


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

The tyger william blake questions and answers pdf

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

Detailed Summary and AnalysisThe poem is told from the perspective of a child. Moreover, Christians often refer to Jesus as the “Lamb of God,” and it makes sense for the food to turn up at the Easter table. Q. The poem sees in the figure of the lamb an expression of God’s will and the beauty of God’s creation. The use of simple language subsequently creates an innocent and childlike speaker. The lamb in Christianity represents Christ as both suffering and victorious; it a sacrificial animal, and can also symbolize gentleness, innocence, and purity. The Lamb by William Blake DRAFT. What is the main idea of the lamb?Ans. I created this site to provide you with tips and resources for homeschooling. Life, food, clothing and soft noises describe the lamb’s physical climate. 0. The stream here is the water of life, and the meadows and valleys are created for the lambs and children for free enjoyment. WILLIAM BLAKE(1757-1827) -THE LAMB Summary The speaker, identifying himself as a child, asks a series of questions of a little lamb, and then answers the questions for the lamb. Compare two poems by William Blake, The Tyger and The Lamb, by using a TWIST analysis: Tone, Word Choice, Imagery, Style, Theme. Source: The Complete Poetry and Prose of William Blake , edited by David E. Erdman (Anchor Books, 1988) Similarly one may ask, what is the theme of the poem The Tyger by William Blake? It has repetition, an easy rhyme scheme, and a pleasant rhythm. In the first stanza, Blake asks the lamb if it ... This poem is meant to be viewed in relation and contrast to “The Lamb,” demonstrating the “two opposing states of the human ... The Tyger by William Blake is taken from The Songs of Experience. Who is the speaker in this poem? Discussion Questions for “The Lamb” and “The Tyger” and other Blake poems **Answer questions on your own paper and attach to this handout. Perform the Reader’s Theater version of the poem found in. The Tyger is drawn from The Songs of Experience written by William Blake. Inr ‘The Lamb ‘ the world of experience is noticeably absent. Child labor presentation. It’s just describes in loving terms. The poem is written in a simple trochaic meter in rhymed couplets. “The Lamb” by William Blake provides a simple and profound answer to a simple and profound question: Who made us? “The Tyger, Incr” uses symbolism. It places spirituality in a natural setting through God. “The Lamb” promotes a joyful and trustful tone by depicting an image where the child speaker talks directly to the lamb with his simplistic vocabulary on a... the speaker’s questions in lines 1-2 and 9-10 suggest that the subject of “the lamb... Read the lesson on William Blake’s poems titled, The Tyger and the Lamb: Summary & Analysis, to learn more about Blake’s craft and how these two poems relate to ... According to the second stanza, who made the Lamb? What does the lamb represent most? William Blake was an English poet and visual artists active in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. How does the poem make you feel about the creator of the Lamb? Charles Blake Wiltshire. If you wanted to add the perspective of “experience” to “The Lamb,” a poem about innocence, what details might you include? Q. Q. (Blake 130 Line 20). Hint: Look towards the end of the second stanza. The interconnected and repeated questions are both simple and deep – who made thee? Short Summary. • A 14 slide presentation that provides background information about William Blake and his poetry, discussion points, videos, and answers to the assignment for whole class review. The image of a fuzzy lamb immediately warms the reader’s heart. How do words and pictures mingle in Blake’s illustrated version of the poem? The second stanza can be considered to the answer of the first stanza. Why do Christians eat lamb?Ans. SURVEY . The “He” referred to in the Click to share on Facebook (Opens in new window), Click to share on Twitter (Opens in new window), Click to share on Pinterest (Opens in new window), Click to email this to a friend (Opens in new window), Click to share on WhatsApp (Opens in new window), Click to share on Reddit (Opens in new window), Click to share on Telegram (Opens in new window). Home The Poems of William Blake Q & A Ask a question and get answers from your fellow students and educators. The second stanza features a circular/symmetrical rhyme scheme of a/b/a/c/d/d/c/b/a/a. As he reveals in this poem, Blake himself maintained the beautiful ability to see life from a childlike point of view. In the first stanza, the poet asks the lamb a number of rhetorical questions about the One who has given it such traits. What reason might Blake have had for presenting the archetypes in pairs in “The Lamb” and “The Tyger”? The child knows that the one who created him is the same being that created the Lamb, in lines 17 and 18, Blake writes: “I a child & thou a lamb/ We are called by his name”. What is the rhyme scheme of this poem? Line 23: The child in the Innocence version of the poem cries “weep!” The second stanza features a circular/symmetrical rhyme scheme of AA BC DD CB AA. In “The Tyger,” what is offered as contrast to the tiger? What is the theme of the lamb?Ans. ... William Blake did not like chimneys. In fact, lambs as baby sheep are related to the childhood theme that runs throughout the Songs of Innocence. The Lamb Summary – What is the theme of “The Lamb” by William Blake? In the opening lines, we don’t know for sure whether the lamb is just a lamb or something else. The poem begins with the question, “Little Lamb, who madethee?” The speaker, a child, asks the lamb about its origins: howit came into being, how it acquired its particular manner of feeding,its “clothing” of wool, its “tender voice.” In the next stanza,the speaker attempts a riddling answer to his own question: the lambwas made by one who “calls himself a Lamb,” one who resembles inhis gentleness both the child and the lamb. Other significant theme of the poem is innocence and simplicity. He poses some questions and then answers them. This latter identification is explicit in “The Lamb.” The Question and Answer sections of our study guides are a great resource to ask questions, find answers, and discuss literature. Q. Good? Which phrases are repeated in this poem? This question is one of the most profound and spiritual questions asked by the poet William Blake and he is well familiar that it’s the same Omni-potent that created the tiger who created the lamb as well. Q. Q. Let’s begin interpreting William Blake’s poetry with an analysis of “The Lamb” by William Blake. The Lamb was created by him who has the same name as the lamb. Answer: This is one of the profoundest and most mystical questions that is asked by the poet, William Blake, and he knows it very well that it is the same Almighty who has made the tiger who has made the lamb also. Fiocchi 20 Gauge Hulls, Reflex Sight With Dovetail Mount, Walter Reed Rei Clinic, Hoi Nba Players 2020, Peace Officer Certification, Wet Charcoal Grill, 1969 Chevy C20 Engine, Cadillac White Diamond Pearl Paint, None of the “duets” Blake included in his Songs of Innocence and of Experience contains more questions than the pair of lyrics that will be the focus of this essay, “The Lamb” and “The Tyger.” And none of these questions provokes more critical speculation than the experienced speaker’s “Did he who made the Lamb make thee?” It is just one of the unanswered queries of “The Tyger,” but it catches the eye and inflames the pen the most.For example, Damon pays attention to the question in his monumental William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols (277-78), and Paley, in his splendid survey of criticism of “The Tyger” (chapter 2, “Tyger of Wrath,” of his Energy and the Imagination), responds to Damon’s analysis (39) and then refers to the question again in his discussions of “the sublime of terror” and of Los’s furnaces. Chapter 16 (“The Tyger”) of Raine opens and closes with this question; Wagenknecht quotes it near the beginning of his chapter “The Lamb and The Tyger” (80) and then comes back to it repeatedly. Peterfreund, on the other hand, concludes his “Power Tropes” by considering “the status of [this] question.” Though other questions precede and follow it, critical intuition or simply sensitivity to sense and structure suggests that this is the climax of the poem’s (or indeed the poems’) questioning. In fact, sensitivity to the structure of “The Tyger” should suggest one response to this question, which, though seemingly obvious, is seldom, if ever, given. Immediately after “Did he who made the Lamb make thee?” comes the famous repetition—the lines that constitute the beginning of the poem, that open “The Tyger.” By repeating the lines Blake actually identifies the question’s “thee” and indicates its addressee: it is not a tyger or, worse, a tiger.The “beasts of prey” that appear in chapter 2 of Paley (30-60) are thoroughly symbolic, but those that haunt chapter 16 of Raine (2: 3-31) are not, nor is Peterfreund’s “tiger,” which is reified as the speaker of experience “buys into Newtonian metonymic logic of natural theology” (134; see 134-38). Neither is the “tiger” that inspires Hernadi’s question “What are the social and political implications of Blake’s contrast between the domesticated lamb grazing on English pastures and the fierce tiger, chiefly roaming in untamed India?,” which he asks to illustrate the way that “new avenues of interpretation keep opening up” in our “post-colonial age” (69n11), but “Tyger Tyger burning bright, / In the forests of the night.” In other words, he emphasizes his experienced poem’s self-referential character and, in effect, suggests the answer (or at least an answer) to its climactic question. Did he who made “The Lamb” also make “Tyger Tyger burning bright”? Of course he did, because there is one and the same maker behind the two works—William Blake, who was perfectly aware of the provocation his work offered and who made it part of his artistic program aimed at “rouz[ing] the faculties to act.”Adapted from Blake’s letter to Dr. Trusler of 23 August 1799. Roused by Trusler’s objections concerning the obscurity of his work, Blake replied: “You say that I want somebody to Elucidate my Ideas. But you ought to know that What is Grand is necessarily obscure to Weak men. That which can be made Explicit to the Idiot is not worth my care. The wisest of the Ancients considered what is not too Explicit as the fittest for Instruction because it rouses the faculties to act” (E 702). Without doubt the self-referential element of “The Tyger” is Blake’s way to add more fuel to the fires of experience to let them burn all the brighter. However, this self-referential turn is not an independent act but a part of the program as a whole, and it cannot be effectively performed before an unprepared audience, on an unprepared stage. Let me therefore return to it later, at a more mature stage of this reflection, after I explain how I understand the idea of this performance. Indeed, just like its self-referential turn, “The Tyger” as a whole cannot be treated as an independent act either. Its climactic question, by referring explicitly to “the Lamb,” suggests that “The Tyger” itself constitutes only part of this program. In other words, the poem of Experience should not be discussed in isolation from the poem of Innocence, which is likewise implied by the manner in which Blake published the two works.It is well known that the Songs of Innocence were published separately in 1789 and then, in 1794, incorporated into the combined volume of Songs of Innocence and of Experience. This is to say, “The Tyger” should not be discussed separately from “The Lamb,” a connection that is often ignored in critical practice; as Wagenknecht puts it, “most critics have used the cryptic simplicity of ‘The Lamb’ as a pretext for saying nothing about it” (80). They are programmed to form a whole, and only as parts of this whole, through the interaction into which they enter while combined, do they reveal their potential to provoke, stimulate, rouse. They throw light and shadow upon each other. They satirizeThe “double-edged irony” of the Songs was most memorably emphasized by Frye: “The Songs of Experience are satires, but one of the things that they satirize is the state of innocence. They show us the butcher’s knife which is waiting for the unconscious lamb. Conversely, the Songs of Innocence satirize the state of experience, as the contrast which they present to it makes its hypocrisies more obviously shameful” (237). and, simultaneously, illumine each other; they mock themselves and, at the same time, give an enthusiastic license to the attitudes they promote—when seen in this shade and this light. Such a shadowy reading of the illuminated pair has of course been attempted, yet none of the analyses gives a full account of the poems’ dynamic nature, their shifts of perspective, and the range of attitudes inscribed in them by their provocative author, he who made both “The Lamb” and “The Tyger,” the tyger and the lamb. To return to the theatrical metaphor, which will to some extent organize the first stage of this discussion: the most vital element of the preparation of the audience is to redirect their attention. They come to the theatre with certain expectations: they are obviously familiar with the songs they are about to hear, and hence redirecting their attention consists largely in drawing it slightly away from ontological/metaphysical exploration itself and focusing it more upon the form that this exploration takes. As I mentioned, none of the duets Blake included in his Songs asks more questions than these two lyrics. That is to say, Blake himself makes an effort to draw our attention to questions, possibly because of their ambiguity. A question may be asked when the answer is genuinely sought, which means that it is not known. While betraying the questioner’s ignorance, such a question simultaneously reveals his/her knowledge: s/he knows that s/he does not know the answer (and that is why s/he asks the question); s/he has enough knowledge to formulate the query. Then again, some questions, like those asked rhetorically, may imply that the questioner knows the answer very well (or, sometimes, that s/he knows very well that there is no answer). In brief, questions provoke questions concerning their status, and Blake seems to rely upon the ambiguity they entail for the effect he wants to achieve—for the stimulation, for rousing the audience’s faculties to act. As for the preparation of the stage upon which the performance is given, three critical decisions will serve the purpose. The first is to remove everything that could disturb or distract; in the case of Blake’s Songs (or any performance based on Blake), this means in particular sweeping up very carefully the cobwebs of morality. The second element is to push backwards metaphysical inquiries, so that they do not form a certain that obscures the performance but are hung at the rear of the stage, mainly as a backdrop. And the third critical decision is to place the speaker’s lyrics at the front of the stage and adjust the spotlights so that sometimes one of these speakers is more visible, sometimes the other, and at other times both stand in focus. “The Lamb.” Songs of Innocence and of Experience copy F (1789, 1794). Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection. B1978.43.1556. The beginning of the performance is simple. It starts with the spotlight focused solely on the speaker of innocence, with the speaker of “The Tyger” invisible; in other words, it begins with “The Lamb” as part of the separately published Songs of Innocence. Read in this way, the lyric presents itself, indisputably, as an exposition of innocence, which gets defined as the poem’s questions find their confident answers. The speaker is a child; his identity does not need to be inferred but is revealed as directly as could be wished (“I a child”); even his sex is indicated in the illustration provided by the author. The speaker’s identity is also reflected on the level of sounds: the poem’s easily pronounceable “Little Lamb who made thee”; its smooth “Gave thee clothing of delight”; its rhymes, which make the whole easy to remember, like a nursery rhyme. In this mood, the poem’s repetitions acquire a childlike tinge as well: the repeated questions and answers sound like the way children are taught or teach themselves about the world. The same is manifest in the poem’s vocabulary: its “meek & ... mild” adjectives, which refer largely to qualities that depend upon the senses—the touch (“softest”), the sight (“bright”), the hearing (“tender voice”)—and its nouns, which stand for concrete objects—the “stream,” the “mead,” the “vales,” the “child,” and the “lamb” are all names for what falls within the experience of a child of nature. In this light, the “Lamb,” He who made the world, seems to be incorporated within this range of the speaker’s experience as well; He is “meek” like the lamb, “mild” like its “tender” voice, which is echoed by—and spreads onto—the valleys that He made to sustain its life. This is probably why the questions about creation (“who made thee”), the sustenance of life (“bid thee feed”), and its aesthetic side in the first stanza find such an unimpeded answer. These are essentially the same questions as those that will be asked by the speaker of “The Tyger,” but here they seem and sound easy because of the ease with which the answer is given. As I said above, seen on its own, “The Lamb” defines the abstraction it represents and makes it as concrete as itself. Innocence emerges from such a reading as possessed of the most fundamental knowledge and as an embodiment of the highest wisdom, because only wisdom is able to answer the most essential questions without hesitation or doubt. But this outlook on innocence (and Innocence) is possible only as long as “The Lamb” remains locked within the confines of the state (and the collection) it represents, that is, only when it is seen on its own, without any tygers on the horizon. The moment the other speaker steps into the spotlight, which is to say, the moment the poem is read along with the counterpart its maker provided in Songs of Experience, hesitation and doubt appear concerning the nature and definition of innocence. Most explicitly, by asking his climactic question, the speaker of “The Tyger” makes it clear that he knows about tigers as well as lambs. This does not seem to apply to the speaker of innocence. As far as the creation goes, he knows only (about) the lamb, and the doubt that appears at this point concerns precisely what he would say if he found himself in a different valley; how would he answer if he knew more? He also knows about the Lamb. But, doubt prompts us to ask, how much does he know? Is he aware that the meek and mild nature of the Lamb, which he emphasizes, makes it a perfect sacrificial animal? In other words, is he aware of the implications of what he is saying? And another doubt follows: how is it that he actually knows about the Lamb? Would a child really come up with the argument that this child provides in his answer? Would a child generate such an entirely language-based equation (“I a child & thou a lamb, / We are called by his name”)?The illustration for “The Lamb,” particularly in its depiction of the child, is again remarkable in this context. Discussing him along with other details of the etching, Wagenknecht draws attention to “the slightly stiff unchildlike gesture of the infant” (81; emphasis mine). Is the child’s answer, which stresses the unity of the creator (the Lamb who became a little child) and the created (the lamb and the child himself), really intuitive? Is it indeed based on the child’s experience? (Let us remember, “The Lamb” is not a poem of Experience.) The answer stanza, which is based on linguistic association, sounds largely disconnected from the question stanza; it seems completely abstracted from the sensual details of delight, from the valley in which the questions are asked. So perhaps in the answer stanza, as in the other parts of this utterance, the child is simply repeating—this time not himself, but those who taught him the smooth equation, who teach by repeating and asking the child to repeat. In short, the foundations upon which the speaker of Innocence builds his certainty seem uncertain. No longer confined to the limits of Innocence, but seen in the light, or indeed the shadow, that Experience sheds upon it, the knowledge of the spokesman of innocence seems restricted; “The Lamb” no longer sounds like another romantic poem about the wisdom of children, about the child as “father of the man.” Completely unaware of the complications and implications, asking questions only in order to repeat the ready answers, questioning but not inquisitive enough, innocence, when viewed in the shade of experience, emerges as an exhibition of ignorance. On the other hand, read in this dim light, or indeed in the shade of innocence’s ignorance, experience manifests itself as knowledge. As I pointed out above, its speaker knows about tigers as well as lambs, possibly all types of lambs—the bleating lambs, the bleeding lambs, the bleeding Lamb. And he knows much more—in fact, he asks so many questions because he knows so much. Unlike the speaker of innocence, the speaker of experience does not unveil his face; no matter how sharp the spotlight, it will never fully reveal his features.In fact, we cannot even be sure of the speaker’s sex. My reliance on gender-specific language, fully justifiable in the case of the speaker of innocence, is, in the case of the speaker of experience, motivated mainly by convenience. because in the state of experience nothing is given without effort on the part of the receiver, nothing is handed on a plate. The experienced voice only implies the identity of its source, and the ear that listens to this voice must work to infer whom it is listening to on the basis of what the speaker says and how it is said. “The Tyger.” Songs of Innocence and of Experience copy F (1789, 1794). Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection. B1978.43.1573. From the very beginning, this voice attacks the listener with the harshness of the sounds it utters, with the vigor of its rhythms and rhymes. Indeed, heard after the previous speaker’s performance, “The Tyger” sounds like an advanced exercise in the art (the word used in line 9) of rhyming. It is patterned through its six stanzas into flawless couplets,including the seemingly irregular “eye”—“symmetry,” which in the mouth of Blake’s speaker did rhyme (see Bentley 116-17), like “Fly”—“enmity” or “Eye”—“Eternity” in “Auguries of Innocence” (lines 33-34, 67-68, E 490-91) or “family”—“die” in pl. 27 of Jerusalem (E 173). Similarly, see Wordsworth’s “high”—“sanctity” and “sky”—“mortality,” both from one stanza/paragraph of canto 7 (lines 1846-47 and 1852-53, H 416) of The White Doe of Rylstone, or the triplet “sky”—“imagery”—“eye” from “Elegiac Musings” (lines 19-21, H 583), whereas the speaker of “The Lamb” seemed unable to sustain the consistency of the rhyming scheme through two simple stanzas. Another striking thing is the extent to which the innocent speaker’s rhyming relied on repetition—at the beginning of each stanza (“thee”—“thee”), at the end (“thee”—“thee”), and in the middle of the second stanza (“name”—“Lamb”, “lamb”—“name”)—as if he ran out of rhymes because his word stock was too poor. By contrast, the speaker of experience has plenty to draw from. His words are by no means limited to what the eye can see or the hand can touch. The first stanza’s adjective “immortal” or its abstract noun “symmetry” make this point visible, indeed glaring, burning bright: the poem’s fluency is impressive when read against the concrete vocabulary of the first stanza of its innocent counterpart. Again, when the experienced speaker uses verbs, they are much more refined than the verbs of innocence (compare the second stanzas’ “aspire” to “is”—“became” in the second stanza of “The Lamb”). He can go for the less obvious synonym (compare the first stanza’s “frame” with “made” in the first stanza of “The Lamb”). More than that, he can actually multiply synonyms: “sieve,” “grasp,” “clasp.” Also, when it comes to concrete nouns, the experienced speaker is not limited to the surface, to what covers the skin (the “clothing wooly bright”), but he knows what is hidden under it (“the sinews of [the] heart”). He does not rely upon what is general (compare the forms of “make,” which are used five times within the first stanza of “The Lamb”), but knows enough to be specific, to enumerate the concrete tools required in the process of making: “hammer,” “chain,” “furnace,” “anvil.” All the more strikingly, the speaker of experience knows enough to talk in a way that refers the audience to what they know. While trying to envision the artisan/the maker whose art could twist those sinews and whose hand or shoulder, or eye, could/dared handle these tools in whatever “deeps or skies,” he speaks a language that evokes associations with, for example, the fires of Vulcan/Hephaestus as much as with Prometheus’s gift (or theft) of fire: “What the hand, dare sieze the fire?” The preceding question, “On what wings dare he aspire?,” placed immediately before an allusion to Prometheus, brings to mind yet another ancient myth and prompts us to ask, were the wings of him who made the tyger like those of Daedalus or like those of Icarus? In other words, did he control the course of his flight? While making the tyger, did the maker know what he was doing? Is the tyger an element of a plan? Or, perhaps, is it an accident resulting from the fact that the maker lost himself, got carried away? The speaker of experience uses language that justifies even Raine’s references to (in order of appearance) Boehme, Paracelsus, Heraclitus, Berkeley, Mosheim, Lardner, Priestley, Cerinthus, Fludd, Agrippa, Hermes Trismegistus, the alchemists and the Gnostics, and their “ambiguous” demiurge (Raine 2: 3-31). His words validate these and many other references because they are handled in a way that seems to be a deliberate, conscious evocation. The speaker is intelligent, and he is a poet (we could even risk using Bloom’s phrase “the Bard of Experience”).Bloom 137; emphasis mine. The phrase seems quite relevant in this context, though the construct itself that Bloom arrives at is best characterized by Paley as “entirely read into the poem” (Paley 40). he knows how to be maximally concise and maximally suggestive at the same time. Most importantly in our context, the speaker is knowledgeable; while thinking of the implications of what he says, the audience, Blake’s readers or critics, do not seem to be in danger of knowing more than he knows. The innocent speaker’s words (for example, “he calls himself a Lamb”) refer the audience to what the speaker seems not to know (for example, the sacrificial implications of the Lamb). The experienced speaker, on the other hand, by the way he picks words and by the images he selects, suggests that he knows the whole range of myths and religions that critics have brought up in a century and a half of critical interpretation of “The Tyger.”Following Paley (37), I regard Swinburn’s William Blake: A Critical Essay (1868)—“both a critical biography and a manifesto of radical poetics” (Kuduk 253)—as the starting point of the long history of critics’ endeavors to determine the poem’s implications. For a survey of criticism followed by a list of 113 books, book chapters, and articles, see Borowsky. His list could obviously be expanded by texts that appeared after it was created; for more recent contributions, see G. E. Bentley, Jr.’s “William Blake and His Circle,” published annually in Blake. All these details considered, experience seems to communicate knowledge. And yet, although the spokesman of experience can generalize and look under the skin, though he is aware of implications and complications and, as Wagenknecht puts it, has “access ... to technical insights” (91), he is unable to handle the essentials. Indeed, experience is unable to answer the fundamental question—who/what immortal hand or eye made thee?—that innocence answers without hesitation or doubt. In other words, experience is underlaid by the most elementary ignorance. It does not even know the most basic thing: how to make itself useful. Having asked “Did he who made the Lamb make thee?,” the speaker of experience reverts to the questions he asked at the beginning. All the energy put into the formulation of the intermediate questions has been wasted, the whole exertion—of the speaker’s brain and heart—futile. Or, perhaps, even worse than futile, if we look at the detail that tends to attract a lot of critical attention.See, for example, Nurmi (680), Grant (75), Wagenknecht (85-86), and Peterfreund (137), the disparity between the first stanza’s more neutral “could” and the last stanza’s awe-inspiring “dare.” Employing his entire knowledge to envision the creature and the maker all the more precisely, the speaker progresses from seeing “fearful symmetry” (line 4) to perceiving “deadly terrors” (line 16); what in line 8 was “the hand” of the maker by line 12 has become a “dread hand” possessed of a “dread grasp” (line 15). No words of the speaker suggest that any change whatsoever has taken place in the maker or the tyger; it seems that they are as they were before all these intermediate questions have been asked. Thus, the change seems to have occurred not in what is being described but entirely in the mind of the subject who produces the description. Perhaps he did start by asking questions about the tyger and its maker, but he evidently ends up inquiring about the constructs of his own mind.In this context, it is good to remember Raine’s reminder that, in The Four Zoas, “the tigers ... are created by Urizen” (2: 4). Somewhere along the way the act of describing got detached from the object of the description. This is clearly visible in the tiger Blake drew under the poem, which is not “ferocious.”The word has been borrowed from Ferber; commenting on the reproduction of “The Tyger” in Phillips (William Blake: The Creation of the Songs: From Manuscript to Illuminated Printing [2000]), he writes parenthetically: “The ‘Tyger’ is the same as the one from Copy T in the Blake Trust/Princeton edition; it is, alas, no more ferocious than in other copies ...” (492), enough; to borrow Pagliaro’s memorable phrase, it looks like “a cat with a human face” (87) and is completely incompatible with the last line’s awesome “dare.” Let me repeat that such an application, indeed misapplication, of energy and exertion is not just futile. It is an intellectual error resulting from the speaker’s most elementary ignorance: he simply does not know what he is talking about. In brief, experience, which seemed to imply knowledge, compromises itself. It knows only how to ask questions, but does not know how to answer them, because its questions, fed by its “knowledge,” take it further and further away from the object of reflection. Viewed—or indeed reviewed—from this shadowy perspective where experience betrays its ignorance, innocence reestablishes itself as wisdom. It can ask and answer without exertion, with ease. It resolves the tension of a question by a prompt answer in a way that is as natural as exhaling after inhaling. Children of innocence answer with the simple “Yea, yea, Nay, nay” (Matthew 5.37), which is also how grown-ups of experience should answer (after all, the Lamb’s sermon on the mount was addressed to adults, to those who know of tygers, who have heard them roar). A little later in his gospel, Matthew records how Jesus “called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of [his disciples]. And said, Verily I say unto you. Except ye ... become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 18.2-3). Again, to assume the attitude of a child is certainly not a task for children: it is adults of experience who must train themselves in the wisdom of innocence—trust, rely on the word/Word rather than demonstration (“blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed”).Jesus’s words to doubting Thomas (John 20.29), learn what they have been taught, repeat and have faith in what they have been told. However much the tygers along the way have managed to roar the “tender voice” down, adults of experience must teach themselves again how to breathe, how to answer fundamental questions (“who made thee”) without hesitation or doubt. Paley is right to insist that Blake’s innocence is not an “illusion” (31). It never loses its validity. It has the power to reassert itself, no matter how many ironies experience heaps upon it. A good example is the innocent trust in “Mercy Pity Peace and Love” (“The Divine Image”). Experience, unlike a pretense of being a perceptive response / innocence’s naivetes, can ridicule it: “Mercy no more could be, / If all were as happy we are” (“The Human Abstract”). But the viewpoint offered by Blake’s mythology supports the innocent, not the perceptive, attitude. Mercy, being the forgiveness of sins, is confirmed as the first attribute of God (“The Divine Mercy / ... Redeems Man in the Body of Jesus Anem,” Jerusalem 32[36].54-55, E 179); love, mercy, pity, and peace emerge from Jerusalem as the genuine features of the Divine Image.See the subchapter “Love-Mercy

day, is just begun" (H 278). His best tigers function merely as metaphors, though they may be strikingly powerful, as in The Prelude, where revolutionary Paris is "a place of fear / Unfit for the repose of night, / Defenceless as a wood where tigers roam" (The Prelude [1805] 10.80-82). Intriguingly, according to Bateson (133), this passage was written a year or two after Wordsworth copied Blake's "The Tyger" into his commonplace-book (see also Paley 36). Jonathan Wordsworth claims, however, that "Blake poems, including 'The Divine Image' and 'The Tyger,' [were] copied by Wordsworth into his commonplace-book" in spring 1807, and that the first part of book 10 of The Prelude, including the passage in question, was written before summer 1804 (see The Prelude. The Four Texts xvi, xvii). But when Blake/Blake's lyrical "I" asks the question, it expresses the most fundamental guideline of his philosophy, his most sacred conviction about (the nature of) art. Commenting specifically on a statement by Wordsworth in the preface to the Poems of 1815—"The powers requisite for the production of poetry are, first, those of observation and description ..." (Poems by William Wordsworth 1: viii)—Blake writes: "One Power alone makes a Poet.—Imagination The Divine Vision" (E 665).For an extensive discussion of Blake's annotations to Wordsworth, see chapter 9 (160-76) of Adams, Blake's Margins. As he says in Milton (3.3-4, E 96) and then reiterates in Jerusalem,See Jerusalem 5.58-59 (E 148), 24.23 (E 169), 60.57 (E 211), and 74.13 (E 229). imagination is "the Divine Body of the Lord Jesus." And the same persuasion is expressed and expanded in The Laocoön: "The Eternal Body of Man is The IMAGINATION. / that is God himself / The Divine Body / JESUS" (E 273). Jerusalem's formulation of Los's "great task," quoted above, also contains the same conviction: "the Human Imagination" is "in the Bosom of God" (5.20). The rhymed verse in the preface "To the Public," which comes shortly before this formulation of Los's (and Blake's) poetic program, addresses the reader as "[lover] of books! [lover] of heaven, / And of that God from whom [all books are given]" (E 145); under it, Blake writes: "When this Verse was first dictated to me" Books—as much as individual poems—are not written, they are dictated, because "We who dwell on Earth can do nothing of ourselves, every thing is conducted by Spirits" (E 145). Every creative impulse comes from "distant deeps or skies." And if the "deeps" are indeed "hell," as Raine seems to believe (2: 19), it is important to remember that in The Marriage (which, Raine stresses repeatedly, was "written about the same time" as "The Tyger"),Raine is particularly emphatic on this point. The full opening sentence of her chapter 16, quoted in part in note 19 above, reads: "The question of good and evil, which forms the theme of The Marriage, was likewise the inspiration of 'The Tyger', written about the same time" (2: 3), and she repeats the information that "The Tyger" and The Marriage were "written about the same time" on p. 31. the printing in the infernal method, by corrosives, is likewise carried out in "Hell." For all these reasons, "The Tyger," Blake's supreme act as a lyricist, which, on one level, is a tribute to what imagination can perform "when the stars thr[o]w down their spears,"As Paley notes (supporting his argument with quotations from Boehme and Paracelsus), "the defeat of the stars," apart from the disarmament of reason, "signifies the casting off of both cosmic and internal constraint, freeing man to realize his potentially divine nature" (55; emphasis mine); then, however, Paley reduces the meaning of this image to revolutionary and social implications (56). is not narcissistic. It is an expression of man's surprise, awe, and amazement at something that does not in fact come from or pertain to man, that cannot be seen as man's achievement, because it was given: it is a gift.To quote Damon again, imagination "is the gift of the Holy Ghost" (A Blake Dictionary 195). The poem captures a human being as he trembles, feeling a stirring of the Spirit that works through him. As suggested above, the poem's self-referential character may be seen as yet another element of the provocation melted into the tissue of "The Tyger." But on deeper reflection, or, more precisely, on reflection illumined by Blake's later writings, this self-reflective character of experience only sounds like a provocation but is in fact an expression of the highest wisdom concerning the imagination and the fundamental unity of the human and the divine. To refer to the Blake Dictionary for the last time, imagination, "the basis of all art," was in Blake's opinion "the central faculty of both God and Man"; as Damon sums it up, "indeed, here the two [God and Man] become indistinguishable" (195; emphasis mine). In fact, "The Lamb" expresses the same wisdom. But it only talks about the unity of the human and the divine: He a child, I a child. "The Tyger," on the other hand, does not assert but executes this unity.Much like the "Introduction" to Experience, which, according to Raine, accomplishes a similar identification through its "ambiguous syntax" and "erratic punctuation" (2: 27-28): "The voice of the Bard is the voice of imagination; the voice of imagination is the voice of the Holy Word" The poem shows how this unity works. Most essentially, it demonstrates that it works. And it forces Blake's audiences, his readers and his critics, "lover[s] of books! lover[s] of heaven," to accept the power of this demonstration and engage actively in the same execution (which, by the way, suggests that he could not but "smile [such] work to see"). The author who made "The Tyger" and "The Lamb" asks "Did he who made the Lamb make thee? / Tyger Tyger burning bright," and his readers and critics, trying to answer this question, regularly think, speculate, and write about God.

[72793370044.pdf](#)
[1607339052e2fc---fekenuwisuzilimivigowe.pdf](#)
[1000 dice game](#)
[arm cortex m3 microcontroller datasheet](#)
[50494670135.pdf](#)
[cellnex telecom sa annual report 2018](#)
[india's most wanted full movie download 123mkv](#)
[how much does domino's pizza pay per hour](#)
[free bible bookmark templates](#)
[20148340338.pdf](#)
[69303656604.pdf](#)
[1608c805b4abce---28638094359.pdf](#)