed. (New York: Modern Library, 1960), p. 490.
- 71/ Ibid., p. 485.
- 72/ Ibid., p. 37.
- 73/ Luke 10:7. Burke's essay fits Luke's dictum more closely than Goldsmith's Deserted Village, which Torchiana views as the reference. Torchiana, W. B. Yeats and Georgian Ireland (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966), p. 321.

- 74/ Edmund Burke, Speech on Moving Resolutions for Conciliation With the Colonies, in Selected Writings and Speeches on America, Thomas Mahoney, ed. (New York: Bobs-Merrill, 1964), p. 183.
- 75/ Ex, p. 325.
- 76/ CP, p. 269.
- 77/ Ibid.
- 78/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 339.
- 79/ Ibid., p. 317.
- 80/ Ibid., p. 318.
- 81/ CP, p. 269.
- 82/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 331.
- 83/ Ibid.
- 84/ CP, p. 269.
- 85/ "Parnell's Funeral", CP, p. 320.
- 86/ CP, p. 273.
- 87/ Ibid., p. 272.
- 87A/ E&I, p. 91.
- 88/ Donald Davie, "A Fascist Poem: Yeats's 'Blood and the Moon'", in Trying to Explain (Manchester: Carcanet New Press, 1980), p. 165.
- 89/ CP, p. 269.
- 90/ John Butler Yeats, Further Letters, selected by Lennox Robinson (Dundrum: Cuala Press, 1920), p. 71.
- 91/ Letters, p. 876.

- 92/ Ibid.
- 93/ Ibid.
- 94/ Ibid.
- 95/ "An Acre of Grass", CP, p. 347.
- 96/ CP, p. 269.
- 97/ "Byzantium", CP, p. 280.
- 98/ Ibid., p. 281.
- 99/ M, p. 342.
- 100/ M, p. 349.
- 101/ CP, p. 218.
- 102/ Yeats makes reference to Blake's vision of his brother's soul "ascending and clapping its hands for joy" in his introduction to the Modern Library Blake, W. B. Yeats, ed. The Poems of William Blake (New York: Modern Library, n.d.), p. xxiii.
- 103/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 333.
- 104/ CP, p. 280.
- 105/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 339.
- 106/ M, p. 354.
- 107/ E&I, pp. 287-88.
- 108/ Ibid., p. 287.
- 109/ M, p. 360.
- 110/ M, pp. 356-57.
- 111/ M, p. 357 (emphasis added).

- 112/ Henn identifies Byzantium as "meeting point of East and West". The Lonely Tower, 2d ed. (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 220.
- 113/ "Byzantium", CP, p. 280.
- 114/ A Vision, p. 231.
- 115/ CP, p. 281. Complexities depart "in the simplicity of fire." ("Vacillation", CP, p. 285.) The departure occurs in a state called Purification, one of whose inhabitants described it to Yeats as a state of purifying intention "[o]f complexity". (A Vision, p. 233.)
- 116/ A Vision, p. 226.
- 117/ CP, p. 281.
- 118/ Richard Finneran, ed., The Byzantium Poems (Columbus: Merrill, 1970), p. 9.
- 119/ M, pp. 355-56.
- 120/ M, p. 346.
- 121/ CP, p. 281.
- 122/ Eugenie Strong, Apotheosis and Afterlife (New York: Dulton, 1916), p. 195. Jeffares noted the passage in "The Byzantium Poems of W. B. Yeats", Review of English Studies XXII (January, 1946), p. 52.
- 123/ Giorgio Melchiori, The Whole Mystery of Art (New York: Macmillan, 1961), p. 212.
- 124/ Jeffares, "The Byzantium Poems of W. B. Yeats", in Finneran, The Byzantium Poems, p. 50.

- 125/ The Golden Bough, II, 358.
- 126/ M, p. 335.
- 127/ CP, p. 280.
- 128/ Henry More, The Complete Poems, Alexander Grosart, ed. (1878; rpt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1969), pp. 133-34.
- 129/ M, p. 361.
- 130/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 304.
- 131/ Curtis Bradford, "Yeats's Byzantium Poems: A Study of Their Development", in John Unterecker, ed., Yeats (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 116 et seq.
- 132/ See text at note 94 above.
- 133/ CP, p. 281.
- 134/ The Identity of Yeats, p. 220.
- 135/ CP, p. 269.
- 136/ Thomas Taylor the Platonist, p. 308.
- 137/ "Parnell's Funeral", CP, p. 320.
- 138/ Letters, p. 742.

Chapter V

- 1/ "A Prayer For My Daughter", CP, p. 213.
- 2/ Ibid.
- 3/ A, p. 504.
- 4/ M, p. 336.
- 5/ A Vision (A), p. 27.
- 6/ Ibid.
- 7/ Ibid.
- 8/ Ibid.
- 9/ Quaritch Blake, p. xii.
- 10/ Ibid.
- 11/ C. J. Jung, CW, VIII, ¶ 339.
- 12/ Ibid., CW, IX(2), ¶¶ 29-32.
- 13/ Ibid.
- 14/ James Olney, The Rhizome and the Flower (Berkeley: U. Cal. Press, 1980), pp. 5-6.
- 15/ Jung, CW, IX(2), ¶ 29.
- 16/ Ibid., ¶ 40.
- 17/ Ibid.
- 18/ Ibid., CW, VII, ¶ 339.
- 19/ M, p. 365.
- 20/ CP, p. 201.
- 21/ Ibid., p. 197.
- 22/ Ibid., pp. 199-200.

- 23/ Blake, Complete Writings, p. 677.
- 24/ Conversation with Anne Yeats.
- 25/ William R. Inge, The Philosophy of Plotinus (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918), I, 208-09.
- 26/ Enneads, III. 2. 11.
- 27/ Ibid., III. 2. 16.
- 28/ George Berkeley, Principles of Human Knowledge, I, 11; II, in A. C. Fraser, ed., The Works of George Berkeley (Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1901).
- 29/ CP, p. 240.
- 30/ A, p. 181.
- 31/ Harold Williams, ed., The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), III, 103.
- 32/ "Introduction to 'The Words Upon The Window Pane'," Ex, p. 351.
- 33/ A, p. 188.
- 34/ Ibid., p. 190.
- 35/ Ibid., pp. 194-95.
- 36/ E&I, p. 510.
- 37/ Ibid., pp. 510-11.
- 38/ C. J. Jung, CW, XV, ¶ 128.
- 39/ E&I, p. 316.
- 40/ Ibid.
- 41/ Mem, p. 251.
- 42/ A Vision, p. 279.

- 43/ C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1923), p. 213.
- 44/ Ibid., p. 64. In a statement to the court-martial considering his sentence for murder at Mylai, Lt. Calley said that his superiors had described his enemy as Communism: "They didn't give it a race . . . a sex . . . an age That was my enemy out there." The Washington Post (Mar. 31, 1971), p. A12.
- 45/ Jonathan Swift, Travels Into Several Remote Nations of the World by Lemuel Gulliver (New York: New American Library, 1960), pt. III, Ch. 5.
- 46/ E&I, p. 313.
- 47/ "On a Political Prisoner", CP, p. 207.
- 48/ "The Circus Animals' Desertion", CP, p. 392.
- 49/ "Meditations in Time of Civil War", CP, pp. 230-31.
- 50/ "Easter 1916", CP, p. 204.
- 51/ "The Recluse", in Paul A. Sheats, ed., The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1982), p. 231.
- 52/ Ex, p. 351.
- 53/ Ibid.
- 54/ Ibid., p. 345.
- 55/ Ibid., p. 351.
- 56/ E&I, p. 402.
- 57/ Ibid.

- 58/ "Blood and the Moon", CP, p. 268.
- 59/ "The Words Upon The Window Pane" in Collected Plays,
p. 602.
- 60/ Gulliver, IV, 7, 8 & 10.
- 61/ Collected Plays, p. 615.
- 62/ CP, p. 277.
- 63/ Ex, p. 367.
- 64/ Ibid., p. 357.
- 65/ A, p. 195.
- 66/ Mem, p. 181.
- 67/ Ibid., p. 176.
- 68/ Ibid., p. 185.
- 69/ E&I, p. 519.
- 70/ Ibid.
- 71/ Ibid.
- 72/ E&I, p. 255.
- 73/ Ibid.
- 74/ Mem, p. 157.
- 75/ Ibid.
- 76/ A Vision, p. 142.
- 77/ A Vision (A), p. 28.
- 78/ Ibid., p. 235.
- 79/ E&I, p. 253.
- 80/ Ibid.

- 81/ "A Prayer For My Daughter", CP, pp. 213-14.
- 82/ A. Norman Jeffares, A New Commentary on the Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1984), p. 243.
- 83/ Thomas Taylor, trans., The Six Books of Proclus on the Theology of Plato (London: Law & Co., 1816), II, 294.
- 84/ Ibid.
- 85/ MacKenna, I, 135.
- 86/ CP, p. 225.
- 87/ Letters, p. 922.
- 88/ T. R. Henn, The Lonely Tower, 2d ed. (London: Methuen, 1966), p. 249. The identification was made by Mrs. Yeats.
- 89/ CP, p. 198. The possible visual sources of the "altarpiece", a subject first raised by Henn, are exhaustively canvassed in David R. Clark, Yeats At Songs & Choruses (Amherst: U. Mass. Press, 1983).
- 90/ VP, p. 821.
- 91/ A Vision (A), p. 73.
- 92/ Ibid.
- 93/ C. J. Jung, CW, V, ¶ 580; CW, XIII, ¶ 118.
- 94/ National Library, Dublin, MS 13.588.
- 95/ CP, p. 310.
- 96/ Ibid., p. 198.
- 97/ Ibid.

- 98/ The book is maintained with Yeats's own books and the marking is not unlike that in the other books in Yeats's library.
- 99/ Mrs. Yeats provided this information to Henn. The Lonely Tower, p. 140 n.3.
- 100/ Enneads, I, 157.
- 101/ Ibid., II, 9, 16; V, 8, 2.
- 102/ CP, p. 244.
- 103/ Thomas Taylor, trans., Select Works of Plotinus (London: Bell, 1895), Ennead 5, 3, 1. In his 1928 note to The Tower, Yeats quotes MacKenna's translation to the effect that the soul is "a principle distinct" from the bodies to which it gives law and movement and life. VP, p. 826.
- 104/ CP, p. 198.
- 105/ Ernst Cassirer, The Platonic Renaissance in England, trans. James P. Pettegrove (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1953), pp. 101-02.
- 106/ "The People", CP, p. 169.
- 107/ Baldassare Castiglione, The Book of the Courtier, trans. Sir Thomas Hoby (London: Dent, 1928). Lady Gregory read to Yeats from Hoby's translation and presented him with a copy. Corrina Salvadori, Yeats and Castiglione (Dublin: Figgis, 1965), pp. 13-14.

Chapter VI

- 1/ A Vision (A), p. xii.
- 2/ A Vision, p. 212.
- 3/ A Vision, p. 214.
- 4/ Ibid.
- 5/ A Vision (A), p. 132. Yeats erroneously attributes the Love and Strife quotation to Heraclitus.
- 6/ C. J. Jung, CW, IX(ii), ¶ 35.
- 7/ Blake, "The First Book of Urizen" in Complete Writings, p. 231.
- 8/ "He and She", CP, p. 331.
- 9/ Blake, "Jerusalem", pl. 68 in Complete Writings, p. 707.
- 10/ "Jerusalem", pl. 54, Complete Writings, p. 685.
- 11/ "Jerusalem", pl. 88, Complete Writings, pp. 733-34.
- 12/ "Crazy Jane Talks With the Bishop", CP, p. 294.
- 13/ Freud, Standard Edition, XI, 189.
- 14/ CP, pp. 294-95.
- 15/ Plato, The Symposium, trans. Walter Hamilton (London: Penguin, 1951), p. 60.
- 16/ Ibid., p. 62.
- 17/ "Summer and Spring", CP, p. 253.
- 18/ Jeffares, W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet, p. 267.
- 19/ A Vision, p. 214.
- 20/ John Dryden, Lucretius: The Fourth Book, Concerning the Nature of Love in The Works of John Dryden, ed. H. J. Swedenberg, Jr. (Berkeley: U. Cal. Press, 1969), III, 59.

- 21/ Jeffares, W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet, p. 267.
- 22/ Ibid.
- 23/ "Crazy Jane on the Day of Judgment", CP, pp. 291-92.
- 24/ Ibid.
- 25/ Collected Plays, p. 191.
- 26/ Sigmund Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle", trans. C. J. M. Hubback, 1920, rpt. in Robert Hutchins, ed., Great Books of the Western World, Freud (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1977), p. 661. See Standard Edition, XVIII, 58 where the translation is "torn apart" rather than "rent".
- 27/ Norman O. Brown, Love's Body (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 47-8.
- 28/ Collected Plays, p. 162.
- 29/ CP, p. 292.
- 30/ W. B. Yeats, Introduction to Poems of William Blake (New York: Modern Library, n.d.), p. xxxv.
- 31/ "Solomon and the Witch", CP, pp. 199-200.
- 32/ "A Last Confession", CP, p. 314.
- 33/ CP, p. 328.
- 34/ Letters, p. 758.
- 35/ Kathleen Raine, Defending Ancient Springs (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 67.
- 36/ Harold Bloom, Yeats (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 233.

- 37/ Bloom, p. 404.
- 38/ Quaritch Blake, II, 250.
- 39/ M, p. 336.
- 40/ A Vision (A), p. 27.
- 41/ A, p. 330.
- 42/ Daniel Corkery, The Hidden Ireland (1924; rpt. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1979), p. 128.
- 43/ "A Prayer for My Daughter", CP, p. 213.
- 44/ A Vision, pp. 19-20.
- 45/ TSM Letters, p. 83.
- 46/ Letters, p. 715.
- 47/ V, 9, 2.
- 48/ V, 9, 1.
- 49/ See Donald T. Torchiana, "'Among School Children' and the Education of the Irish Spirit", in A. N. Jeffares and K.G.W. Cross, eds., In Excited Reverie (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), p. 123.
- 50/ Ibid.
- 51/ "Among School Children", CP, p. 243.
- 52/ See Chapter III.
- 53/ Dante Alighieri, La Vita Nuova, p. 11.
- 54/ Joseph Campbell, The Masks of God: Creative Mythology (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976), p. 541.
- 55/ CP, p. 243.
- 56/ Ibid.
- 57/ Inge, I, 124 (Greek parentheticals omitted).

- 58/ CP, p. 244.
- 59/ Ibid.
- 60/ Letters, p. 719.
- 61/ V, 9, 5.
- 62/ Kathleen Raine, Death-in-Life and Life-in-Death: 'Cuchulain Comforted' and 'News for the Delphic Oracle' (Dublin: Dolmen, 1974), p. 50.
- 63/ CP, p. 244.
- 64/ CP, p. 535.
- 65/ Ibid., p. 244.
- 66/ Thomas Parkinson, W. B. Yeats: The Later Poetry (Berkeley: U. Cal. Press, 1966), p. 99.
- 67/ Ibid., p. 98.
- 68/ Blake, The Book of Thell, Complete Writings, p. 130.
- 69/ Variorum Poems, p. 822.
- 70/ "Adam's Curse", CP, p. 89.
- 71/ Ibid.
- 72/ III, 2, 2.
- 73/ III, 2, 3.
- 74/ CP, pp. 244-45.
- 75/ CP, p. 244.
- 76/ Ibid.
- 77/ Parkinson, p. 105.
- 78/ MacKenna, I, 157.
- 79/ Parkinson, p. 106.

- 80/ MacKenna, V, 9, 11.
- 81/ Ibid.
- 82/ VI, 9, 10.
- 83/ V, 4, 2.
- 84/ V, 9, 5.
- 85/ VI, 9, 10.
- 86/ Lionel Trilling, "Freud: Within and Beyond Culture", in Beyond Culture (New York: Harvest, 1968), p. 84.
- 87/ Ibid., p. 85.
- 88/ CP, p. 7.
- 89/ "Imitated from the Japanese", CP, p. 340.
- 90/ "The Man and the Echo", CP, p. 393.
- 91/ Ibid., p. 394.
- 92/ CP, p. 282.
- 93/ The Golden Bough, V, 224-26; 268-71; VI, 85-6.
- 94/ Ibid., V, 272.
- 95/ "Vacillation", CP, p. 283.
- 96/ A Vision, p. 236.
- 97/ A. G. Stock, W. B. Yeats: His Poetry and Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), p. 203.
- 98/ A Vision, p. 240.
- 99/ Ibid., p. 193.
- 100/ Ibid., p. 240.
- 101/ Ibid., p. 193.
- 102/ CP, p. 243.

103/ A Vision, p. 193.

104/ "Magic", E&I, pp. 46-7; see "The Philosophy of Shelley's Poetry", E&I, p. 74.

105/ Variorum Poems, p. 822.

106/ Ibid., p. 823.

107/ Ibid.

108/ A Vision (A), Notes, p. 74.

109/ A Vision, p. 240.

Chapter VII

- 1/ CP, p. 330.
- 2/ Quoted in Richard Ellmann, The Identity of Yeats (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 283.
- 3/ A Full Moon in March (London: Macmillan, 1935), p. vi.
- 4/ Yeats owned Early Eastern Christianity and was familiar with it. See Au 379. Although Yeats's library contained Walter Scott's 1924 edition of the Hermetic writings, Yeats must have known the 1906 translation of G.R.S. Mead, his friend, fellow-member of the Theosophical Society, and frequent attendant at Yeats's Monday evenings. See Virginia Moore, The Unicorn (New York: Octagon, 1973), pp. 133; 455 n.11.
- 5/ See, e.g., Kurt Rudolph, Gnosis, trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson (New York: Harper & Row, 1983), p. 57. As shown in the text infra, all of these elements of Gnosticism were familiar to Yeats.
- 6/ Harold Bloom, Yeats (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 413.
- 7/ Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 42.
- 8/ Jonas, p. 43.
- 9/ Corpus Hermeticum ("C.H.") I, 21. Except as otherwise indicated, the translation is that of G.R.S. Mead in Thrice Greatest Hermes (1906; rpt. Detroit: Hermes Press, 1978).

- 10/ C.H. XIII, 6.
- 11/ C.H. IX, 3, translation by Walter Scott in Hermetica (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924).
- 12/ CP, p. 209.
- 13/ Robert K. Meyer, ed., St. Athanasius, The Life of St. Antony (Westminister: Newman Press, 1950).
- 14/ Ibid., p. 64.
- 15/ CP, p. 210.
- 16/ F.A.C. Wilson, Yeats's Iconography (New York: Macmillan, 1960), p. 164.
- 17/ Ex, p. 301.
- 18/ W.K.L. Clarke, The Lausiac History of Palladius (London: Translations of Christian Literature Series, 1918), p. 164.
- 19/ C.H. XVI, 16.
- 20/ Ibid.
- 21/ C.H. XII, 4.
- 22/ Jonas, p. 282.
- 23/ C.H. XIV, 7.
- 24/ Deuteronomy 5:9. The Gnostic God was also a "jealous God". See Apocryphon of John 13, 8-14, quoted in Elaine Pagels, The Gnostic Gospels (New York: Vintage, 1981), p. 69.
- 25/ Mem, p. 145.
- 26/ A Vision, pp. 187, 247.

- 27/ Henry Bett, Nicholas of Cusa (London: Methuen, 1932), pp. 135-36; 150-52.
- 28/ C.H. XIII, 1-2.
- 29/ Jonas, p. 285.
- 30/ Ex, p. 301.
- 31/ Meyer, ed., p. 49.
- 32/ Ex, p. 405.
- 33/ CP, p. 328.
- 34/ Jonas, p. 272.
- 35/ E.g., Bloom, p. 407. See Virginia D. Pruitt, "Yeats and the Steinach Operation", 34 The American Imago 287 (1977) and works there cited.
- 36/ Gershom G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (London: Thames & Hudson, 1955), p. 237.
- 37/ CP, p. 329.
- 38/ Francis Burkitt, Early Eastern Christianity (London: John Murray, 1904), pp. 88-89.
- 39/ CP, p. 328.
- 40/ Ibid.
- 41/ Thomas Whitaker, Swan and Shadow: Yeats's Dialogue With History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964), p. 123.
- 42/ Genesis 1:26-27.
- 43/ G.R.S. Mead, Fragments of a Faith Forgotten (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1900), p. 173.

- 44/ Moore, The Unicorn, p. 113.
- 45/ Francis Burkitt, Church and Gnosis (Cambridge: Univ. P., 1932), p. 44.
- 46/ C.H. I, 18-19.
- 47/ Letters, p. 824.
- 48/ CP, p. 329.
- 49/ Nietzsche, "Morality as Anti-Nature", in Twilight of the Idols, tr. R. J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), p. 44.
- 50/ Nietzsche, The Will to Power, tr. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 191.
- 51/ Martin Buber, "Religion and Modern Thinking", in Eclipse of God (London: Gollancz, 1953), p. 116.
- 52/ Ibid., p. 119.
- 53/ James Lovic Allen, Yeats's Epitaph (Washington: University Press, 1982), p. 52.
- 54/ M.C. Flannery, Yeats and Magic (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1977), p. 51.
- 55/ Bloom, p. 46.
- 56/ T. R. Henn, The Lonely Tower (London: Methuen, 1966), p. 70.
- 57/ Jonas, p. 71. See C.H. VII, 1.
- 58/ CP, p. 359.

59/ David S. Thatcher, Nietzsche in England, 1890-1914, The Growth of a Reputation (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1970), p. 147.

60/ Ibid.

Chapter VIII

- 1/ A, p. 115.
- 2/ E&I, p. 249.
- 3/ F.S.L. Lyons, rev. of W. B. Yeats and Irish Folklore, by Mary Helen Thuente, Times Literary Supplement (1981), 280.
- 4/ A, p. 115.
- 5/ T. H. Huxley, "On the Physical Basis of Life" (1868) in Huxley, Selected Essays (London: Watts & Co., 1931), pp. 67 et seq.
- 6/ "What is Popular Poetry?", E&I, p. 4.
- 7/ E&I, p. 251.
- 8/ Ex, p. 332.
- 9/ E&I, p. 294.
- 10/ Ibid.
- 11/ Ibid.
- 12/ Vincent of Lerins, Commoditorium, II, 3, quoted in Philip Wiener, ed., Dictionary of the History of Ideas (New York: Scribners, 1968), I, 416.
- 13/ T. H. Huxley, "Agnosticism and Christianity" in Selected Essays, p. 204.
- 14/ Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, quoted in T. H. Huxley, "Agnosticism" (1889) in Selected Essays, p. 162.
- 15/ Blake, Annotations to Reynolds in Complete Writings, p. 459.

- 16/ See Ch. VII.
- 17/ T. H. Huxley, "Agnosticism" in Selected Essays, p. 163.
- 18/ Ibid., p. 165.
- 19/ Ibid., p. 167.
- 20/ A, p. 78.
- 21/ Ibid., p. 90.
- 22/ Ibid., p. 265.
- 23/ Ibid., p. 400.
- 24/ UP, I, 219.
- 25/ The Celtic Twilight, p. 134.
- 26/ Ibid.
- 27/ Ibid., p. 155.
- 28/ Lewis Carroll, "Through the Looking Glass" in The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll (New York: Vintage, 1975), p. 200.
- 29/ Harold Bloom, Yeats, p. 66.
- 30/ Ibid.
- 31/ UP, I, 284.
- 32/ Ibid.
- 33/ The Celtic Twilight, p. 157.
- 34/ E&I, p. 185.
- 35/ Ibid.
- 36/ Ibid., p. 429.
- 37/ See Chapter II.
- 38/ The Celtic Twilight, p. 103.

- 39/ Ibid.
- 40/ Ibid., p. 99.
- 41/ Ibid., p. 97.
- 42/ Ibid.
- 43/ Ibid.
- 44/ E&I, p. 181.
- 45/ Ibid., p. 180.
- 46/ Ibid., pp. 180-81.
- 47/ Ibid.
- 48/ Ibid.
- 49/ See Yeats, Introduction to Modern Library William Blake,
p. xxxvi.
- 50/ E&I, pp. 248-49.
- 51/ Ibid., p. 248.
- 52/ "Plans and Methods", Beltaine (Feb. 1910) in UP II,
203-04.
- 53/ Joseph Hone, W. B. Yeats, 1865-1939 (London: Macmillan,
1942), p. 477.
- 54/ Stallworthy, Vision and Revision in Yeats's Last Poems
(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 150.
- 55/ Ibid.
- 56/ Ibid., pp. 154-55.
- 57/ See Ch. VII.
- 58/ CP, p. 397.
- 59/ Stallworthy, p. 144.

- 60/ Ibid., pp. 144-45.
- 61/ E&I, p. 514.
- 62/ Quoted in James Henthorn Todd, St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland (Dublin: Hodges, Smith & Co., 1864), p. 389.
- 63/ E&I, p. 518.
- 64/ Quaritch Blake, pp. xii-xiii.
- 65/ E&I, p. 518.
- 66/ Quaritch Blake, p. xiii.
- 67/ Ibid.
- 68/ E&I, p. 125.
- 69/ CP, p. 400.
- 70/ Ibid.
- 71/ E&I, p. 517.
- 72/ E&I, p. 173.
- 73/ CP, p. 400.
- 74/ Frank O'Connor, The Backward Look (London: Macmillan, 1967), p. 2.
- 75/ E&I, p. 204.
- 76/ Ibid., p. 206.
- 77/ Arthur Koestler, p. 250. For a thorough discussion of Victorian optimism and its relation to the idea of progress, see Walter Houghton, The Victorian Frame of Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).
- 78/ Leonard Huxley, Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley (London: Macmillan, 1910), I, 193.

- 79/ See Robert Nisbet, History of the Idea of Progress (New York: Basic Books, 1980), pp. 4-5.
- 80/ Alfred Tennyson, "Locksley Hall", in W. J. Rolfe, ed., The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson (Cambridge, The Riverside Press, 1898), p. 94.
- 81/ The Celtic Twilight, p. 122.
- 82/ Ibid., p. 100.
- 83/ Ibid., p. 118.
- 84/ E&I, p. 162.
- 85/ "The Theatre", E&I, p. 172.
- 86/ See, for example, the extracts from the diary of Henry Crabb Robinson reprinted in Arthur Symons, William Blake (New York: Cooper Square, 1907), p. 269.
- 87/ Nietzsche, The Birth of Tragedy (New York: Anchor, 1956), p. 96.
- 88/ Letters, p. 734.
- 89/ Wyndham Lewis, Time and Western Man (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1928), p. 434.
- 90/ Ibid.
- 91/ Letters, p. 734.
- 92/ TSM Letters, p. 122.
- 93/ Jonathan Swift, The Battle of the Books in Herbert Davis, ed., A Tale of a Tub With Other Early Works (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), p. 150.
- 94/ Ibid., p. 151.
- 95/ A General Introduction For My Work, E&I, pp. 510-11.

Chapter IX

- 1/ John Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy (London: Black, 1829), p. 223.
- 2/ Ibid.
- 3/ A Vision, p. 67.
- 4/ A Vision (A), p. 129.
- 5/ Ibid., pp. 131-32.
- 6/ A Vision, pp. 274-75.
- 7/ E&I, p. 526.
- 8/ James Joyce, A Portrait of the Artist As A Young Man (New York: Penguin, 1976), p. 207.
- 9/ Letters, p. 869.
- 10/ Ibid., p. 825.
- 11/ On The Boiler, p. 26.
- 12/ Frank Kermode, The Sense of an Ending (New York: Oxford U. Press, 1967), p. 107.
- 13/ CP, p. 210.
- 14/ Ibid., p. 337.
- 15/ Ibid., p. 239.
- 16/ Ibid., p. 385.
- 17/ Ibid., p. 241.
- 18/ Ibid., p. 337.
- 19/ Hans Kohn, The Twentieth Century (New York: Macmillan, 1957), p. 57. See Ernst Nolte, Three Faces of Fascism, trans. Leila Vennewitz (New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston, 1966), p. 20.

- 20/ Elizabeth Cullingford, Yeats, Ireland and Fascism (London: Macmillan, 1981). Declan Kiberd, not likely to be overly indulgent of Yeats on this score, rightly concludes that Cullingford shows O'Brien's case to be "greatly overstated". Declan Kiberd, 12 *Irish University Review*, No. 1 (Spring 1982), pp. 122-23.
- 21/ Conor Cruise O'Brien, "Passion and Cunning: An Essay on the Politics of W. B. Yeats", in A. N. Jeffares and K.G.W. Cross, eds., In Excited Reverie (New York: Macmillan, 1965, p. 273.
- 22/ George Orwell, "W. B. Yeats" in Critical Essays (London: Secker & Warburg, 1946), p. 119.
- 23/ E&I, p. 162.
- 24/ Mircea Eliade, The Myth of the Eternal Return (Princeton: Bollingen, 1971), p. 52.
- 25/ Ibid., p. 81.
- 26/ James Joyce, Ulysses (New York: Random House, 1934), p. 34.
- 27/ Eliade, p. 91.
- 28/ Ibid.
- 29/ The Celtic Twilight, p. 100.
- 30/ "Introduction to 'The Words Upon the Window Pane'", Ex, p. 355.
- 31/ Orwell, p. 119.
- 32/ Eliade, p. 153.

- 33/ CP, p. 264.
- 34/ E&I, p. 192.
- 35/ Ibid., p. 472.
- 36/ Rosa Alchemica, M, pp. 284-85.
- 37/ CP, p. 375.
- 38/ On The Boiler, p. 37.
- 39/ CP, p. 244.
- 40/ "Under Ben Bulben", CP, p. 399.
- 41/ Stallworthy, Vision and Revision in Yeats's Last Poems, p. 126.
- 42/ CP, pp. 375-76.
- 43/ See Vivienne Koch, W. B. Yeats: The Tragic Phase (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951), p. 74. Donoghue makes the acute observation that the verb "hovers between indicative and imperative with a touch of each." Denis Donoghue, William Butler Yeats (New York: Viking, 1971), p. 134.
- 44/ Augustine Martin, "What Stalked Through The Post Office?" in The Crane Bag, Vol. II (1978), p. 177.
- 45/ E&I, pp. 120-21.
- 46/ M, pp. 284-85.
- 47/ CP, p. 385.
- 48/ Augustine Martin, "Hound Voices Were They All: An Experiment in Yeats Criticism", in A. Norman Jeffares, ed., Yeats, Sligo and Ireland (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1980), p. 140.

- 49/ Variorum Poems, p. 828.
- 50/ CP, p. 241.
- 51/ A, p. 182.
- 52/ Kermode, p. 97.
- 53/ Helen Vendler, Yeats's Vision and the Later Plays (Cambridge: Harv. U. Press, 1963), p. 96.
- 54/ "Under Ben Bulben", CP, pp. 398-99.
- 55/ Quoted by Ellman, The Identity of Yeats, p. 297.
- 56/ Giorgio Melchiori, The Whole Mystery of Art (New York: Macmillan, 1961), p. 144.
- 57/ CP, pp. 210-11.
- 58/ Jon Stallworthy, Between the Lines (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 17.
- 59/ Yvor Winters, The Poetry of W. B. Yeats (Denver: Swallow, 1960), p. 10.
- 60/ CP, p. 211.
- 61/ Stephen Spender, The Destructive Element (Philadelphia: Saifer, 1953), p. 130.
- 62/ CP, p. 239.
- 63/ Ibid., p. 240.
- 64/ A Vision, p. 268.
- 65/ See Ch. IV.
- 66/ CP, p. 337.
- 67/ Stallworthy, Vision and Revision in Yeats's Last Poems, p. 37.

- 68/ "The Man and the Echo", CP, p. 393.
- 69/ Stallworthy, Vision and Revision in Yeats's Last Poems, pp. 62-64.
- 70/ Curtis Bradford, Yeats at Work (Carbondale: Southern Illinois U. Press, 1965), p. 148.
- 71/ E&I, p. 86.
- 72/ CP, p. 367.
- 73/ Ibid.
- 74/ E&I, p. 530. Interestingly, the images that come from the cavern of the mind, like the images that come from the cavern of "Old Rocky Face", were bound up with political thinking, images from communist Moscow and fascist Rome.
- 75/ Jung, CW, VII, ¶ 329.
- 76/ Ibid., p. 201.
- 77/ A Vision (A), p. 27.
- 78/ See text at note 7 above.
- 79/ Jung, Memories, Dreams and Reflections, p. 175.
- 80/ A, p. 225.
- 81/ Augustine Martin, W. B. Yeats (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1983), p. 31.
- 82/ A Vision, p. 52.
- 83/ Letters, p. 769.
- 84/ A Vision (A), p. 149.

- 85/ Orwell, p. 117. See Seamus Deane, rev. of Yeats by Douglas Archibald, The Sunday Tribune Magazine, July 31, 1983, p. 4.
- 86/ Journal, Mem., p. 157.
- 87/ E&I, p. 255.
- 88/ Ibid., p. 254.
- 89/ Ibid., p. 255.
- 90/ Ibid.
- 91/ DWL 86-7.
- 92/ Ibid.
- 93/ Stallworthy, Vision and Revision in Yeats's Last Poems, p. 45.
- 94/ Heraclitus, fragment XCIII. See Charles Kahn, ed. The Art and Thought of Heraclitus (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1979), pp. 70-71. For translation quoted, see Olney, pp. 90-92.
- 95/ Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent", p. 43.
- 96/ On The Boiler, p. 26.
- 97/ Ex, p. 392.
- 98/ Eliot, p. 44.

Conclusion

- 1/ "A General Introduction For My Work", E&I, p. 509.
- 2/ T. S. Eliot, "Yeats" in Kermode, ed., Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot, p. 249.
- 3/ MacNeice, The Poetry of W. B. Yeats (London: Faber & Faber, 1979), pp. 154-155; 197.
- 4/ M, p. 365.
- 5/ A Vision, pp. 84-85.
- 6/ A Vision (A), p. 243.
- 7/ Letters, p. 741.
- 8/ Ex, 293.
- 9/ "A General Introduction For My Work", E&I, p. 519.
- 10/ Ibid.
- 11/ Letters, p. 501.
- 12/ Ibid., p. 618.
- 13/ "At the Hawk's Well", Collected Plays, p. 215.
- 14/ Ibid.
- 15/ See Ch. II.
- 16/ Freud, Standard Edition, IV(1), 262.
- 17/ See Ch. II.
- 18/ A Vision, pp. 27-29.
- 19/ See Ch. III.
- 20/ A Vision, p. 214.

- 21/ Nietzsche, The Dawn of Day in Oscar Levy, ed.,
The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche (London:
Foulis, 1911), IX, 388. Yeats's library contains a
copy of The Dawn of Day inscribed "W. B. Yeats from
AG." See David S. Thatcher, Nietzsche in England,
1890-1914, The Growth of a Reputation (Toronto: U.
of Toronto Press, 1970), p. 143.
- 22/ E&I, p. 308.
- 23/ Burnet, Early Greek Philosophers, p. 136. The passage
is marked in Yeats's copy.
- 24/ A, p. 34. See Ch. V.
- 25/ "Easter 1916", CP, p. 204.
- 26/ The Celtic Twilight, p. 97.
- 27/ "Poetry and Tradition", E&I, p. 255.
- 28/ Ibid.
- 29/ Letters, p. 466.
- 30/ JBY Letters, p. 97.
- 31/ Ibid.
- 32/ Ibid., p. 98.
- 33/ A, p. 207.
- 34/ Letters, p. 734.
- 35/ A, p. 183.
- 36/ A Vision, p. 23.
- 37/ A Vision (A), pp. 235; 243.
- 38/ A Vision, p. 141.
- 39/ E&I, p. 255.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Works By Yeats

A	<u>Autobiographies</u>
A <u>Vision</u> (A)	<u>A Critical Edition of Yeats's 'A Vision'</u> (1925), eds. George Mills Harper and Walter Kelly Hood
CP	<u>Collected Poems</u>
E&I	<u>Essays and Introductions</u>
Ex	<u>Explorations</u>
<u>Letters</u>	<u>The Letters of W. B. Yeats</u> , ed. Wade
M	<u>Mythologies</u>
Mem	<u>Memoirs</u> , ed. Donoghue
Quaritch <u>Blake</u>	W. B. Yeats and Edwin Ellis, eds., <u>The Works of William Blake</u>
<u>Senate Speeches</u>	<u>The Senate Speeches of W. B. Yeats</u> , ed. Pearce
<u>TSM Letters</u>	<u>W. B. Yeats and T. Sturge Moore: Their Correspondence, 1901-1937</u> , ed. Bridge
UP I & II	<u>Uncollected Prose</u> , 2 vols., ed. Frayne

Other Abbreviations

Blake <u>Complete Writings</u>	Blake, William, <u>Complete Writings</u> , ed. Sir Geoffrey Keynes
<u>CW</u>	C. J. Jung, <u>Collected Works</u>
<u>Enneads</u>	<u>Plotinus, The Enneads</u> , trans. Stephen MacKenna
Freud <u>Standard Edition</u>	Sigmund Freud, <u>The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud</u> , trans. and ed. James Strachey
<u>JBV Letters</u>	J. B. Yeats, <u>Letters to His Son W. B. Yeats and Others</u>

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works by W. B. Yeats

A Critical Edition of Yeats's 'A Vision' (1925), eds. George Mills Harper and Walter Kelly Hood (London: Macmillan, 1978)

Autobiographies (London: Macmillan, 1955)

A Vision (London: Macmillan, 1962)

Collected Plays (London: Macmillan, 1952)

Collected Poems (London: Macmillan, 1950)

Essays and Introductions (London: Macmillan, 1962)

Explorations, sel. Mrs. W. B. Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1962)

Letters of W. B. Yeats, ed. Allan Wade (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954)

Letters on Poetry from W. B. Yeats to Dorothy Wellesley, ed. Kathleen Raine (London: Oxford University Press, 1964)

Memoirs, ed. Denis Donoghue (London: Macmillan, 1972)

Mythologies (London: Macmillan, 1959)

On The Boiler (Dublin: Cuala Press, 1938)

Senate Speeches of W. B. Yeats, ed. Donald R. Pearce (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960)

Uncollected Prose by W. B. Yeats, Vol. I, ed. John P. Frayne (London: Macmillan, 1970)

Uncollected Prose by W. B. Yeats, Vol. II, ed. John P. Frayne and Colton Johnson (London: Macmillan, 1975)

Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats, eds. Peter Allt and Russell K. Alspach (New York: Macmillan, 1957)

W. B. Yeats and T. Sturge Moore: Their Correspondence, 1901-1937, ed. Ursula Bridge (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953)

Ed., Oxford Book of Modern Verse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936)

Ed., Poems of William Blake (New York: Modern Library, n.d.)

Ed. with Edwin Ellis; The Works of William Blake (London: Quaritch, 1893)

II. About Yeats

- Adams, Hazard, Blake and Yeats: The Contrary Vision (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955)
- Adams, Steve L. and Harper, George Mills, eds., "The Manuscript of Leo Africanus", Yeats Annual No. 1 (1982)
- Allen, James Lovic, Yeats's Epitaph (Washington: University Press, 1982)
- Archibald, Douglas H., "Father and Son: John Butler and William Butler Yeats", The Massachusetts Review (Summer, 1974)
- Bloom, Harold, Yeats (London: Oxford University Press, 1970)
- Bradford, Curtis, Yeats at Work (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965)
- Bradford, Curtis, "Yeats's Byzantium Poems: A Study of Their Development", in John Unterecker, ed., Yeats (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963)
- Clark, David R., Yeats At Songs & Choruses (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983)
- Craig, Cairns, Yeats, Eliot, Pound and the Politics of Poetry (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982)
- Cullingford, Elizabeth, Yeats, Ireland and Fascism (London: Macmillan, 1981)
- Deane, Seamus, rev. of Douglas Archibald, Yeats, The Sunday Tribune Magazine, July 31, 1983
- Donoghue, Denis, William Butler Yeats (New York: Viking, 1971)
- Ellmann, Richard, The Identity of Yeats (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964)
- Ellmann, Richard, Yeats: The Man and the Masks (New York: Norton, 1978)
- Finneran, Richard, ed., The Byzantium Poems (Columbus: Merrill, 1970)
- Flannery, M. C., Yeats and Magic (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1977)

- Henn, T. R., The Lonely Tower, 2d ed. (London: Methuen, 1965)
- Hone, Joseph, W. B. Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1942)
- Jeffares, A. Norman, A New Commentary on the Poems of W. B. Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1984)
- Jeffares, A. Norman, W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978)
- Kiberd, Declan, rev. of Elizabeth Cullingford, Yeats, Ireland and Fascism, 12 Irish University Review, No. 1 (Spring 1982)
- Koch, Vivienne, W. B. Yeats: The Tragic Phase (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951)
- Lynch, David, Yeats - The Poetics of the Self (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979)
- Lyons, F. S. L., rev. of W. B. Yeats and Irish Folklore, by Mary Helen Thuente, Times Literary Supplement (1981), 280
- MacNeice, Louis, The Poetry of W. B. Yeats (London: Faber & Faber, 1979)
- Martin, Augustine, "Hound Voices Were They All: An Experiment in Yeats Criticism", in A. N. Jeffares, ed., Yeats, Sligo and Ireland (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1980)
- Martin, Augustine, W. B. Yeats (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1983)
- Martin, Augustine, "What Stalked Through the Post Office?", in The Crane Bag, Vol. II (1978)
- Melchiori, Giorgio, The Whole Mystery of Art (New York: Macmillan, 1961)
- Moore, Virginia, The Unicorn (New York: Octagon, 1973)
- Murphy, William M., Prodigal Father: The Life of John Butler Yeats (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978)
- O'Brien, Conor Cruise, "Passion and Cunning: An Essay on the Politics of W. B. Yeats", in A. N. Jeffares and K. G. W. Cross, eds., In Excited Reverie (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965)

- Olney, James, The Rhizome and the Flower (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980)
- Orwell, George, "W. B. Yeats", in Critical Essays (London: Secker & Warburg, 1946)
- Parkinson, Thomas, W. B. Yeats: The Later Poetry (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966)
- Pruitt, Virginia D., "Yeats and the Steinach Operation", 34 The American Imago 287 (1977)
- Raine, Kathleen, Death-in-Life and Life-in-Death: 'Cuchulain Comforted' and 'News for the Delphic Oracle' (Dublin: Dolmen, 1974)
- Salvadori, Corrina, Yeats and Castiglione (Dublin: Figgis, 1965)
- Stallworthy, Jon, Between the Lines (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963)
- Stallworthy, Jon, Vision and Revision in Yeats's Last Poems (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- Stock, A. G., W. B. Yeats: His Poetry and Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961)
- Torchiana, Donald T., "'Among School Children' and the Education of the Irish Spirit", in A. N. Jeffares and K. G. W. Cross, eds., In Excited Reverie (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965)
- Torchiana, Donald T., W. B. Yeats and Georgian Ireland (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966)
- Tuohy, Frank, Yeats (London: Macmillan, 1976)
- Whitaker, Thomas, Swan and Shadow: Yeats's Dialogue With History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964)
- Wilson, F. A. C., Yeats's Iconography (New York: Macmillan, 1960)
- Winters, Yvor, The Poetry of W. B. Yeats (Denver: Swallow, 1960)
- Yeats, J. B., Letters to His Son W. B. Yeats and Others (London: Faber & Faber, n.d.)
- Yeats, John B., Early Memories; Some Chapters of Autobiography (Dublin: Cuala Press, 1923)

III. Other Works

- Abrams, M. H., The Mirror and the Lamp (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953)
- Alighieri, Dante, La Vita Nuova, tr. Dante Gabriel Rossetti (London: Routledge, n.d.)
- Bett, Henry, Nicholas of Cusa (London: Methuen, 1932)
- Blake, Complete Writings, ed. Sir Geoffrey Keynes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969)
- Blavatsky, H. P., Isis Unveiled (California: Theosophy Co., 1925)
- Bloom, Harold, The Anxiety of Influence (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973)
- Boswell, James, Life of Johnson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1933)
- Brown, Norman O., Love's Body (New York: Random House, 1964)
- Buber, Martin, The Eclipse of God (London: Gollancz, 1953)
- Burke, Edmund, "Letter to a Noble Lord", in Edmund Burke Selected Works, ed. W. J. Bate (New York: Modern Library, 1960)
- Burke, Edmund, Speech on Moving Resolutions for Conciliation with the Colonies, ed. Thomas Mahoney (New York: Bobs-Merrill, 1964)
- Burkitt, Francis, Church and Gnosis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932)
- Burkitt, Francis, Early Eastern Christianity (London: John Murray, 1904)
- Burnet, John, Early Greek Philosophy (London: Black, 1829)
- Campbell, Joseph, The Masks of God: Creative Mythology (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976)
- Carroll, Lewis, The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll (New York: Vintage, 1975)

- Cartwright, Julia, Jules Bastien-Lepage (London: Seeley & Co., 1894)
- Cassirer, Ernst, The Platonic Renaissance in England, trans. James P. Pettegrove (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1953)
- Castiglione, Baldassare, The Book of the Courtier, trans. Sir Thomas Hoby (London: Dent, 1928)
- Chadwick, H. M. and N. K., The Growth of Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932-40)
- Chadwick, N. K., Poetry and Prophecy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1942)
- Clarke, W. C. L., The Lausiac History of Palladius (London: Translations of Christian Literature Series, 1918)
- Coleridge, S. J., Biographia Literaria (1817; rpt. London: Dent, 1980)
- Coleridge, S. J., Complete Works, ed. William G. T. Shedd (New York: Harper, 1856)
- Corkery, Daniel, The Hidden Ireland (1924; rpt. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1979)
- Courbet, Gustave, "The Realist Manifesto" in Linda Nochlin, ed., Realism and Tradition in Art 1848-1900, Sources and Documents (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960)
- Davie, Donald, Trying to Explain (Manchester: Carcanet New Press, 1980)
- Dodds, E. R., The Greeks and the Irrational (1951; rpt. Boston: Beacon, 1957)
- Dryden, John, The Works of John Dryden, ed. H. J. Swedenberg, Jr. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969)
- Eliade, Mircea, A History of Religious Ideas, trans. Willard R. Trask (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978)
- Eliade, Mircea, The Myth of the Eternal Return (Princeton: Bollingen, 1971)
- Eliot, T. S., Selected Essays (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1932)

- Eliot, T. S., Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot, ed. Frank Kermode (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975)
- Engell, James, The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981)
- Erikson, Erik H., Identity: Youth and Crisis (New York: Norton, 1968)
- Euripides, Bacchae, trans. Henry Birkhead in C. R. Lind, ed., Ten Greek Plays (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1957)
- Fraser, A. C., ed., The Works of George Berkeley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901)
- Fraser, Sir James, The Golden Bough (1890; rpt. New York: Macmillan, 1951)
- Freud, Sigmund, The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, trans. and ed. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1953-74)
- Frye, Northrup, Fables of Identity (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1963)
- Frye, Northrup, Fearful Symmetry (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969)
- Graves, Robert, The White Goddess (London: Faber & Faber, 1977)
- Hallam, Arthur, The Writings of Arthur Hallam, ed. T. H. Vail Motter (London: Oxford University Press, 1943)
- Horace, The Complete Works, eds. C. E. Bennett and J. C. Rolfe (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1958)
- Houghton, Walter, The Victorian Frame of Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957)
- Huxley, Leonard, Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley (London: Macmillan, 1910)
- Huxley, T. H., Selected Essays (London: Watts & Co., 1931)
- Inge, William R., The Philosophy of Plotinus (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1918)
- Jonas, Hans, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958)

- Joyce, James, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (New York: Penguin, 1976)
- Joyce, James, Ulysses (New York: Random House, 1934)
- Jung, C. J., Collected Works, eds. Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, Gerhard Adler, William McGuire (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1957-67)
- Jung, C. J., Memories, Dreams, Reflections, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Vintage, 1965)
- Juvenal, Satires, in Juvenal and Persius, trans. G. G. Ramsay (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961)
- Kahn, Charles, ed., The Art and Thought of Heraclitus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)
- Kant, Immanuel, Critique of Pure Reason, trans. Jim D. Meiklejohn in Robert Hutchins, ed., Great Books of the Western World (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952)
- Keats, John, The Letters of John Keats, ed. M. B. Forman (London: Oxford University Press, 1935)
- Kermode, Frank, The Sense of an Ending (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967)
- Koestler, Arthur, The Act of Creation (New York: Dell, 1967)
- Kohn, Hans, The Twentieth Century (New York: Macmillan, 1957)
- Kohut, Heinz, The Analysis of the Self (New York: International Universities Press, 1971)
- Levy, Oscar, ed., The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche (London: Foulis, 1911)
- Lewis, C. S., Selected Literary Essays by C. S. Lewis, ed. Walter Hooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969)
- Lewis, Wyndham, Time and Western Man (New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1928)
- Locke, John, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 1690; rpt. in Robert Hutchins, ed., Great Books of the Western World (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1977)

- MacKenna, Stephen, trans., Plotinus, The Enneads (London: Warner, 1917-35)
- McLuhan, Marshall, Understanding Media (New York: New American Library, 1964)
- Mead, G. R. S., trans., Corpus Hermeticum, in Thrice Greatest Hermes (1906; rpt. Detroit: Hermes Press, 1978)
- Mead, G. R. S., Fragments of a Faith Forgotten (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1900)
- Meyer, Robert K., ed., St. Athanasius, The Life of St. Antony (Westminister: Newman Press, 1950)
- More, Henry, A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings (1662; rpt. New York: Garland, 1978)
- More, Henry, The Complete Poems, ed. Alexander Grosart (1878; rpt. Hildensheim: Olms, 1969)
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, The Birth of Tragedy (New York: Anchor, 1956)
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, The Birth of Tragedy, trans. Francis Golfing (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956)
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, The Will to Power, trans. Walter Kaufman and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Random House, 1967)
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, Twilight of the Idols, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
- Nisbet, Robert, History of the Idea of Progress (New York: Basic Books, 1980)
- Nolte, Ernst, Three Faces of Fascism, trans. Leila Vennewitz (New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston, 1966)
- O'Connor, Frank, The Backward Look (London: Macmillan, 1967)
- Ogden, C. K. and Richards, I. A., The Meaning of Meaning (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1923)
- O'Shaughnessy, Arthur, Music and Moonlight (London: Chatto & Windus, 1874)
- Pagels, Elaine, The Gnostic Gospels (New York: Vintage, 1981)

- Plato, Phaedrus, trans. Benjamin Jowett, in Great Books of the Western World: Plato (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1977)
- Plato, The Symposium, trans. Walter Hamilton (London: Penguin, 1951)
- Plato, Timaeus, trans. R. D. Archer-Hind (London: Macmillan, 1888)
- Porphyry, "Concerning the Cave of the Nymphs", in Raine and Harper, eds., Thomas Taylor the Platonist (Princeton: Bollingen, 1969)
- Raine, Kathleen, Defending Ancient Springs (London: Oxford University Press, 1967)
- Randall, John H., The Making of the Modern Mind (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926)
- Reid, B. L., The Man From New York (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968)
- Rhode, Erwin, Psyche (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1925)
- Richards, I. A., Beyond (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974)
- Rudolph, Kurt, Gnosis, trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson (New York: Harper & Row, 1983)
- Russell, Bertrand, A History of Western Philosophy (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945)
- Scholem, Gershom G., Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (London: Thames & Hudson, 1955)
- Scott, Walter, trans., Corpus Hermeticum in Hermetica (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924)
- Spender, Stephen, The Destructive Element (Philadelphia: Saifer, 1953)
- Storr, Anthony, The Dynamics of Creation (New York: Atheneum, 1972)
- Strong, Eugenie, Apotheosis and Afterlife (New York: Dulton, 1916)

- Swift, Jonathan, A Tale of a Tub With Other Early Works, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965)
- Swift, Jonathan, The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, ed. Harold Williams (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963)
- Swift, Jonathan, Travels Into Several Remote Nations of the World by Lemuel Gulliver (New York: New American Library, 1960)
- Symons, Arthur, William Blake (New York: Cooper Square, 1907)
- Taylor, Thomas, A Dissertation on the Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries (1790 or 91; rpt. in Kathleen Raine and George Mills Harper, eds., Thomas Taylor the Platonist (Princeton: Bollingen, 1969)
- Taylor, Thomas, trans., Select Works of Plotinus (London: Bell, 1895)
- Taylor, Thomas, trans., The Six Books of Proclus on the Theology of Plato (London: Law & Co., 1816)
- Tennyson, Alfred, The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson, ed. W. J. Rolfe (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1898)
- Thatcher, David S., Nietzsche in England, 1890-1914, The Growth of a Reputation (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1970)
- Todd, James Henthorn, St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland (Dublin: Hodges, Smith & Co., 1864)
- Trilling, Lionel, "Freud: Within and Beyond Culture", in Beyond Culture (New York: Harvest, 1968)
- Vendler, Helen, Yeats's Vision and the Later Plays (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963)
- Virgil, The Aeneid, trans. C. Day Lewis (Garden City: Doubleday, 1952)
- Whyte, L. C., The Unconscious Before Freud (New York: Anchor Books, 1962)
- Wordsworth, William, The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth, ed. Paul A. Sheets (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1982)

Yates, Frances A., Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition
(London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964)

Yeats, John Butler, Further Letters, Selected by Lennox
Robinson (Dundrum: Cuala Press, 1920)

Abstract of "Enlarging Irish Hate: The Objects and Uses of Yeatsian Hate", A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of Arts, University College Dublin, for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Joseph M. Hassett in October 1984

William Butler Yeats was extraordinarily vocal and vigorous in articulating hatred as his poetic passion of preference -- so much so that when he dreamed of his goals as a poet, he "dreamed of enlarging Irish hate". This dissertation examines both the objects and uses of Yeatsian hate.

Examination of the objects of Yeatsian hate (e.g., the philosophy of John Locke, Victorian science, the materialism of Huxley and Tyndall) reveals what it was they challenged in the poet's thinking, thus shedding light on those aspects of Yeats's thought he guarded most jealously.

Study of the way in which Yeats used his hate to penetrate the uncharted depths of his mind provides a new avenue of insight into the creative process.

Because the ultimate value of an inquiry into Yeatsian hate must be measured in terms of the extent to which it contributes to understanding and appreciation of the poetry, the dissertation considers ways in which Yeats's preoccupation with hate illuminates particular poems and poetic themes. Among the matters considered are Yeats's cultivation of Swiftian indignation as a source of



poetic knowledge and power, his variations on Blake's theme that sexual love is founded on spiritual hate, Gnostic Ribh's belief that "Hatred of God may bring the soul to God", the message of Yeats's "communicators" that the Beatific Vision "comes from being free of Hatred", and Yeats's prayer for himself and his daughter that, "all hatred driven hence," the soul might recover "radical innocence".