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Warren’s Audubon and Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan”: Two Visions

STEVEN T. RYAN

Robert Penn Warren’s Audubon concludes with the line, “Tell me a story of deep delight.” The subtitle of Audubon is A Vision. Section II of the poem tells the story of Audubon’s encounter with a woman and her sons who are hanged for attempting to kill him. This section, which constitutes nearly half of the poem (pp. 5-18), is entitled “The Dream He Never Knew the End Of.” Despite these rather obvious clues, despite how much has been written about Audubon since its publication in 1969, and despite the oft-emphasized connection between Robert Penn Warren and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, there has been no critical emphasis upon the use of “Kubla Khan: Or, A Vision in a Dream. A Fragment” in Audubon: A Vision. Yet, if one looks closely at this relationship, “Kubla Khan” appears to operate as a virtual subtext for Audubon.

Lesa Carnes Corrigan’s recent book, Poems of Pure Imagination: Robert Penn Warren and the Romantic Tradition, has expanded upon Victor Strandberg’s earlier analysis of the Warren/Coleridge connection, including a chapter devoted specifically to the use of Coleridge in Audubon. Corrigan continues the previous critical focus on Rime of the Ancient Mariner as the primary touchstone between Coleridge’s and Warren’s poetry and does offer useful insight into Warren’s Audubon as a figure reminiscent of the Ancient Mariner in his vision and his isolation: “Elements of Coleridgean Romanticism appear throughout Audubon, especially in Warren’s creation of a figure who represents not only the ‘blessedness’ of earned vision but also the isolation that comes with knowledge.” When Corrigan arrives at Warren’s “story of deep delight,” she offers the following interpretation: “This yearning for a renewed sense of wonder, like the passion that compels Audubon in his search for meaning, connects
the past with the present, the 'visionary gleam' of childhood with the adult's attempt to regain that vision." Though, as far as it goes, this explanation is sound, deeper and darker implications of the "story of deep delight" are suggested through the direct allusion to Coleridge's "Kubla Khan."

The special privileging of The Rime of the Ancient Mariner and the ignoring of "Kubla Khan" probably derive from Warren's extensive analysis of Ancient Mariner and the tendency within New Criticism to characterize "Kubla Khan" as an over-valued text. Thus recent criticism, as exemplified by A.C. Goodson's Verbal Imagination: Coleridge and the Language of Modern Criticism, has clarified the New Critics' debt to Coleridge, such as I.A. Richards' "semasiologist" contention that to ask "about meaning of words is to ask about everything" derives from Coleridge's "transcendental Logos"; yet, "Kubla Khan" is routinely passed over as a slight text, lacking the richness of Coleridge's more philosophical texts. However, Warren was not inclined to pass over "Kubla Khan."

Brooks and Warren's influential Understanding Poetry (3d ed., 1960) contains extensive analysis of "Kubla Khan," much of which suggests Warren's interest in the text and its specific application to Audubon. For example, the Khan is described as both the man of power and "the man of vision—the artist who projects the dome." Most important, special emphasis is placed on the break from the narration with Coleridge's use of the intrusive "I," a technique that Warren imitates in the final sections of "Audubon."

The narration has been abruptly broken off. A new topic has been introduced, and for the first time an "I" has been introduced into the poem. . . . We have an "I" and we also have a dream or vision for the first time in the poem. If the early paradise within the Khan's domain has the quality of vision or dream, it has been presented at least as factual truth.

Most of the Brooks/Warren analysis of "Kubla Khan" dwells upon Coleridge's reaction to the inspiration of the Abyssinian maid. Here they provide a clear model for Warren's interest in the artist's incorporation and transformation of that which is presented as "factual truth": "The artist cannot simply imitate; he must in his joyful creativity build anew and through his own music the thing that is envisioned." Brooks and Warren also examine Coleridge's awareness of what it means to request ultimate vision:

. . . if the speaker could indeed recover the vision and build the dome for us, he would pass beyond the bounds of poetry as we know it and become himself a numinous thing—a creature to be held in awe and dread as one who had indeed been in paradise and tasted its milk and honey-dew.

The darker implications of passing "beyond the bounds of poetry as we know it" are expressed in a way that suggests the later condition of Warren's Audubon: "If the shudder of awe and the warnings whispered by those listening to his song are a compliment and a testimony to his power, they also mark his exile and his isolation." Thus Warren sees the speaker of "Kubla Khan" in the role of the modern poète maudit, just as he sees Coleridge's Ancient Mariner and as he later portrays Audubon.

Another clue to Warren's use of "Kubla Khan" is suggested by Geoffrey Yarlott's Coleridge and the Abyssinian Maid, an influential study of Coleridge which appeared in 1967, two years before Warren's publication of Audubon. In his analysis of "Kubla Khan," Yarlott's interpretation emphasizes the poem's investigation of the relationship between art and nature as the synthesis of opposites (heat/cold, life/death, convex/concave) which can only be "interfused under the impetus of sacred inspiration." When Yarlott argues that Coleridge's "pleasure-dome" is a reflection of base sensuality and carnal experience, he quotes from Coleridge's "Honour," which uses the image of the hag: "In poetry he generally represented pleasure in harsh pejorative terms: 'A hideous hag th' Enchantress Pleasure seems / And all her joys appear but feverous dreams.'" In Audubon,
Warren’s hag is also be equated to base sensuality. Yarlott’s interpretation takes greater risks as he argues that Coleridge’s pleasure-dome reflects his personal fears of a domesticity which could stifle his creativity: “Unconsciously, therefore, the description of the pleasure-paradise may have been a further projection of Coleridge’s apprehensiveness lest the Sara type of domesticity should stifle his creative powers.” What Yarlott sees as covert in “Kubla Khan” becomes overt in Warren’s Audubon. John Burt (referring to Warren’s 1977 interview with Peter Stitt) states that Warren’s focus in Audubon “concerns Audubon’s gradual acceptance of his vocation despite dereliction of his family and the abandonment of customary responsibilities that acceptance implied.” Yarlott contends that Coleridge leaves the honeymoon bed, “but the effort was worth it, since he had been rewarded by a vision which exposed for him the limitations of the dell. Beyond the microcosm he had seen ‘the whole world . . . imag’d in its vast circumference,’” Likewise, Audubon’s creativity derives from wandering through the world and requires abandonment of safe and sensual domesticity. Audubon knows the life he has rejected:

Keep store, dandle babies, and at night nuzzle
The hazelnut-shaped sweet tits of Lucy, and
With the piratical mark-up of the frontier, get rich (22).

Yarlott’s psychological interpretation of “Kubla Khan” may have provided Warren with the suggestion that Audubon’s artistic journey into the world’s “vast circumference” was a flight from such sensual domesticity.

Because the relationship between Audubon and “Kubla Khan” has been ignored, the meaning of Audubon’s final directive (“Tell me a story of deep delight.”) has not been fully appreciated. It becomes a far more ambiguous statement when viewed within the context of “Kubla Khan.” Coleridge’s use of “deep delight” also occurs towards the end, after his shift to the “damsel with a dulcimer”:

Could I revive within me
Her symphony and song,
To such a deep delight ‘twould win me,
That with music loud and long,
I would build that dome in air,
That sunny dome! Those caves of ice!”

The “deep delight” within Coleridge’s poem occurs with a similar shift to the personal—a personal level that in both cases involves both the poet and the reader. We may assume that by evoking Coleridge’s wish for this “deep delight,” Warren is also associating the “story” he wishes us to tell him with his own creative attainment, an attainment that both Warren and Coleridge have associated with “dream” and “word.”

But we must continue with Coleridge’s conclusion to appreciate a level of irony within Warren’s use of “deep delight,” for Coleridge emphasizes the dark power of such creative attainment:

And all who heard should see them there,
And all should cry, Beware! Beware!
His flashing eyes, his floating hair!
Weave a circle round him thrice,
And close your eyes with holy dread,
For he on honey dew hath fed,
And drunk the milk of Paradise.”

Before his concluding line, Warren also offers his instruction and issues his warning:

Make it a story of great distance, and starlight.
The name of the story will be Time,
But you must not pronounce its name (32).

We have a similar thrust toward ultimate vision and similar use of magical incantation—in this case, the ancient language taboo derived
from a belief in the active power of the word. Both Warren and Coleridge want us to accept that the ultimate creative attainment associated with the “deep delight” is not a mere figment of the imagination. It is rather a fearsome power of dark/light and of death/life that must be confronted with awe. Vincent A. King clarifies this point when he writes that Warren insists that “it is only by submitting to the knife, by bending one’s head in faith, that identity and vision are attained.”

Through the final echo of “deep delight,” Warren’s child-like repetition of “Tell me a story” (32) takes on an added dimension and should awaken within us a realization that inextricably pairs the dream with the nightmare.

In “A Poem of Pure Imagination: An Experiment in Reading,” Warren quotes from a Coleridge letter and reveals an important premise that is central to both poets: “... I believe most steadfastly in original sin; that from our mother’s womb our understandings are darkened; and even where our understandings are in the light, that our organization is depraved and our volitions imperfect. . . .”

On the one hand, both Coleridge and Warren are drawn to the hardcore materialism inspired by science in each of their ages—what Warren calls the “anonymous, devouring life-flux.” However, Warren also expresses his impatience with the domination of this vision when in his Coleridge essay he argues that Coleridge was not completely enamored with Hartley’s “doctrine of necessity.”

Daniel Duane’s “Of Herons, Hags and History: Rethinking Robert Penn Warren’s Audubon: A Vision” offers a compelling argument that Warren’s philosophical skepticism opposes Warren’s “bloody gothic patina” with Audubon’s recoil “from the concrete towards the ideal” which “lets idealist temptation obscure the bald ugliness of material history.” When Warren writes about Audubon, Duane contends that Warren offers the “black blood” while his Audubon “declaws the wilderness via unconditional love for the not-me.”

Certainly Warren’s admiration for art as exemplified in “Pure and Impure Poetry” demands a refusal “to overspiritualize nature,” but this refusal is what permits our acceptance of the spirituality of the poem. In fact, Warren in his Audubon selection from American Literature: The Makers and the Making presents Audubon as a far more sophisticated artist than Duane suggests. According to Warren, “Audubon knew it was too late for his dream of man’s sinking into nature, and he could even praise, though in somewhat ambiguous inflections, the course of history that had rendered that dream anachronistic.”

One may see both Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan” and Warren’s Audubon as celebrations of human vision but only if one admits that this celebration must include the imperfection and imperfectability of the sources of that vision. John Burt offers the best explanation for Warren’s dark coupling of external and internal energy: “... where Warren confronts the impersonal energies of nature, he also confronts what is least personal but most compelling in his own imaginative force.”

We must then ask ourselves the significance of Warren’s insistence that Audubon be seen as “A Vision” and how this relates to the more obvious play upon vision in “Kubla Khan.” Neither Coleridge nor Warren intends to hide the importance of a primary historical source that operates as the inspiration for each poem. In his preface, Coleridge tells us of falling asleep while reading Purchas his Pilgrimage, or Relations of the World and the Religions observed in all Ages (1613) and claims that specific words and phrases within “Kubla Khan” have been taken from Samuel Purchas’s text. Likewise, Warren’s Audubon is blunt in its use of borrowed material. Section V, “The Sound of That Wind,” quotes directly from Audubon’s Ornithological Biography. We have in both cases a poetic vision awakened by a historical account.

Both Coleridge and Warren see the historical narrative—the words—as the door through which they are permitted to enter the dream or vision. However, once incorporated within vision, the orig-
inal narratives are superseded by the poets’ reliving of the past and become secondary to the poetic language which seeks the sign in absolute harmony with the living past. The vision, as Coleridge explains, comes to him in his “profound sleep” as a “composition in which all the images rose up before him as things, with a parallel production of the correspondent expressions, without any sensation or consciousness of effort.” Crucial is the belief that the word and thing are, within the quintessential poetic creation, inseparable. The artist does not invent a language to represent the thing, rather the language “vision” offers an ideal correspondence to the sensory vision. If we return to Warren’s concluding section, “Tell Me a Story,” the story of “deep delight” would refer to the story in which language and sensory vision are one. The “name” of the story will be “time,” a name which must not be pronounced. Because the story will be of “this century, and moment,” because it is made “of great distance, and starlight” (32), we accept that the story must have the specificity of time and also reach beyond that specificity. It must capture within its word (and by implication wordlessness) the secret of time (and by implication timelessness).

Warren, like Coleridge, contemplates the grand role of the artist, but Warren also finds within Coleridge’s “Kubla Khan” a basis for his habitual skepticism. The situation that Coleridge describes in the prefatory note to his poem (whether factual or fictional) emphasizes how he awakens with “a distinct recollection of the whole” and feverishly sets to work to reproduce this wholeness of image and word. But once he is interrupted, he discovers “that though he still retained some vague and dim recollection of the general purport of the vision, yet, with the exception of some eight or ten scattered lines and images, all the rest had passed away like the images on the surface of a stream into which a stone has been cast, but alas! without the after restoration of the latter!” As expressed by the title, we are left with a fragmented vision, one in which the artist must accept that the originally perceived wholeness is beyond his grasp and the final product is an incomplete expression of the initial realization.

Warren duplicates Coleridge’s fragmentation by deliberately organizing his poem as a series of photographs. As he explains in an interview, “I did it in fragments, sort of snapshots of Audubon.” The concept of art as fragmentation of reality is as central to Warren’s vision as it is to Coleridge’s. Warren expresses his theme in a letter to Howard Moss: “No man is ‘real’ except in so far as he creates his reality, discovers the true, central passion that may give meaning to his life.” The difficulty occurs with the creation of a reality, an act which must be performed to attain authenticity but an act which will also reveal the limitations of human vision. What Warren describes in his essay on Welty’s fictional use of Audubon as “an irony of limit and contamination” is twice dramatized in Warren’s Audubon: first in “Was Not the Lost Dauphin” with Audubon’s slaying the heron and later in “The Dream He Never Knew the End Of” with Audubon’s near-death experience. Both cases pair death with vision. In the first case, Audubon sees the heron in flight, then realizes that he must kill it in order to render it with minute accuracy. In flight, the heron appears black against the red dawn: “black against / the color of God’s blood spilt, as though/ Pulled by a string,” but Audubon sees the heron differently in his mind: “In my mind it is white” (3). In his letter to Moss, Warren explains the importance of this double vision: “... the image in nature, black against the red dawn, and the image defined by the mind: on one hand experience by immersion in nature (‘love’) on contrast [sic] with meaning by abstraction, definition (‘knowledge”). Duane seems to simplify this double vision when he argues that Audubon dismisses “the moment’s black bird for an essentially white one” because he “recoils from the concrete towards the ideal, he lets idealist temptation obscure the bald ugliness of material history.” The meaning of Warren’s double vision seems much closer to Werner Heisenberg’s explanation of the uncertainty
involved in describing an atomic event. In Physics and Philosophy, Heisenberg imagines a powerful microscope that would have the capability of "observing" an atomic event. Whereas some might imagine that such an observation would settle the particle/wave argument, Heisenberg explains that "the knowledge of the position of a particle is complementary to the knowledge of its velocity or momentum. If we know the one with high accuracy we cannot know the other with high accuracy; still we must know both for determining the behavior of the system." Thus Heisenberg concludes, "This again emphasizes a subjective element in the description of atomic event, since the measuring device has been constructed by the observer, and we have to remember that what we observe is not nature in itself but nature exposed to our method of questioning." Similarly, the heron, black against red sky, is nature in motion and reveals to the observer what we might term "knowledge of momentum." When Audubon shoots the heron from the sky and brings it to earth, he may observe the heron minutely as "particle," but this will inevitably remove the heron from its natural state (flight as motion). Neither observation is "correct," as what we observe “is not nature in itself but nature exposed to our method of questioning.” To translate this twentieth-century insight into Warren’s contemplation of Audubon's nineteenth-century world, the “dream of man’s sinking into nature” is no longer possible. Or as Warren translates the idea in “American Portrait: Old Style” as an expression of the specific role of imagination: “What imagination is—it is only / The lie we must learn to live by, if ever / We mean to live at all.” The blackness and whiteness of the heron are dependent upon both the heron’s reality within nature and upon how we observe the heron ("nature exposed to our method of questioning"). The “snapshots” that Warren imagines recognize that art (Audubon’s painting or Warren’s poem) “fragment” nature in order to “see” nature more clearly, but in so doing, expose nature to another “method of questioning.” This problem is nicely expressed in Marshall Walker’s article on Audubon: “The question is whether the poet’s subjective ordering of the scene to his aesthetic satisfaction results in a true picture of the world, whether truth of coherence is also truth of correspondence.” To apply Heisenberg’s principle of indeterminacy, truth of coherence and truth of correspondence can be seen as complementary but can never yield a singular, “true” image.

Warren extends this problem within a second dramatic moment, a moment which re-emphasizes that to exist within the momentum of life limits one’s vision. In “The Dream He Never Knew the End Of” Audubon has been warned that the hag and her sons are about to kill him, but he is overcome by a lassitude which will not permit him to defend himself. When the “door bursts open” and he is suddenly rescued by three travelers, his realization is that “now he will never know the dream’s ending” (13). This abrupt interruption of the dream directly parallels Coleridge’s explanation of the interruption which prevented his complete retention of the poem and left him with only a “fragment.” Warren extends Coleridge’s concept of the lost ideal by introducing death as the means of completing the vision. Thus Warren stresses the importance of recognizing that “to walk in the world” is to live with motion and to record this reality means the acceptance of fragmented or incomplete vision.

Warren’s focus on the complex relationship between imagination and reality begins early in “The Dream He Never Knew the End Of” as Audubon envisions the face before the woman opens the door to her cabin:

What should he recognize? The nameless face
In the dream of some pre-dawn cock-crow—about to say what,
Do what? The dregs
Of all nightmares are the same, and we call it
Life. He knows that much, being a man,
And knows that the dregs of all life are nightmare.
Unless
Unless what? (6)
The interplay is between the internal and external. “Being a man,” Audubon knows that life is the dregs of nightmares and nightmares the dregs of life, but this suggests only a dark, hopeless entanglement of the internal/external. The possibility of rising above this mire is merely hinted by the alternative “unless,” but Audubon cannot clearly formulate this alternative. The mystery becomes clearer when the woman and her sons rise to kill him:

And knows
He has entered the tale, knows
He has entered the dark hovel
In the forest where trees have eyes, knows it is the tale
They told him when he was a child, knows it
Is the dream he had in childhood but never
Knew the end of, only
The scream. (11)

This fearsome childhood “tale” prepares us for the poem’s final section, “Tell Me a Story” and final line, “Tell me a story of deep delight” (32). Again, we realize the light tone of the ending is deceptive for the “tale” and “dream” must incorporate darkness and death and are similar to Coleridge’s evocation of the demonic: “A savage place! As holy and enchanted / As e’er beneath a waning moon was haunted / By woman wailing for her demon lover”! The primal element within both poems harkens back to the oral tradition of folk tale. Warren’s “dark hovel” and “trees with eyes” exist within the early realm of the imagination—in pre-literate culture and in childhood. Completion (or perfection) of the tale means both creative attainment and death, again suggesting the awesome force of creativity concluding “Kubla Khan.”

With death approaching, Warren’s Audubon cannot understand why “a lassitude sweetens his limbs” (12). Before Audubon is rescued, he reaches his private moment of intense longing, a moment that restricts him from epiphany: “It is too late. Oh, oh, the world! / Tell me the name of the world” (12). The life-saving interruption rescues him from ultimate attainment, which is both the end of the tale and the name of the world. His continued earthly state requires his confusion and his incompleteness. If we equate this interruption to Coleridge’s account of his creation of “Kubla Khan,” we can see that both interruptions prevent the completion of the song, poem, and tale. The artist is left with his fragment, but if we also consider Coleridge’s final dream of “deep delight,” we can see that without such an “interruption” of mundane reality (the unwanted guests that divide the prophet poet from his ultimate epiphany), the creative force would really “save” us from life; the vision would carry us into the salvation of death. Later, as Warren’s hag hangs from the tree, Audubon suspects that she now possesses the completion of the dream: “From the first, without motion, frozen / In a rage of will, an ecstasy of iron, as though / This was the dream that, lifelong, she had dreamed toward” (16). Section III, “We are Only Ourselves,” a mere four lines, tells us that “we are only ourselves, and that promise” (19). And as for Audubon, “He continued to walk in the world” (19). To create art while walking in the world is to create the fragment of the poem and the incomplete tale. According to Justus, “Warren emphasized the gap between the semiotics of the world and the human ability to read the signs correctly.” The poet continues to seek “the name of the world,” but “to walk in the world” means to be restricted from its name. What Justus sees as Warren’s realistic assessment of the poet’s attainment falls well short of the “promise” beyond “ourselves”: “. . . the poet’s recognition that lessons learned are apt to be transitory, that wisdom is process, not product, and innocence and rage are destined to coexist in uneasy equilibrium.” What Warren discovers in Coleridge’s account of the vision of Xanadu includes not only Coleridge’s dream of word and image formulated into a perfect wholeness, but also the inevitable interruption (of world, of flesh) that drives the poet back into the world.
The visions that both Coleridge and Warren create are intensely sweet and savage. In fact, Warren's use of "sweet" within the context of his poem is inseparable from the savage. The bear in the beginning "feels his own fat sweeten" (4); when the hag watches the gold watch around her neck, "her face / Is sweet in an outrage of sweetness, so that / His gut twists cold" (8). When Audubon feels death approaching, "lassitude / Sweetens his limbs" and "the saliva / In his mouth tastes sweet" (12). Later, as an alternative to his wandering, Audubon imagines how he might "at night nuzzle / The hazelnut-shaped sweet tits of Lucy." This sweetness suggests a longing for innocence close to the savage core. Like Warren's simple plea, "Tell me a story," we must be aware of an artistic context in which romantic innocence exists on the edge of naturalistic indulgence and fury:

The bear's tongue, pink as a baby's, out-crrips to the curled lip,  
It bleeds the black blood of the blueberry.

The teeth are more importantly white  
Than has ever been imagined. (4)

Given the naturalistic depths of Warren's play upon sweetness (and on Melvillian whiteness), Brooks and Warren's tender explanation of the role of Coleridge's Abyssinian maid takes on added dimensions: "She is from a far-away land, playing a music of unutterable sweetness calculated to inspire one to recreate the Khan's paradise." From this view, even the simple plea with which Coleridge concludes his prefatory note to "Kubla Khan" (misquoting Theocritus) takes on a darker tone: "I shall sing a sweeter song tomorrow: but the tomorrow is yet to come."
Or Else Poem / Poems 1968-1974 is conceived,” Robert Penn Warren tells us in a prefatory note, “as a single long poem composed of a number of shorter poems as sections or chapters.” To what extent is the title’s assertion—both Poems and Poem—a valid claim? James Justus writes of “the directions for reading this volume playfully handed over to the reader, who must decide: is it a six-year collection of diverse poems ...? or is it a single poem conceived as a sequence? It is something of both.” Dave Smith finds that Warren “has caused his 32 poems to operate as something like panels which form a loose sequential movement .... In an especially canny but not unpredictable strategy—if one has noted Warren’s long habit of binding poems into thematic sequences Warren has constructed the poems of Or Else as reflectors, baffles, mirrors, and back-lights .... [I]t is through the juxtaposition and oblique continuities of remarkably varied poems that the form of Or Else creates a vision at once dynamic, complex, and emblematic.”

Having found evidence of a strong sequential structure in Warren’s last four poetic collections (Now and Then, Being Here, Rumor Verified, and Altitudes and Extensions), as well as in his first (Thirty-six Poems), I have recently tried to determine if such could also be said of Or Else. I have found that it can, and in the space available here, I wish to present the first part of a detailed reading of that collection carried out along the same lines as those I had earlier made of the others. While the principal theme of my study is the sequential echoing structure of the collection, there is a secondary one as well, the Danae and Perseus myth that increasingly appears to me to be an essential part of Warren’s personal poetic mythology.