Coleridge, Caterpillars and the 'convulsive agonies' of the 'Chrysalis'

Philip Lindholm[1]

IN THE SPRING OF 1803, COLERIDGE PARAPHRASED contemporary knowledge on butterflies and moths and took ample notes on the life-cycle of the caterpillar from his reading of Moses Harris's *The Aurelian: or, Natural History of British Insects*, first published in 1766, which describes the physiological transformation from the 'caterpillar state' to the 'winged state' via the 'great agony' of the 'chrysalis'.[2] Harris, a gifted botanical artist, had been studying insects since before the age of twelve, and *The Aurelian* presented his collection of water-colour paintings and accompanying observations on many of the Lepidoptera to the second Aurelian Society, formed in 1762. A highly sought-after illustrator, Harris produced a vast body of drawings of butterflies, moths, caterpillars, pupae and plants during his lifetime and, with the help of generous patrons, lavish hand-coloured engravings, such as the fifty engraved plates contained in the two editions of *The Aurelian*. As a naturalist and the first appointed Secretary of the Aurelian Society, Harris catalogued over four hundred species of butterflies and moths, providing both the English and the known Linnean names for many of the Lepidoptera, and offering detailed descriptions of contemporary entomological methods. These ranged from practical advice for collectors, such as information on times of appearance and food plants, to guidance on breeding, as well as detailed descriptions of the tools needed to chase and catch butterflies, including the correct use of different types of nets.

Those who collected and studied butterflies called themselves 'Aurelians', from the Latin *aureolus* meaning 'gilded' or 'golden', in reference to the iridescent sheen upon the chrysalis, or hard-shelled pupa, of some butterfly species. The word 'chrysalis' itself comes from the Greek word χρυσός for 'gold', and Harris aptly writes, in reference to the 'Chrysalids of the Butterfly Kind', that 'many of them appear all over beautifully gilt with burnish'd Gold, others variously spotted with Gold and Silver'.[3] Something of this scintillating 'radiance' is captured in Coleridge's notebook entry of 2 April 1805, written in Malta, referring to the imagined sight of butterflies basking in a sunlit tree:

> The first yellow green leaves of the figures scattered all over* the Tree, & yet thinly, & yet disclosing every branch & every grey twig[,] resembled

[1] Philip Lindholm completed his Ph.D. dissertation, entitled *Synaesthesia in British Romantic Poetry*, in June 2018 at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, where he is currently employed as a temporary lecturer. His work is located at a mid-way between Romantic science and literature and focuses on the senses and the embodied imagination.

[2] Moses Harris, *The Aurelian: or, Natural History of British Insects; Namely, Moths and Butterflies, Together with the Plants on which they Feed*…, ed. Robert Mays (London, Country Life, 1986), iv-v. See CN I 1378 and CN III 3264; on Coleridge's interest in the life-cycle of the caterpillar, see also Nicholas Halmi et al. (eds), *Coleridge's Poetry and Prose. A Norton Critical Edition* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2004), 413.

[3] Harris, 15.

> to a wonder a flight of large green Butterflies alighted on the leafless Tree / all shot through with Sunshine
>
> *no! only at the extremities of each twig.[4]

This meticulous attention to detail, which Stephen Romer calls 'a novel kind of nature writing in English', is reflected in Coleridge's amendment to his initial observation.[5] Taken as a whole, the fragmentary notebook entry is an instance of Coleridge's impressionistic, subjective heightening of experience, illustrating his belief, expressed in Chapter XIV of *Biographia Literaria*, in the poet's twofold 'power of exciting the sympathy of the reader by a faithful adherence to the truth of nature, and the power of giving the interest of novelty by the modifying colours of imagination'.[6]

What appears to have most stimulated Coleridge's imagination where butterflies are concerned, however, was not the splendour of their coruscating chrysalis or glittering wings 'all shot through with Sunshine', but rather the toilsome, seemingly torturous transformation undergone by the caterpillar in order to attain what Harris calls the 'winged state'. In a passage of *The Aurelian* entitled 'On the Caterpillar, and its Change to the Chrysalis', Harris describes this metamorphosis of the caterpillar in vivid detail:

> In their Progress from the Egg to the Chrysalis, they shift or throw off several Skins generally one every seven Days; … they are about seven Weeks in their Caterpillar State; at the Expiration of which Time they are full fed, and *prepare for a future State*, by making themselves a secure Retreat, wherein they lie two or three Days, during which Time they shrink and grow shorter, losing the Use of their Feet entirely, *and appear as if in great Agony*; at Length the Skin on the two first Joints behind the Head, which at this Time appear very much swell'd, bursts, or rather splits, and opens some Way down the Back, and cross the Head, that in some you would at first Sight suppose the Head of itself was divided.[7]

In addition to the intense physical transformation, it was this retreat inward to 'prepare for a future state' which evidently appealed to Coleridge, who in Chapter XII of *Biographia Literaria* describes the 'self-intuition' of creative potential using images that draw heavily from contemporary entomology:

> They and they only can acquire the philosophic imagination, the sacred power of self-intuition, who within themselves can interpret and understand the symbol, that the wings of the air-sylph are forming within the skin of the caterpillar; they only, who feel in their spirits the same

---

[4] Seamus Perry, *Coleridge's Notebooks: A Selection* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 85.

[5] Stephen Romer, 'Review: Coleridge's Notebooks edited by Seamus Perry', *The Guardian*, 18 Jan. 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/jan/18/featuresreviews.guardianreview22. Accessed 19 Apr. 2019.

[6] Nicholas Halmi et al. (eds), *Coleridge's Poetry and Prose,* 489.

[7] Harris, 15 (my emphasis).

> instinct, which impels the chrysalis of the horned fly to leave room in its involucrum for antennæ yet to come. They know and feel, that the *potential* works *in* them, even as the *actual* works on them![8]

Here Coleridge describes the relationship between 'intuition' and 'imagination' in terms of a readiness to be animated, and he achieves this by demonstrating remarkable familiarity with contemporary entomological findings on the pupa of butterflies and moths. Thus, I wish to suggest that the caterpillar's transformation into the butterfly via the perceived 'agonies' of the chrysalis furnished Coleridge with a powerful symbol for his metaphysics of latency, one that is inextricably related to his thoughts on what constitutes 'Life'. In particular, I aim to outline Coleridge's Aurelian poetics in the visionary fragment 'Psyche' (1808), and his related reflections on the nature of life, through the prism of his lifelong interest in the contemporary 'vitalist debate', which can be traced back as early as 1795 but to which he would only significantly contribute from 1816 onwards with his own *Theory of Life*. The image of the chrysalis, I maintain, allowed Coleridge to envision a lepidopteran 'poetic Psyche', an organic 'philosophic imagination' that, like the pupa, is capable of creative self-development—and one which, by implication, suffers similar 'agonies' to the caterpillar undergoing its existential metamorphosis.

Coleridge's early interest in the so-called 'vitalist debate' is attested by a letter of 31 December 1796 to John Thelwall, in which Coleridge demonstrates his familiarity with contemporary theories of life and 'animal vitality':

> Dr. Beddoes, & Dr Darwin think that *Life* is utterly inexplicable, writing as Materialists—You, I understand, have adopted the idea that it is the result of organised matter acted on by external Stimuli.—As likely as any other system; but you *assume* the thing to be proved—the '*capability* of being stimulated into sensation' *as a property* of organised matter—now 'the Capab.' &c is *my* definition of *animal Life*— *[9]

What emerges from Coleridge's comments is less a belief that '*Life* is utterly inexplicable', than an active resistance to the type of 'Materialism' that rests on the 'assumption' that life 'is the result of matter acted on by external Stimuli', what he refers to in Chapter VI of *Biographia Literaria* as 'the despotism of outward impressions'.[10] 'Sensation' as a mere 'property of organised matter' cannot account for life; instead, Coleridge argues, it is the '*capability* of being stimulated into sensation', the inherent potentiality of the mind's receptivity to sense perception and its subsequent 'stimulation' from a dormant state, which

---

[8] Halmi et al., 465. I am grateful to Graham Davidson for drawing my attention toward a similar observation in Fragment 2 of *Opus Maximum*, where Coleridge writes that 'the young Bull butts ere yet its horns are formed, the stag-chafer in its worm state makes its bed-chamber prior to its [metamorphosis], exactly as much longer than itself as is required for the length of the horn which is yet to be produced. Through all Nature there is a manifestation of power pre-existent to the product. . . . Throughout all Nature there is seen an evolution from within'; (OM 119-120).

[9] CL I 294-295, quoted in Nicholas Roe (ed.), *Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the Sciences of Life* (Oxford: OUP, 2001), 9.

[10] Halmi et al., 426.

Coleridge defines as '*animal Life*'.

In the same letter, Coleridge proceeds to sketch the various contemporary theories of life, turning next to the physician Alexander Monro, author of *Observations on the Nervous System* (1783), by explaining that 'Monro believes in a plastic immaterial Nature—all-pervading'. He refrains from commenting on Monro's theory, but instead appears to lend poetic support to it by quoting his own lines from 'Effusion XXXV' (later published in 1817 as 'The Eolian Harp') which he added to the poem that same year: 'And what if all of animated Nature / Be but organic harps diversely fram'd / That tremble into thought as o'er them sweeps / Plastic & vast &c—', referring to his concept of 'one intellectual breeze'.[11] Coleridge further explores this notion of an animating, immaterial energy that same year in *Religious Musings*, where he evokes the spirits of 'plastic power' that 'interfus'd / Roll thro' the grosser and material mass / In organising surge!' (ll. 423-425).[12] Rather than settling for this model of a universal creative consciousness shaping life, however, the letter to Thelwall continues Coleridge's intellectual survey of conflicting vitalist theories:

> Hunter [believes] that the *Blood* is the Life—which is saying nothing at all—for if the blood were *life*, it could never be otherwise than Life—and to say, it is *alive* is saying nothing—& Ferriar believes in a *Soul*, like an orthodox Churchman—So much for Physicians & Surgeons—Now as to the Metaphysicians, Plato says, it is *Harmony*—he might as well have said, a fiddle stick's end—but I love Plato—his dear *gorgeous* Nonsense! And *I*, *th'o last not least,* I do not know what to think about it—on the whole I have rather made up my mind that I am a mere *apparition*—a naked Spirit! And that Life is I myself I! which is a mighty clear account of it.[13]

The perceptibly mischievous tone of this overview appears to indiscriminately dismiss the 'orthodox Churchman', 'Physicians & Surgeons' and 'Metaphysicians'. Despite Coleridge having playfully 'made up [his] mind' as to his own spectral nature, however, he concludes the letter by 'requesting from Thelwall a copy of his *Essay*, *[on] . . . Animal Vitality*',[14] suggesting that his interest in vitalist theory was still nascent. What Coleridge's elusiveness in this

---

[11] Paul Magnuson offers the following commentary on the theory of 'plastic nature'—and the related Cambridge Platonist concept of 'harmony'—informing the conversation poems: 'Monro's formulation of a plastic nature was in accord with Ralph Cudworth's *True Intellectual System* (1678), which Coleridge borrowed from the Bristol Library on 15 May 1795 and again on 9 November 1796. A Neo-Platonist and Christian advocate, Cudworth argued against materialism and atheism and for God's direction of the world through a plastic nature "which doth drudgingly execute that part of his providence which consists in the regular and orderly motion of matter" and which is like harmony in the arts, "particularly those musical ones of singing, playing on instruments, and dancing."'; Paul Magnuson, 'The "Conversation" poems', *The Cambridge Companion to Coleridge*, ed. Lucy Newlyn (Cambridge University Press, 2002), 36. Despite exploring this theory of a 'plastic' unifying power in 'Effusion XXXV', however, Coleridge makes it very clear in his letter that this is what '*Monro* believes' (my italics).

[12] Halmi et al., 34.

[13] CL I 479, quoted in Roe, 10.

[14] Roe, 10.

letter reveals above all, then, is a stubborn resistance to dogmatism, a refusal to reduce the fluid phenomenon of 'Life' to a static concept—a refusal, that is, to '*assume*' any 'thing to be proved' according to an arbitrary metaphysical principle that is 'as likely as any other system'.

In a letter of 1801 to Thomas Poole, Coleridge claims, after having read Newton's *Optics*, that 'Newton was a mere materialist—*Mind* in his system is always passive', and that 'there is ground for suspicion, that any system built on the passiveness of the mind must be false, as a system'.[15] Having familiarised himself with the vitalist theories of the surgeons John Hunter and John Abernethy, viewed through the lens of post-Kantian German *Naturphilosophie*, Coleridge writes in his *Theory of Life* of 1816 that 'Life is not a *Thing*—a self-sufficient *Hypostasis*—But an *Act* and a *Process*'.[16] For Coleridge, 'Life' is capability, possibility and potential; it is not a 'system', least of all one 'built on the passiveness of the mind'. It is 'the *power* which discloses itself from within as a principle of *unity* in the *many*', where 'the unity . . . is produced *ab intra*', like the caterpillar birthing the butterfly contained within itself; as Denise Gigante explains, this logic maintains that 'life is a principle of unity disclosing itself from within', and that the 'life of an organism, like the aesthetic power of a work of art, cannot be reduced to a component quality or part'.[17] This perspective ties in with Coleridge's remark, drawing from the image of the caterpillar's chrysalis, that there are those who 'know and feel, that the potential works *in* them, even as the actual works *on* them!'. The 'Intelligence' of 'nature' and mind, Coleridge writes in *Biographia Literaria*, is 'a self-developement, not a quality supervening to a substance'.[18] Here, we encounter the notion of a self-generating 'nature' imbued with creative consciousness – and of 'Life' as a 'self-conscious-will' and 'self-developement'—which is practically Darwinian in its evolutionary thrust.

In the context of the vitality debate, Nicholas Roe remarks that Coleridge's outburst on 6 April 1799 upon learning of his son Berkeley's death while in Germany suggests that 'life surely consists in more than mere organisation':

> What if the vital force which I sent from my arm into the stone, as I flung it in the air & skimm'd it upon the water—what if even that did not perish!—It was *life*—! It was a particle of *Being*—! *it was* Power! & *how could* it perish—? *Life*, *Power*, *Being*!—organisation may & probably is, their *effect*; their *cause* it *cannot* be![19]

Much like the ripples created by the animated stone skimming 'upon the water', the material 'organisation' of '*Life*, *Power*, *Being*!' is their mere 'effect', but it cannot be their 'cause'. Beyond the intimate psychological insight into a

---

[15] Halmi et al., 628-629.

[16] Quoted in Eric G. Wilson, 'Coleridge and Science', *The Oxford Handbook of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Frederick Burwick (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 645.

[17] Denise Gigante, *Life: Organic Form and Romanticism* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 23.

[18] Halmi et al., 479.

[19] CL I 479, quoted in Roe, 11.

grieving father's mind afforded by Coleridge's agitated train of thought – conveyed here by the urgency of the dashes and exclamation marks, the wishful conjecturing of 'what if', the poignant mingling of triumph and dejection in the past tense of '*it was*', the simultaneously unwavering confidence and anguished disbelief of '*how could* it perish—?' – one discerns here a steadfast belief in the existence of an enduring vital spirit which is representative of Coleridge's lifelong interest in the sciences of life. In its own distressed spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings, the fragmentary syntax of the reaction provoked by Berkeley's death enacts the very 'vital force' it attempts to describe, propelling thoughts forward with an organic impetus that boldly defies 'organisation'.

Accordingly, I wish to suggest that four years after learning of his son's death, Coleridge found a particularly fertile image for this 'vital force' in the form of the chrysalis and the process of pupation. Coleridge's entomological metaphor of the 'philosophic imagination, the sacred power of self-intuition' which can only be 'acquire[d]' by those 'who within themselves can interpret and understand the symbol, that the wings of the air-sylph are forming within the skin of the caterpillar', is inextricably bound up with his conception of 'Life' as a dynamic vital power consisting of creative, self-developing potential. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that Coleridge's outlook on the nature of life and organic futurity in the Aurelian context is far from triumphant. 'Psyche', one of Coleridge's 'Visionary Fragments', was first published in *Biographia Literaria*, although it was written almost a decade earlier, around 1808:

> The poetic PSYCHE, in its process to full developement, undergoes as many changes as its Greek name-sake, the* butterfly.
>
> * The fact, that in Greek Psyche is the common name for the soul, and the butterfly, is thus alluded to in the following stanza from an unpublished poem of the author.
>
> > The butterfly the ancient Grecians made
> > The soul's fair emblem, and its only name—
> > But of the soul, escaped the slavish trade
> > Of mortal life!—For in this earthly frame
> > Our's is the reptile's lot, much toil, much blame,
> > Manifold motions making little speed,
> > And to deform and kill the things, whereon we feed.
> >
> > S. T. C.[20]

Saliently, the 'many changes' undergone by the caterpillar in its transformation

[20] Halmi et al., 413. J. C. C. Mays dates this fragment slightly earlier: '1806-7? The germ of the poem could be a prose note made in Malta in on 12 Dec 1804 (*CN* II 2317) when C and SH were at Coleorton. The way the poem developed suggests that it might have been composed and held in C.'s head, and only written down as occasion prompted'; PW 2, 2, 1036. Mays also cites a related MS note: 'In some instances the Symbolic and Onomastic are united—as in Psyche,= anima & papilio'; PW 2, 2, 1037.

from the 'chrysalis' to the 'winged state', which Coleridge mentions before quoting his poem and which are central to the pupation imagery he so often returns to in his notebooks, appear entirely absent in the lines of this short poetic fragment. Coleridge's initial remark that the Greek word for 'soul', 'Psyche', also means 'butterfly' is merely the point of reference for a juxtaposition of the lepidopteran 'soul's fair emblem' with the 'slavish trade / Of mortal life'.[21]

Hence, the poem rapidly shifts its focus from the airborne butterfly-soul to 'the reptile's lot' by examining the arduous and destructive life of the caterpillar—and by extension, 'Our's'. Whereas Coleridge in his notebooks describes the carefree flight of a 'Butterfly let loose' in terms of aesthetic exuberance—'how very high, how madly, how purposeless / it pushes the air under it & runs up the Stairs of Air'[22]—'Psyche' imagines life 'in this earthly frame' as the laborious creeping of the caterpillar, slowly inching towards a leaf, with the latter providing life-sustaining nourishment despite its own destruction in the feeding process. Strenuous movement is conveyed by the accumulative *m*-alliteration of the lines 'much toil, much blame / Manifold motions making little speed', with their emphatic repetition of 'much', as well as through the winding syntax of the lines, in which consonant clusters are broken up by a flurry of commas in order to generate a meandering rhythm evocative of the sliding, undulating wave motion of a boneless caterpillar.[23] The ABABBCC rhyme scheme—essentially a rhyme royal stanza consisting of a tercet and two couplets—similarly contributes to a vacillating rhythmical effect alternating between halting flow and inching propulsion. The poem ends with an alexandrine which, here perhaps more appropriately than ever, drags its slow length along with 'little speed' in order to syntactically evoke the caterpillar's toilsome locomotion. In the process, the metrical stress falls on those verbs which epitomise what Coleridge evokes as the ultimately fruitless, rapacious 'toil' and 'blame' of our 'mortal life': 'deform', 'kill', 'feed'. Drawing from careful entomological observation, Coleridge depicts 'Life' in miniature as a tale full of sound and fury that, in stark contrast to the soaring Aurelian 'soul', is really but the 'slavish trade' of a larval 'earthly frame' which literally creeps in a petty pace from day to day.

As this short poem suggests, Coleridge's references to the caterpillar in his

[21] The poetic associations of the butterfly-soul are perhaps most memorably exploited by John Keats, for example in the elicitation of the mythological 'winged Psyche' ('Ode to Psyche', l.6), the goddess of the soul often depicted as butterfly-winged, and in the evocation of the 'death-moth'—or death's-head hawkmoth (*Acherontia Atropos*)—as the 'mournful Psyche' ('Ode on Melancholy', ll. 6-7) of the melancholic mind.

[22] Perry, 31.

[23] In 'The Caterpillar', written ca. 1816, Anna Laetitia Barbauld similarly describes the distinctive movement of a caterpillar: 'my arm / Felt the light pressure of thy hairy feet; / Thou hast curled round my finger, from its tip, / Precipitous descent! with stretched out neck, / Bending thy head in airy vacancy, / This way and that, inquiring, thou hast seemed / To ask protection' (ll. 7-13). Although her poem opens with a vivid description of the caterpillar noting its colour and texture, the emphasis is on its vulnerability as a 'helpless thing' (l.1) and a 'houseless wanderer' (l.6). Like Coleridge, Barbauld sees this as an opportunity for a meditation on 'life' (l.26), but in her poem the caterpillar is the sole survivor of human attempts to eradicate its entire 'race' (l.14) with pesticide, and it is the lonely state of a 'single sufferer' (l.36) which awakens 'sympathy spontaneous' (l.41) and the 'touch of pity' (l.23): 'A single wretch, escaped the general doom, / Making me feel and clearly recognise / Thine individual existence, life, / And fellowship of sense with all that breathes' (ll.24-27).

notebooks reveal a rather ambiguous stance towards the existential implications of the transformation of the chrysalis. Gregory Leadbetter remarks, for example, that while the pupation imagery referring to the 'involucrum' of the chrysalis which leaves 'room for Antennae yet to come' is 'the exhilarating space of human potential', there is also the 'possibility that the human imago he invokes will appear as an inhuman prodigy or, monster'—for example, when Coleridge asserts that 'doubtless the state of a Caterpillar during the foetal quickening of the Psyche would appear & for the Caterpillar would be, a Disease'.[24] Exploring Coleridge's emphasis on the '*becoming* of the poet', Leadbetter also points out that the transformation from larva to imago involves life and death, because 'birth into a new state means dying to the old, becoming something utterly altered, cut off from members of the same species that are left on the other side of the transformation, without wings or antennae'.[25] In his notebooks, Coleridge explicitly addresses this notion of a radical break with the past, of a life-cycle that is fundamentally non-cyclical because it involves irreversible transmutation despite blurring the boundaries of life and death:

> I fear to die—I dread it—Just as one might have feared to be born and to live.—What is death? The pain of the soul giving birth to itself / the natal hour of Life renewing itself—the convulsive agonies of the Caterpillar in its laborious forth-struggle from the tegument that compressed the wings, and the antennae of its ψυχη [*psuchê*] — . . . you would feel just the same terror at your being born that you now do at dying—But with the same uncertainty it would be the same thing—[26]

To a certain extent, then, the 'great agony' and 'laborious forth-struggle' of the chrysalis is imagined by Coleridge as an instance of the paradox by which one might, as Keats writes in *Hyperion*, 'with fierce *convulse* / *Die into life*' (III. ll. 129–30, emphasis added).

Coleridge's early definition, in 1776, of '*animal life*' as the '*capability* of being stimulated into sensation' is by 1803 supplemented by a more explicitly religious dimension. The image of the caterpillar's metamorphosis to represent 'the pain of the soul giving birth to itself / the natal hour of Life renewing itself', with its strong Christian undertones, evokes resurrection and the birth of a new spiritual body which might transcend what 'Psyche' describes as 'this earthly frame'. Rather than becoming a universal symbol of the human soul's schooling for heaven, however, 'the pain of the soul giving birth to itself' during the progressive transformation of the chrysalis appears at the time to have had profoundly personal implications for Coleridge, who had been mourning the loss of creative identity and poetic powers. More than a

[24] CN III 3474, quoted in Gregory Leadbetter, *Coleridge and the Daemonic Imagination* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 60.
[25] Leadbetter, 61.
[26] CN III 3362, quoted in Leadbetter, 61.

metaphysical contribution to the 'vitality debate', Coleridge's compulsive interest in pupation imagery ultimately reflects both artistic anxieties and confidence in the self-regenerating powers of the latent 'poetic Psyche'. Richard Holmes describes the poem 'Psyche' as a 'visionary fragment' written in the 'emblematic' style of the 'seventeenth-century religious poets . . . in which natural objects are presented for spiritual meditation', and Coleridge's meditation here is clearly also on imaginative and psychological regeneration, on the creative faculty's power to overcome the blunting 'slavish trade / Of mortal life'.[27] At the same time, however, the pessimistic tone of the poem and the fact that it does not depict the transformation from the 'caterpillar state' to the 'winged state' reveals Coleridge's increasing doubts about the possibility of the butterfly's emergence, as well as our own ability to overcome 'the reptile's lot'. Viewed through the prism of Coleridge's fascination with the life-cycle of the caterpillar and the phenomenon of 'Life' more generally, then, the visionary fragment 'Psyche' emerges as a self-reflexive emblem of the 'sacred power of self-intuition' which constitutes its very own poetic chrysalis, a textual site of creative potential staging the 'forth-struggle' of a lepidopteran 'philosophic imagination' anxiously awaiting to burst forth into flight.

[27] Richard Holmes (ed.), *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Selected Poetry* (London: Penguin Classics, 2000), 342.