*What do you make of this disagreement about the importance of words in poetry?*

*Is it possible that Mallarmé, Whitman, and Spicer are all right, even though they seem to disagree completely?*

Need for words vs Importance of words

* Poetry is an art
  + Evokes emotion.
  + It serves it’s purpose by existing and being observed (read in this case)
  + It is deliberate. It is created, there for someone thought about what was going into the poem.
  + There are unique styles and approaches to expressing the same thing. There are also ways of expressive different things with the same style
* Poetry is written
  + It has words.
    - Words have ideas tied to them
    - Manipulating the preset ideas of words in order to form new, fresh, and thought provoking meanings.
  + There are forms and rules set to transmit ideas.
    - Broken rules are done so for a reason. Why not transmit an idea clearly? Can a broken rule of writing improve the way a reader understands an idea?

The implications both coming together

* Words need to be used in order to express ideas
  + Poets have the goal of transmitting ideas in a way that poetry only can.
    - It is not always direct, or else they would be writing prose.
    - It is not always immediately understandable, as opposed to song lyrics and nursery rhymes
  + The words are a means to end, in which the means should and are used creatively to fit the poets needs
    - Presentation of words in a specific order to create a certain thought chain.
    - Using words in ways that would not normally be done i.e. personification, unusual descriptors, intangible ideas used as physical objects.

*When you read poetry, do you focus on the words, or is there a part of the reading that you can’t explain by pointing at the words?*

Both are techniques for understanding the poetry. As poetry is an art form, it can be observed in as many ways as one can approach it.

* Picking out words and lines and then scrutinizing them for meaning can achieve an understanding that’s unique. It also has the downside of not clearly seeing what it’s relevance is to the rest of the poem, and how it can effect other ideas as well as how other ideas in the poem can effect it. It can be a powerful tool if the author has said something rather profound, and also a debilitating one if the author wishes to portray other, more complicated meanings using the passage with the rest of the poem.
* Looking at passages as a whole can show a reader relationships and thought patterns that give insight to the poet’s intent for whichever subject the poet is writing about. It is harder to see that a poem may be alluding to deeper ideas then what is written on the surface if much of the surface is not looked at. Analyzing passages is a great way to get a fuller picture, and a more intricate perspective on a subject.
* Reading poem’s through without any kind of analysis other then the experience of reading can also be an insightful way of understanding a poem. Poems are not always cryptic, nor are they always particularly understandable when analyzed. A poet may want the experience of the poem to take effect, instead of an analysis on the words themselves. Going back and looking at lines that made the reader feel a certain way can reinforce this kind of understanding. They may be explained traditionally because they are feelings of a reader, and therefor may not be able to be explained in any other way then “This line made me feel this way”.

*Where does the meaning come from?*

It comes from the combination of the poets’ use of words with his artistic license of manipulation.