

**POETRY OR PROSE  
POETRY IN DECLINE THE RISE  
OF PROSE  
OR  
THE END OF POETRY**

By

Colin leslie dean

**B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA,**

**MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies,**

**Grad Cert (Literary studies)**

**POETRY OR PROSE  
POETRY IN DECLINE THE RISE  
OF PROSE  
OR  
THE END OF POETRY**

By

Colin leslie dean

**B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA,**

**MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies,**

**Grad Cert (Literary studies)**

GAMAHUCHER PRESS WEST GEELONG VICTORIA AUSTRALIA  
2011

# AUSTRALIAS LEADING EROTIC POET COLIN LESLIE DEAN FREE DOWNLOAD AT

[http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/gamahucher\\_press\\_catalogue.htm](http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/gamahucher_press_catalogue.htm)

STATES

POETRYOR PROSE

Nearly all that goes for poetry these days is just prose

Technically you can only call something poetry if it has structure ie metre or rhythm

**Free verse is not poetry and those who write it are not poets**

According to the standard definition of poetry which defines poetry as being metrical writing or writing that is in metre, free verse by not being metrical or in metre is not poetry and those who write it ie Walt Whitman , T S Eliot etc are not poets. Thus modernist free verse poetry is not really poetry at all but only prose as free verse is not poetry according to the standard definition of poetry ie writing that is in metre

read definition of poetry as distinct from prose

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prosody\\_%28poetry%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prosody_%28poetry%29)

”In poetry, metre (meter in American English) is the basic rhythmic structure of a verse or lines in verse “

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Verse\\_%28poetry%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Verse_%28poetry%29)

“The word "verse" is commonly used in lieu of "[poetry](#)" to distinguish it from [prose](#).

Where the common unit of poetry, that is, verse, is based on [meter](#) or [rhyme](#)

A **verse** is formally a single [metrical line](#) in a [poetic composition](#)”

[Free verse](#) is usually defined as having no fixed meter and no end rhyme”

Thus free verse is not poetry/verse and those who write it are not poets as free verse is not in metre-which is the defining essence of poetry ie which makes a writing poetry

Here are 3 more definitions of poetry all requiring metre or rhythm ie structure

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/poetry>

1.  
the [art](#) of rhythmical [rhythm is structure] composition, written or spoken, for exciting pleasure by beautiful, imaginative, or elevated thoughts.
2.  
literary work in metrical [metre is structured] form; verse.
3.  
prose with [poetic](#) qualities [this is a circular definition as poetic is defined to be processing poetry qualities ie metre rhythm structure]

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/poetry>

- 1  
a: metrical [METRICAL WRITING IS STRUCTURED] writing: verse b: the productions of a poet: poems [FROM a THAT MEANS POEMS ARE STRUCTURED]
- 2  
: writing that formulates a concentrated imaginative awareness of experience in language chosen and arranged to create a specific emotional response through meaning, sound, and rhythm [LOOK UP ITS DEFINITION IT MEANS STRUCTURED]

<http://contemporarylit.about.com/cs/literaryterms/g/poetry.htm>

**Definition:** Poetry is an imaginative awareness of experience expressed through meaning, sound, and rhythmic language [ie structured language]

Here is a definition of “poem” note a poem is distinct from prose by being structured ie metre rhythm

<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/poem>

1. A verbal composition designed to convey experiences, ideas, or emotions in a vivid and imaginative way, characterized by the use of language chosen for its sound and suggestive power and by the use of literary techniques such as meter, metaphor, and rhyme.
2. A composition in verse rather than in prose.
3. A literary composition written with an intensity or beauty of language more characteristic of poetry than of prose.

#### FREE VERSE IS A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS

FREE[UNSTRUCTURED] VERSE[STRUCTURED]

Thus free verse is not poetry/verse and those who write it are not poets as free verse is not in metre-which is the defining essence of poetry ie which makes a writing poetry

Thus most of 20th century poetry is really just prose as **it has no form or structure ie metre** and most of what is called poetry on poetry forums is really only prose ie unstructured

If you say modern poetry is unstructured poetry this is a contradiction in terms as poetry by definition is structured if the writing is unstructured ie no metre then it is not poetry but only prose

Some say poetry is not subject to fixed objective criteria but goes through fashions Fact is poetry is defined to be structured –this has been the accepted criteria of poetry for other cultures as well as since the beginnings of the western culture

If the definition changes all the time to fashion then poetry as a category is meaningless  
 IE THEN WE CANNOT COMPARE POETRY WRITTEN AT OTHER TIMES WITH  
 A DIFFERENT DEFINITION TO TIMES WHERE THE DEFINITION OF POETRY IS  
 DIFFERENT

If poetry due to fashion is unstructured you may just as well call everything poetry and do away with the term prose but then how do you distinguish say shakespeare from a 10

year olds poetry

then the telephone directory is poetry

or articles in the news paper are poetry

poetry is distinguished from prose by being structured very simple

If unstructured can be poetry then the first law of thermodynamics is poetry as it is a poem

or better still the Encyclopedia Britannica is an anthology of meaningful poetry

by calling an unstructured writing poetry you do away with the category prose-unstructured -and make everything poetry

sorry only talentless people will argue that way

only talent can write structure-real poetry

only talentless want to call unstructured writing poetry

If one is going to write unstructured prose then don't call it poetry by all means coin a new term but you cannot call it poetry

If a piece of writing is a mix of structured and unstructured invent a new term for it but you cant call it poetry Similarly if there are hundreds of different mixed types of unstructured writing then call them each by a different name but you cannot call them all poetry

Now a poem is an objective thing just like a chair or electron it is objective in that you or any one else can hear the structure of the poem. The essence of poetry is a structure without structure a work cannot be called poetry. A completely meaningless bunch of gibberish would still be poetry if it s structured as you could hear the structure Things

like metaphor enjambement epanalepsis synaesthesia rhyme alliteration etc are techniques ie embellishments used to embellish the structure of a poem If these embellishments are present in a non structured work ie prose then that work is not poetry-you are free to call such a work anything you want but you cant call it poetry –as the embellishments are not essential to poetry or prose for that matter-the only essential thing to poetry is structure . Poetry being an objective thing ie structure means there are objective criteria to judge a poem namely whether the structure is perfect or if there are flaws in structure The content or use of techniques ie embellishments are irrelevant as to whether a poem is good or bad To judge a work good or bad based upon content or these techniques ie embellishments is only arbitrary subjective value laden judgment-the history of poetry show how these thing come into fashion and go out of fashion **A poem firstly and lastly is good or bad if its structure is good or bad.** Any other criterion is just subjective arbitrary value judgment-open to changing fashion- which have no place in judging a poem. Oscar Wilde said it correctly

“There are no such things as a moral or immoral book

Books are well written or badly written That is all”

Thus if Shakespeare and a 10 year each write a perfect structured sonnet then all we can say is they both are good poets any other judgment based on content or embellishments is only arbitrary subjective value laden judgment-the history of poetry show how these thing come into fashion and go out of fashion

Example a sonnet is defined to have 14 structured lines A sonnet has 14 lines so to qualify for being called a sonnet it must have 14 structured lines A Shakespearean, or English, sonnet consists of 14 lines, each line containing ten syllables and written in [iambic pentameter](#), in which a pattern of an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed syllable is repeated five times. The rhyme scheme in a Shakespearean sonnet is *a-b-a-b, c-d-c-d, e-f-e-f, g-g*; the last two lines are a rhyming couplet.

Traditionally, English poets employ [iambic pentameter](#) when writing sonnets, but not all English sonnets have the same metrical structure: the first sonnet in [Sir Philip Sidney's](#) sequence [Astrophel and Stella](#), for example, has 12 syllables: it is [iambic hexameters](#),

albeit with a turned first foot in several lines. In the [Romance languages](#), the [hendecasyllable](#) and [Alexandrine](#) are the most widely used [metres](#)

Now we have different types of sonnets with 14 structured lines but with different rhyme schemes and each with a different name

A Shakespearean, or English, sonnet

Petrarchan or Italian sonnet

Spenserian sonnet

Caudate sonnet

Curtal sonnet

Pushkin sonnet

So if you write a sonnet it must have 14 structured lines and if you invent a new rhyme scheme then you call it a different name but you cant call it say a Shakespearean sonnet unless it has the Shakespearean rhyme scheme As you cannot call a work a sonnet unless it has structure and 14 lines

Example in physics many different particles have been discovered electron proton positron neutron etc each is a different thing so each has a unique name The same applies to poetry/prose Each new variation hybrid mixture should have it own unique To call them the same thing creates confusion-as it would in physics if al the particles were called the same name

Now modernist poets use the sonnet but with free verse-ie the 14 lines but in free verse ie unstructured ie no metre

This is a contradiction in terms as to be a sonnet/poem it must be structured So they should use a new term for what they call a free verse sonnet as a so called free verse sonnet is not even a sonnet as it has no structure but only 14 lines As pointed out below



free verse is a contradiction in terms you cant have unstructured poetry (structured)-thus free verse is by the definition of poetry not even poetry

Some says poetry is an evolving thing

sure

but if poetry is defined to be structured ie metre then any writing that does not meets the definition is not poetry coin a new term for it but don't call it poetry

Some say Whitman did away with metre and is Americas greatest poet

but if he is not using metre then by definition his work is not poetry but instead just prose Whitman should have called what he wrote some new term but he should not have called it poetry Whitman may have been a new voice but he was not a new voice in American poetry as what he wrote was not poetry but only unstructured prose or what is called free verse-which is a contradiction terms

thus it is claimed that whitman is Americas greatest poet but acknowledge that he wrote not in metre thus if he is calling himself a poet that **then makes him Americas greatest bad poet**

if you say he or others write in free verse

that is a contradiction in terms verse/poetry is by definition structured you cannot have unstructured structured poetry ie non-metre but metre poetry

take physics that is evolving to but an electron is defined by certain characteristic if a particle is to be called an electron then it must meet the definition if it does not then it is not an electron

same goes for poetry if writing does not meet the definition of what poetry is then it is not poetry

**BY DEFINITION POETRY IS STRUCTURED BY METRE**

IF WHITMAN or any one else IS NOT USEING METRE ie structure THEN BY DEFINITION HE IS NOT A POET

Again if it is said that what poetry is changes to fashion this only adds to confusions  
 In all cultures and in our western culture poetry has always been structured the pre-Whitman American poets would have regarded poetry as structured  
 From the Sumerians Babylonians Egyptians Greeks Indians Chinese Chaucer Shakespeare Milton Byron Shelly Keats all would have thought of poetry as structured and any thing else as mere prose ie unstructured

Again by definition if the work is not structured ie metre -but has nevertheless song/cadence-then the work is not poetry –so call it a new name but you cant call it poetry

The definition is clear poetry is structured ie metre if the work has no metre Whitman and the rest are by definition not producing poetry or can be called poets

Thus modern modernist poetry which is unstructured cannot be really called poetry by historical consensus from the Sumerians then to pre-Whitman American poets if a work is unstructured then it is nothing but prose

Of one of Americas great modernist poets Allen Ginsberg even William Carlos William said “most people, most critics<sup>1</sup> would call (Allen Ginsbergs collection called “Empty Mirror”{1947-1953)) just prose”

Thus when poetry is called free verse or unstructured poetry this really means POETRY IS DEAD OR THE END OF POETRY

**WHEN PROSE IS CALLED POETRY LIKEWISE POETRY IS DEAD OR AT AN  
 END**

We have a scandal in poetry for based on the standard definition of poetry ie writing in metre free verse is not poetry and those who write it are not poets ie Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson T S Eliot and most of the modernist poets are not poets as they did not write in metre

---

<sup>1</sup> William Carlos William in “Allen Ginsberg Collected Poems”, Penguin books, 2009,p.817

Generations of students have uncritically and unquestionably just accepted -like sheep- when their professors have said free verse is poetry and those who write it are poets when according to the standard definition of poetry ie writing in metre Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson T S Eliot and most of the modernist poets are not poets and when professors have said Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson are great poets they have in effect misled generation of students as according to the standard definition of poetry ie writing in metre Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson are not poets at all but if one is to call them poet then they are GREAT VERY BAD POETS

Harvard Yale Oxford Cambridge etc professors of literature have misled generations of students by feeding them the falsification that free verse is poetry and Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson are great poets-when by the standard definition of poetry they are not poets

Either these professors did not know the standard definition of poetry ie metre which means they are incompetent or they did know the definition and intentionally misled generations of students into believing free verse is poetry and Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson are great poets when by the standard definition they are not poets at all

what a scandal what a disgrace they should be drummed out of their well paying jobs ridiculed and shamed for this falsification

Since based on the standard definition of poetry ie writing in metre Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson T S Eliot and most of the modernist poets are not poets as they did not write in metre

Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson are not poets as they did not write in metre [just look up in your dictionary the definition of poetry and you will see Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson are not poets]

a standard definition in all dictionaries-gee and no one has cared to see what the definition of poetry is what a scandal what a disgrace

# WHAT YOU HAVE JUST READ IS A MODERNIST POEM

## APPENDIX

### Emily Dickinson IS not a poet

You can call her work anything you want but you cant call it poetry as her work is not in metre ie structure which is the definition of poetry the definition of poetry is clear and she did not not write poetry If you dont like the definition of poetry that is just to bad as the definition is clear

Rrhyme is not what makes a work poetry  
metre is  
and Emily Dickenson did not write metre  
she wrote prose

just as the early critics saw there is no form-thus her work is not poetry  
quote from wiki

Emily Dickinson is not a poet but if one is to be gracious she is a very bad poet as she does not conform to metre-which is the defining element to make something poetry

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson#Structure\\_and\\_syntax](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson#Structure_and_syntax)

Dickinson avoids pentameter, opting more generally for trimeter, tetrameter and, less often, dimeter. Sometimes her use of these meters is regular, **but oftentimes it is irregular**

Her contemporaries saw this

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson#Structure\\_and\\_syntax](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson#Structure_and_syntax)

Andrew Lang, a British writer, dismissed Dickinson's work, stating that "if poetry is to exist at all, it really must have form and grammar, and must rhyme when it professes to rhyme. The wisdom of the ages and the nature of man insist on so much".[152]

Thomas Bailey Aldrich, a poet and novelist, equally dismissed Dickinson's poetic technique in *The Atlantic Monthly* in January 1892: "It is plain that Miss Dickinson possessed an extremely unconventional and grotesque fancy. She was deeply tinged by the mysticism of Blake, and strongly influenced by the mannerism of Emerson ... But the incoherence and formlessness of her — versicles are fatal ... an eccentric, dreamy, half-educated recluse in an out-of-the-way New England village (or anywhere else) cannot with impunity set at defiance the laws of gravitation and grammar"

Even her only critic and literary mentor Higginson noted her lack of metre and saw her poems would have seemed odd, even unacceptable, to her contemporary audience

<http://www.poets.org/page.php/prmID/308>

" He then immediately advised her against publication. Most likely, Higginson felt that she was unclassifiable within the poetic establishment of the day—**departing from traditional forms as well as conventions of language and meter**, her poems would have seemed odd, even unacceptable, to her contemporary audience

rules are rules just like the laws of science  
 you just have to live with them  
 you cant change the rules just because you dont like them  
 based on the rules of poetry Emily Dickinson is not a poet-you just have to live with that  
 just like you have to live with the law of gravitation

just as the early critics saw there is no form-thus her work is not poetry

"Andrew Lang, a British writer, dismissed Dickinson's work, stating that "if poetry is to exist at all, it really must **have form**..."

"Thomas Bailey Aldrich, a poet and novelist, equally dismissed Dickinson's poetic technique...But the incoherence and **formlessness** of her — versicles are fatal

"Most likely, Higginson felt that she was unclassifiable within the poetic establishment of the day—**departing from traditional forms as well as conventions of language and meter**"

again modern critic do see her work as lacking skill

quote

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson#Structure\\_and\\_syntax](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson#Structure_and_syntax)

"Rather than seeing Dickinson's poetic styling as a result of lack of knowledge or skill, modern critics believed the irregularities were consciously artistic"

some say

"Dickinson wrote in hymn meter which was inspired by the Puritan style of writing that came 100 years before her birth. Hymn meter is meant to be sung, it might go like 6 - 7 - 6 - 7 syllables in a song and that keeps the song going."

rhythmic prose is not poetry just because a work has rhythm this does not in itself make it poetry

poetry is defined to be based on metre not rhyme and not rhythm

thus she is not a poet

## **EMILY DICKINSON IS A CREATION OF IDEOLOGISTS AND FEMINISTS**

Emily Dickinson only wrote prose and not poetry-according to the definition of poetry ie structured lines with form metre

You can call their work anything you want but you cant call it poetry as their works are not in metre ie structure which is the definition of poetry the definition of poetry is clear and these writers did not not write poetry If you dont like the definition of poetry that is just to bad as the definition is clear

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/75550766/POETRY-OR-PROSE-POETRY-IN-DECLINE-THE-RISE-OF-PROSE-OR-THE-END-OF-POETRY>

Firstly

Emily Dickinson is not a poet but if one is to be gracious she is a very bad poet as she does not conform to metre-which is the defining element to make something poetry

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson#Structure\\_and\\_syntax](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson#Structure_and_syntax)

Dickinson avoids pentameter, opting more generally for trimeter, tetrameter and, less often, dimeter. Sometimes her use of these meters is regular, but oftentimes it is irregular.

Consequently her contemporaries did not see her work as poetry

[Andrew Lang](#), a British writer, dismissed Dickinson's work, stating that "if poetry is to exist at all, it really must have form and grammar, and must rhyme when it professes to rhyme. The wisdom of the ages and the nature of man insist on so much"

[Thomas Bailey Aldrich](#), a poet and novelist, equally dismissed Dickinson's poetic technique in *The Atlantic Monthly* in January 1892: "It is plain that Miss Dickinson possessed an extremely unconventional and [grotesque](#) fancy. She was deeply tinged by the mysticism of [Blake](#), and strongly influenced by the mannerism of [Emerson](#) ... But the incoherence and formlessness of her — versicles are fatal ... an eccentric, dreamy, half-educated recluse in an out-of-the-way New England village (or anywhere else) cannot with impunity set at defiance the laws of gravitation and grammar"

Even her her only critic and literary mentor Higginson noted her lack of metre and saw her poems would have seemed odd, even unacceptable, to her contemporary audience

<http://www.poets.org/page.php/prmID/308>

" He then immediately advised her against publication. Most likely, Higginson felt that she was unclassifiable within the poetic establishment of the day—departing from traditional forms as well as conventions of language and meter, her poems would have seemed odd, even unacceptable, to her contemporary audience

Thus all one can say is she is not a poet or if at best a VERY BAD POET

Secondly

**She has been invented constructed by modern critics as being a great poet**

From being unskilled and lacking knowledge she has now been constructed into a great poet

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily\\_Dickinson#Structure\\_and\\_syntax](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emily_Dickinson#Structure_and_syntax)

Rather than seeing Dickinson's poetic styling as a result of lack of knowledge or skill, modern critics believed the irregularities were consciously artistic

With the growing popularity of [modernist poetry](#) in the 1920s, Dickinson's failure to conform to 19th-century poetic form was no longer surprising nor distasteful to new generations of readers. Dickinson was suddenly referred to by various critics as a great woman poet, and a [cult following](#) began to form

The [second wave](#) of [feminism](#) created greater cultural sympathy for her as a female poet

The modernist and feminists critics that have constructed Dickinson into being a great poet are open to ridicule as in fact Dickinson by her contemporaries and the definition of poetry ie metre is no a poet at all or if gracious she is not a great poet but a VERY BAD POET

**ISBN 91876347392**