IMAGINATION, METAPHOR AND MYTHOPOEIA IN THE POETRY OF THREE MAJOR ENGLISH ROMANTIC POETS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

FIRAT KARADAŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

JULY 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. SencerAyata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şükriye Ruhi (METU, FLE) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez (METU, FLE) _____

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam (METU, PHIL) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik (METU, FLE) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hande Sadun (Hacettepe U., IED) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Fırat Karadaş

Signature :

ABSTRACT

IMAGINATION, METAPHOR AND MYTHOPOEIA IN THE POETRY OF THREE MAJOR ENGLISH ROMANTIC POETS

Karadaş, Fırat

Ph.D., English Literature

Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

July 2007, 252 pages

This thesis studies metaphor, myth and their imaginative aspects in the poetry of William Wordsworth, Percy Bysshe Shelley and John Keats. The thesis argues that a comprehensive understanding of metaphor and myth cannot be done in the works of these poets without seeing them as faces of the same coin, and taking into consideration the role of the creating subject and its imagination in their production. Relying on Kantian, Romantic, and modern Neo-Kantian ideas of imagination, metaphor and myth, the study tries to indicate that imagination is an inherently metaphorizing and mythologizing faculty because the act of perception is an act of giving form to natural phenomena and seeing similitude in dissimilitude, which are basically metaphorical and mythological acts. In its form-giving activity the imagination of the speaking subjects of the poems studied in this thesis sees objects of nature as spiritual, animate or divine beings and thus transforms them into the alien territory of myth. This thesis analyzes myth and metaphor mainly in two regards: first, myth and metaphor are handled as inborn aspects of imagination and perception, and the interaction between nature and imagination are

presented as the origin of all mythology; second, to show how myth is something that is re-created time and again by poetic imagination, Romantic mythography and re-creation of precursor mythologies are analyzed. In both regards, poetic imagination appears as a formative power that constructs, defamiliarizes and re-creates via mythologization and metaphorization.

Keywords: Romantic poetics, metaphor, myth, imagination, perception

ÖZ

ÖNEMLİ ÜÇ İNGİLİZ ROMANTİK ŞAİRİN ŞİİRLERİNDE İMGELEM, METAFOR VE MİT YARATIMI

Karadaş, Fırat
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı
Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

Temmuz 2007, 252 sayfa

Bu tez William Wordsworth, Percy Bysshe Shelley ve John Keats'in şiirlerinde metafor, mit ve imgelemsel özelliklerini incelemektedir. Tez, söz konusu şairlerin şiirlerinde mit ve metaforu imgelemin ve algılama sürecinin birbirini tamamlayan etmenleri olarak ele almakta ve yaratımlarında öznenin işlevsel rolüne işaret etmektedir. Çalışma, Kantçı, Romantik ve modern Neo-Kantçı imgelem, metafor ve mit düşüncelerine dayanarak imgelemin özünde metafor ve mitoloji üreten bir yeti olduğunu çünkü bir öznenin imgelemi için algılama eyleminin doğadaki nesneleri biçimlendirme ve farklılıklar arasında benzerlik görme eylemi olduğunu, bunun da temelde metafor ve mit yaratımı anlamına geldiğini söylemektedir. Bu biçimlendirme eylemi esnasında, söz konusu şairlerin şiirlerindeki konuşucu özneler imgelemleriyle doğadaki nesnelere tinsel, canlılara özgü veya ilahi özellikler yükleyerek onları mitolojinin doğaüstü ve yabancı dünyasına dönüştürürler. Bu tez, söz konusu şiirlerde metafor ve miti başlıca iki bağlamda incelemektedir: birinci bağlamda, metafor ve miti imgelem ve algılama sürecinin özünde varolan nitelikler olarak ele almakta ve imgelem ile doğa arasındaki etkileşimin antik çağdan, Romantik döneme ve günümüze kadar mitolojinin kaynağı olduğunu savunmaktadır.

İkinci bağlamda ise mitolojinin şiirsel imgelem tarafından sürekli yeniden yaratılan bir şey olduğunu göstermek için Romantik mitografi ele alınmış ve eski mitlerin nasıl yeniden yaratıldığı gösterilmiştir. Her iki bağlamda şiirsel imgelem mit ve metafor yaratımı yoluyla yeniden kuran ve doğayı mitolojinin yabancı dünyasına dönüştüren biçimlendirici bir güç olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Romantik poetika, metafor, mit, imgelem, algılama

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish first to express sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez for her valuable guidence and insight in the writing process. Thanks go to the jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şükriye Ruhi and Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam for their advice, criticism, and encouragements.

I would also like to thank the other jury members Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik and Assist. Prof. Dr. Hande Sadun for their suggestions and comments.

To my wife, Derya, I offer sincere thanks for her unshakable faith in me and her willingness to endure with me my endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Metaphor and myth have always been of central concern in the study of English romantic poetry. However, there has been no detailed study on the metaphorical nature of the myth and the mythical nature of the metaphor in Romantic poetry. Such philosophers as Giambattista Vico, Immanuel Kant, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Gottfried Herder prepared a philosophical background for understanding metaphor and myth as two faces of the same coin. Vico, Rousseau and Herder argued that metaphor and myth were modes of expression for the poetic imagination of primitive man in 'the state of nature' (to use Rousseau's terminology) and Kant suggested that metaphor and myth were cognitive acts through which imagination expresses itself when confronted with the 'sublime' and the 'beautiful.' One common point in the ideas of these philosophers was that they saw metaphor and myth as the subject's expression of its vigorous and creative imagination and thought that the object of perception is assimilated, absorbed and re-created by the subject via metaphor and myth in the act of perception. These ideas rejected such distinctions as subject and object and metaphorical and literal because what the realist or materialist philosophers call 'object' and 'literal' are indivisible aspects of the metaphorizing and mythologizing acts of perception. The difference between these ideas was that while Kant presented metaphor as a mode of expression for the imagination of every subject, Vico, Rousseau and Herder limited it to the life of the primitive man living in the state of nature and argued that such distinctions as metaphorical and literal began with the emergence of logical/abstract thinking in civilized society.

The ideas of these philosophers had a direct influence on the formation of romantic poetics. They were even carried a step further with the ideas of such romantic poets as William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Percy Bysshe Shelley and John Keats. These poets underlined the crucial function of the human mind in the perception of 'objective reality' and its capability of changing and re-creating this reality. However, while they sometimes—especially Coleridge and Shelley—focused on the extraordinary and transcendental power of the imagination, they sometimes—especially Wordsworth, Keats and, again, Shelley—focused on the imagination's faculty of metaphorization and mythologization of phenomena. Among these poets, Wordsworth, similar to Vico, Rousseau and Herder, took metaphor and myth as inherent characteristics of a child's or a primitive person's perception of nature, which Wordsworth most of the time mythologizes as a mother figure rearing the poetic imagination of 'her child.' The common point between these poets was their conceiving the subject, its mind and imagination at the center of human perception and poetic creation, and their rejection of such distinctions as subject-object and metaphorical-literal. From their ideas it can be concluded that they also conceived myth in the same terms as metaphor and saw it as a metaphorical utterance re-created and manipulated by the poet's imagination.

This study contends that a detailed understanding of metaphor and myth and their interconnectedness also requires a study of modern theories of myth and metaphor. The above-mentioned ideas caused a great change in the conception of metaphor and myth; they prepared a ground for the demolition of the distinction between subject and object and metaphorical and literal. They did this by seeing the object as submitted to the subject and by establishing metaphor as the sole mode of expression for the subject. However, they did not bring forth a new terminology that would replace these distinctions, and they did not give an answer to the question of 'meaning' – that is, whether metaphor had a 'meaning' of its own or whether there was necessarily a stable literal meaning behind it. Besides, although they suggested that metaphor should be taken on a discourse level rather

than on a word level (Vico defined metaphor as 'miniature fable'), they did not present any detailed study of metaphor on these terms. Likewise, although they had some suggestions about myth, their ideas were not directly focused on myth. Modern theories of metaphor and myth can fill in some of the gaps in these ideas and make a comprehensive study of metaphor and myth in romantic poetry possible.

1.1 Modern Theories of Metaphor and Myth

Modern theories have approached metaphor from different angles. While some have employed a cognitive or linguistic perspective, others have approached it in terms of the relationship between the addresser and addressee; likewise, while some have seen it as an illocutionary act representing the speaker's (the subject's) voice, others have discussed whether it should be taken on the word or discourse levels. However, the common point in all these theories is that there is a tendency in them either to reject or to re-define the metaphorical-literal distinction, to take metaphor either as having a meaning of its own or as an 'extension' of a somewhat 'literal' meaning, and to see its relation to the objects in natural phenomena as arbitrary and relative.

One of the most outstanding modern theorists of metaphor is I.A. Richards. Richards relies on the romantic idea of metaphor in that he sees metaphor on the level of discourse rather than on the word or sentence level and rejects a distinction between subject and object, the human mind and reality, language and reality and thus between 'the literal and 'the metaphorical.' In "The Philosophy of Rhetoric" I. A. Richards argues that all 'meanings' are universally relative, only appropriate to and valid in the cultural context in which they occur; "any part of a discourse, in the last resort, does what it does only because the other parts of the surrounding, uttered or unuttered discourse, and its conditions are what they are" (10). For Richards, metaphor is not, as traditional views have conceived it, "a sort of happy extra trick with words…a grace or ornament or *added* power of language" (49). He criticizes this idea and, quoting Shelley and Jeremy Bentham,

he argues that “language is vitally metaphorical” because “the mind and its entire doings are fictions.” On this ground, language is not the ‘dress’ of thought; it is the creator of thought.

The theory of metaphor should, then, for Richards, be reformulated. Richards states that a first step for this is to introduce two technical terms: the ‘tenor’ and the ‘vehicle’ (“The Philosophy of Rhetoric” 53). These terms are presented to replace such terms as ‘the original idea’ and ‘the borrowed one,’ ‘what is really being said or thought of’ and ‘what it is compared to,’ ‘the underlying idea’ and ‘the imagined nature.’ Terms that reject such categorization are needed. Richards presents the terms tenor and vehicle for this purpose. He says, “we need the word metaphor for the whole double unit, and to use it sometimes for one of the two components in separation from the other is as injudicious as that other trick by which we use ‘the meaning’ here sometimes for the work that the whole double unit does and sometimes for the other component – the tenor, as I am calling it – the underlying idea or principal subject which the vehicle or figure means”. To use a linguistic terminology, vehicle is the ‘global’ meaning and tenor the ‘underlying idea’ or principle subject which the vehicle means.

Richards argues that tenor and vehicle interact in the production of meaning. Their co-presence results in a meaning which is not attainable without their interaction. As opposed to the traditional view, vehicle is not a mere embellishment of a tenor; they are in co-operation and interaction. At one extreme, the tenor may become a mere embellishment for the vehicle.

What is noteworthy in Richards’ view is that he sees the relation of metaphor to the objects in natural phenomena as arbitrary. In *The Meaning of Meaning* he states, “between the symbol and the referent there is no relevant relation other than the indirect one” (11). If, as already has been said, according to Richards, all language is metaphorical, the indirect relationship between the symbol and the referent suggests that language does not necessarily denote objects and this puts into question the idea of ‘literal meaning’ in language, which is claimed to directly denote the object of perception. Thus, employing such a view,

Richards rejects the presence of such thing as 'literal' and tries to replace the literal-metaphorical distinction with 'vehicle' and 'tenor,' both of which being components of the metaphor. Besides, he sees metaphor, as the romantics did, as closely related to the subject that uses it and he imbues this subject with a privileged role in its relation to the 'object.'

Like Richards, Harries also handles metaphor on the discourse level, but, unlike him, he focuses rather on the problem of referentiality in metaphor. In his article "Metaphor and Transcendence" Harries questions ideas of unity and self-sufficiency in metaphor and argues that through metaphor a poem always transcends itself and refers to texts, concepts, entities and objects beyond itself. Harries stresses the paradoxical relationship between the poet's effort to achieve unity in his work of art and the inevitable use of metaphor. What makes this relationship paradoxical is the associative/connective, referential and transcendental nature of metaphor and the poet's constant effort for self-sufficiency.

Harries argues that "if poetic self-sufficiency is to be preserved, the authority of the poet's poetic precursors must also be negated" (Harries 81). In Harold Bloom's terminology, metaphors inherited from precursors refer to things (precursor poems, etc.) beyond the poem, and thus they become obstacles that the poet seeks to remove with his own combinations. Not only the strength of earlier poems but also language weighs on the poet. We are always face to face with words not quite our own, "words that make us speak as if another person is speaking, see as this person sees" (81).

As can be observed, the important point in Harries' idea is that metaphor is a characteristic of language; it makes the language of a text transcend itself. Thus, it is not a linguistic item that is used merely for embellishment; it is an inescapable component of textual discourse. In this case, textual discourse itself is metaphorical. This idea is important for the purpose of this study because this study will handle metaphor and myth as indivisible components of poetic discourse.

While Richards sees metaphor as a self-sufficient entity acquiring its meaning from context and Harries focuses on the referential function of metaphor, such critics as Ina Loewenberg, John R. Searle, Ted Cohen and Wayne C. Booth have brought a different dimension to the idea of metaphor. They see metaphor as a communicative unit through which the speaker conveys a message to the hearer. Among these critics, Loewenberg handles metaphor as a means of communication between an addresser and addressee. In her "Identifying Metaphors" Loewenberg argues that "metaphors are identifiable only if we can identify some utterances as metaphors" (170). We cannot "identify metaphors" – as most linguists have done – "by singling out any kind of sentence" (170). She states that knowledge of "the truth or falsity of statements and the intentions of the speaker are essentially involved in the identification of utterances as metaphorical" (170).

In this respect, Loewenberg argues, metaphorical utterances are like speech acts, because 1) No one correctly understands a metaphorical utterance unless he understands it *as* a metaphorical utterance; 2) no one produces a metaphorical utterance unless he utters a sentence as a metaphor; and 3) some unifying principle appears to underlie all metaphors. Then, at the heart of Loewenberg's view lies the idea that metaphorical utterances are like illocutionary acts. They do not include truth-claims and assertions. Instead, they are proposals made by the speaker to the hearer.

Handling metaphor in terms of the relationship between an addresser and addressee, Loewenberg brings a new dimension to discussions of metaphor. However, her presupposing the presence of a 'literal' meaning and seeing metaphorical meaning as an extension of the literal one differentiate her idea from those of Richards and Harries.

Like Loewenberg, John R. Searle also takes metaphor as a form of communication between the speaker and the hearer; but, unlike her, he rather privileges the speaker over the hearer in his argument because he states that the speaker's intention in uttering the metaphorical statement has an *a priori* role in the meaning and function of metaphor. Searle explains metaphor by drawing a

distinction between what a speaker means by uttering words, sentences and expressions, and what the words, sentences and expressions themselves mean. He calls the former "speaker's utterance meaning," and the latter "word or sentence meaning." Searle argues that when in an utterance the speaker's utterance meaning differs from word or sentence meaning, then this utterance is a metaphorical one. In this respect, the word/sentence meaning is the literal one and the speaker's utterance meaning (when it is different from the word/sentence meaning) the metaphorical one. Thus, Searle thinks that words have meanings independent of the human mind but these words acquire metaphorical meaning with the intervention of the human mind, that is, the speaker's intention.

For Searle, the differences between literal and metaphorical utterances are that in the case of literal utterance, the speaker's meaning and sentence meaning are the same. In order to understand the utterance, the hearer does not require any extra knowledge beyond his knowledge of the rules of language, his awareness of the conditions of the utterance and a set of shared background assumptions. However, in the case of metaphorical utterance, the truth conditions of the assertion are not determined by the truth conditions of the sentence and its general terms. He should have knowledge of the speaker's intentions. The metaphorical utterance means something different from the meaning of the words and sentences, not because "there has been a change in the meanings of the lexical elements, but because the speaker means something different by them; the speaker's meaning does not coincide with sentence or word meaning" (Searle 258).

Since he places the speaker at the centre of metaphorical utterance, it is very difficult to say that Searle presupposes a certain communication between the speaker and the hearer. The hearer remains in a passive position in Searle's discussion. Moreover, his openly presupposing a 'literal' meaning puts him on the same plane as Loewenberg rather than with Richards and Harries.

Likewise, in his "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy" Ted Cohen states that what makes metaphor so effective is the sense of intimacy it creates. This intimacy takes place between the maker and the appreciator of metaphor. For

him, there is a unique way in which the maker and the appreciator of metaphor are drawn closer to one another. Three aspects are involved here: "the speaker issues a kind of concealed invitation; the hearer expends a special effort to accept the invitation; and this transaction constitutes the acknowledgement of a community" (Cohen 6). An appreciator of metaphor must do two things: he must realize that the expression is a metaphor, and he must figure out the point of the expression. In both tasks, the hearer typically employs a number of assumptions about the speaker: what the speaker believes, what the speaker believes about what the hearer believes, etc.

Wayne C. Booth proposes a similar view and sees metaphor as a means of communication; but, unlike Loewenberg, Searle, and Cohen, he handles it in rhetorical terms. In "Metaphor as Rhetoric" Booth argues that the main characteristics of successful metaphors are that they are 'active,' 'concise' and 'appropriate,' they must be properly 'accommodated to the audience,' and they must build a proper 'ethos' for the speaker, that is, they must build or sustain his character as someone to be trusted. (Booth 54-55)

On the other hand, such theorists as Max Black, Paul Henle and Monroe C. Beardsley employ a more linguistic stance, isolating metaphor from the speaker and the hearer as well as from the subject and its cognitive faculties. In his "Metaphor" Max Black criticizes the traditional 'substitution' and 'comparison' approaches to metaphor and presents his 'interaction' view and two terms—focus and frame—to replace the traditional ones. Black states that when we use a metaphor, we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a result of their interaction. According to this view: 1) metaphor works by applying to the principal subject "a system of 'associated implications' characteristic of the subsidiary subject"; 2) it selects and organizes "features of the principal subject by *implying* statements about it that normally apply to the subsidiary subject"; 3) this "involves shifts in meaning of words belonging to the same family or system as the metaphorical expression" (Black 77-78).

As seen, differently from Richards and Harries, and similar to Loewenberg, Searle and Cohen, Max Black sees metaphor as an item on the word level. Although, like all of the critics handled above apart from Richards, he argues that metaphor has a meaning of its own, he sees this meaning as an extension of the 'literal' one. Thus, he presupposes a literal meaning independent of metaphor.

Another theorist who approaches metaphor on the word level and from a linguistic stance is Paul Henle. With his idea of the 'iconic character of metaphor,' Paul Henle introduces a new term and brings a new dimension to discussions on metaphor. Like Richards and Black, Henle discusses in his "Metaphor" that some terminology other than 'literal' and 'figurative' is required to define metaphor. We shall want, Henle says, some way of referring to the relationship between a word and its various meanings. This may be accomplished by saying that a word is an "immediate sign" of its literal sense and a "mediate sign" of its figurative sense. These terms are, Henle argues, appropriate since it is only through the literal sense that one arrives at the figurative.

Relying on the above argumentation, Henle presents his idea of "the iconic character of metaphor." He defines his idea by referring to the distinction made by C.S. Pierce between symbolic and iconic modes of signification. "A sign is a *symbol* insofar as it signifies according to an arbitrary rule, insofar as it is a conventional sign. A sign is an *icon* to the extent that it signifies in virtue of similarity." In this regard, "there is clearly an iconic element in metaphor" because "metaphor depends on analogy, and in this analogy one side is used to present the other" (Henle 87).

As seen, Henle's theory, like those of Loewenberg, Searle, Cohen and Black, assumes a distinction between the literal and the metaphorical and suggests that we can understand metaphor only by referring to, or comparing it with, an extra-linguistic reality. With his idea of metaphor as resemblance/comparison Henle's view is, however, different from those of the others.

In contrast to Black and Henle, Monroe C. Beardsley's view is a totally linguistic one. In his "The Metaphorical Twist," Beardsley criticizes the traditional

view that metaphor is an implicit comparison, or an elliptical simile and introduces his "Verbal-opposition Theory." This theory, for Beardsley, focuses on the significations of the words themselves. To see these significations, "we must look for the metaphoricalness of the metaphor, so to speak, in some sort of conflict that is absent from literal expressions" (Beardsley 110-1).

The metaphorical aspect of a word can be explained with the fact that each word has certain connotations and these connotations are what form the metaphorical aspect of a word. It should be noted that these connotations do not relate the word to things in objective reality but to other words. However, this theory of connotations, Beardsley argues, is still insufficient. There needs to be another distinction, which is between connotations and the properties connoted by the term. "The connotations of a word standing for objects of a certain kind are drawn from the total set of accidental properties either found in or attributed to such objects" (Beardsley 110-1). Beardsley calls this set of accidental properties the 'potential range of connotations' of that word. The other type of connotations is 'staple connotations.'

The main point that should be underlined in the overall argument of Beardsley's article is that in understanding a metaphor, the focus should be on the word itself, its connotations/properties, its relationship with other words and its function in the structure of meaning. The focus should not be on some extra-linguistic objects or on some comparison with these objects. Or it should not be on the intentions of the speaker when uttering the word. Then, for Beardsley, although there is an objective reality out there independent of both the subject and language, in metaphor the focus should be on the word itself.

As seen above, modern theories have approached metaphor from various angles. Some have taken it on the level of discourse, while others on the level of the word; some theories have taken all language as metaphorical and seen metaphor as having a totally independent meaning, while others have seen metaphorical meaning as an extension of the literal one; and while some critics have handled it in terms of the relationship between the addresser and addressee,

others have studied it in linguistic terms. However, the common point in all these ideas is that there is an effort in all of them to break with the traditional ideas that make a clear-cut distinction between the metaphorical and the literal and subject and object, and that see metaphor as mere embellishment for the literal word.

All the ideas of metaphor handled above can in some way or the other be applied to myth. Myth can be taken in Richards' terms with respect to 'tenor' and 'vehicle' and to his idea of metaphor's relative relation to objective phenomena; in Harries' terms with respect to its referential and non-referential aspects; in Loewenberg and Searle's terms as an illocutionary act in which the speaker conveys a meaning to the hearer; and in Henle's terms as an iconic element. However, the above-mentioned ideas are on metaphor and there is no mentioning of myth in them. There are some modern ideas that focus mainly on myth and its metaphorical aspect. Three theories are outstanding in this regard: those of James Frazer, Northrop Frye and of Levi-Strauss.

James Frazer is one of the most outstanding figures in the modern approach to myth. With the ideas he presents in *The Golden Bough*, Frazer is seen as the founder of the "myth and ritual school" of interpretation. In this work, Frazer is seen to be primarily interested in studying myths that are linked to seasonal cycles, and the kind of myth he is most interested in is that concerning a fertility god and goddess. Having chosen that model, he chooses as his paradigm the Phoenican/Greek story of Adonis. The myth tells us that, as a man, Adonis is mortally wounded by a wild boar, to be subsequently revived as a god by Aphrodite, the goddess of love and fertility. The idea is that she wishes to ensure that each year he will be reborn in the spring to be with her.

The idea of "the Golden Bough" is taken to represent the renewal of the king/god. 'The Golden Bough," which is an oak, contains the power of Jupiter (Roman god of sky and storm) who periodically casts his full force into the tree in the course of a lightning flash. The successor to the title must pluck it in order to prove he has acquired divine energy. Only through this violent succession, anticipated by the violence of the thunderstorm, can the fertility of the land be

ensured. There is "a magical connection between the drama of the dying and reviving god on the one hand, and the seasonal cycle on the other. The king is dead; long live the king" (Coupe 25).

The theorist of myth who most openly assumes a close relationship between metaphor and myth is Northrop Frye. In his *Anatomy of Criticism* Frye argues that the world of literature is "a world of total metaphor, in which everything is potentially identical with everything else, as though it were all inside a single infinite body" (136). According to Frye, what makes this identification between the elements of literature possible is myth. Frye studies literature as a self-contained, self-referential being that works with certain myths or mythical elements. Works of literature are not individual entities; they work within a community of myths. Myth is the core principle of literature. It is not only part of literature but "structures its principles and even its smallest element, the symbol or archetype" (Meletinsky 88). In other words, literature is made of archetypes belonging to 'predecessor' works and it is these archetypes that make the literary world a self-contained universe.

Frye defines archetype as a "communicable unit," a "typical or recurring image," a "symbol" that "connects one poem with another and thereby helps to unify and integrate our literary experience" (*The Anatomy* 99). For instance, the repetition of certain images in literature such as the sea or the forest, binary oppositions such as light/dark, demonic/angelic, and so on or the evolution of such images in literature as well as in biblical mythology as 'sheep,' 'shepherd,' 'lamb,' 'flock,' 'pasture,' and so on into pastoral poetry (from Virgil's *Eclogues* to biblical mythology to *Lyciads* and the *Shepherd Calendar* to Blake's "The Lamb") indicate a certain unity in the imitations of nature poetry and in the communicating activity of the archetypes. Thus, the study of archetypes, Frye argues, is the study of literary symbols as parts of a whole. In this respect, literature forms a certain 'memory' consisting of a storehouse of archetypes. Archetypes are 'associative clusters' that present the poet in the process of artistic creation with a 'word-hoard' of mythical elements such as "lists of kings and foreign tribes, myths and

genealogies of gods, historical traditions, the proverbs of popular wisdom, taboos, lucky and unlucky days, charms, the deeds of the tribal heroes," and so on (57).

For Frye, the mythical patterns or images appear in certain forms of, what he calls, 'cyclical movements' in literature. With 'cyclical movement,' Frye means a motion from one point to another in mythical space and time. There are three main categories of cyclical movement: the first one is in the divine world, and it takes place with the death or rebirth, or the disappearance and return, or the incarnation and withdrawal, of a god. This divine activity is usually identified with one or more cyclical processes of nature. The god may be either a sun-god, dying at night and reborn in the morning, or a god of vegetation, dying in winter and reviving in spring. The second one is the cyclical movement presented by the "fire world of heavenly bodies." Most obvious is the journey of the sun-god across the sky, "often thought as guiding a boat or a chariot, followed by a mysterious passage through the dark underworld, sometimes conceived as the belly of a devouring monster, back to the starting point." The third is that of the human world, which exists in-between the spiritual and animal worlds.

The common points in Frazer and Frye's ideas are that both theorists have a cyclical view of history and literature and they create a fictional/metaphorical world based on this cyclical view; both of them conceive literature as a total and self-contained entity in which myths activate and manipulate each other and replace one another; and both give an *a priori* role to the seasonal cycle in myth. What makes Frazer and Frye different is that while Frazer focuses mainly on the dying and reviving god, Frye employs a Jungian/Freudian terminology and psychology, and studies the existence of myths/archetypes in literature.

A critic whose idea of myth is a great deal different from those of Frazer and Frye is Claude Lévi Strauss. Applying Ferdinand de Saussure's idea of language and Troubetzkoy's structural linguistics to anthropology, he studies myths as linguistic entities that do not operate individually but in a system. So, he focuses on the common points of myths that make them parts of the system.

The canonical article in which Levi-Strauss presents his idea of myth is "The Structural Study of Myth". In this article, Levi-Strauss argues that myths can be studied according to "the Saussurian principle of the 'arbitrary character of linguistic signs'" (209). For Levi-Strauss, myth is language: to be known, it has to be told; it is part of human speech. However, it is both language and something different from it. Levi-Strauss explains this distinction by employing Saussure's *langue* and *parole*, "one being the structural side of language, the other the statistical aspect of it, *langue* belonging to a reversible time, *parole* being non-reversible" (Levi-Strauss 209). This means that myth, as language, consists of both *langue* and *parole,* the former referring to the common aspects that make it part of a system and the latter to the individual features that differentiate it from others. In this regard, *parole* represents the historical and *langue* the ahistorical aspect of myth.

Levi-Strauss states that these two levels already exist in language. He says that myth also exists on a third level in addition to *langue* and *parole*, which also proves that myth has a language of its own. He thus argues that, while myth as structure looks like language, it is actually something different from language because it operates on a higher or more complex level. Myth shares with language the following characteristics: first, it is made of units that are put together according to certain rules; and second, these units form relations with each other, based on binary pairs or opposites, which provide the basis of the structure. Then, it can be said that on the one hand myth refers to events that are thought to have taken place long ago; and, on the other, it is timeless; it explains the present, the past and the future. According to Levi-Strauss, it is that double structure, altogether historical and ahistorical, which explains how myth is *langue* and *parole* on the one hand and a third-level entity on the other.

What characterizes the third level of myth, for Levi-Strauss, is that myth, like the rest of language, is made up of constituent units. However, the true constituent units of myth are not "the isolated relations but bundles of such relations, and it is only as bundles that these relations can be put to use and

combined so as to produce a meaning" (Levi-Strauss 211). In other words, each myth can be taken as a constituent entity but, with the special character of mythological time, myths become related to each other as a bundle; they become sub-structures of a 'metastructure.' Here, although the individual myths in the bundle may seem diachronically remote from each other, when they are grouped according to some common patterns, they begin to correspond to a two dimensional time referent "which is simultaneously diachronic and synchronic, and which, accordingly, integrates the characteristics of 'langue' on the one hand, and those of 'parole' on the other" (212). Another feature that distinguishes myth from other linguistic forms and characterizes its third level, according to Strauss, is the special binary logic lying at the root of mythical thought. The theory of binary oppositions is "the key to Lévi-Strauss' methodology…Binary oppositions – for example, high/low, hot/cold, and left/right – are the fundamental mechanism of mytho-logic, according to Lévi-Strauss" (61). Its different application of time and space and its categorizing elements of time and space in the opposition of the sacred and profane characterize the binary logic in myth. Strauss does not elaborate much on the mythological time, which is said in his work to be one of the most important characterizing principles of myth. He defines mythological time only by saying that it is ahistorical, synchronic and atemporal. However, he does not detail his definition by delving more deeply in the meanings of these terms. Cassirer's study of the concept of causality and the nature of space and time in mythological time, which will be handled in the theoretical framework of this study, will help us see better Strauss' understanding of mythological time and the third level of myth.

Although Levi-Strauss does not speak directly on the metaphorical aspect of myth, his handling myth in Saussurean terms as language whose relation to the referent (the objective phenomena) is arbitrary, his defining it as timeless, ahistorical and synchronic, and his regarding it as part of a self-sufficient system inevitably lead to the idea of the metaphorical structure of myth and its existence at the level of discourse.

In the study of the ideas of the three theorists of myth it can be seen that myth is taken not as a story about an ancient world but as a structural element that contributes to the metaphorical aspect of a work. Frazer defines this structural element in terms of his idea of the 'dying' and 'renewing' god or king; Frye in terms of his idea of the archetypal nature of literary discourse and of the modes and mythical elements present in this discourse; and Levi-Strauss, in a more abstract and at the same time generalizable way, in terms of structural linguistics. Relying on these theories of myth, this study arrives at the conclusion that it is impossible to approach myth and the mythical elements in literature without taking into account their metaphorical aspect and that myth or mythical elements are structural elements that contribute to the metaphorical nature of literary discourse.

As can be observed in the above overview, each idea approaches metaphor and myth from one perspective and each perspective lacks what another one has. One perspective takes metaphor as the language of the subject but hardly mentions myth and its discourse level; another one deals with metaphor and its arbitrary relation to reality but does not clarify the role of the subject in the creation of metaphor, and does not define myth in relation to metaphor; and another one focuses on the communication between the addresser and addressee in the production of the meaning of metaphor but at the same time presupposes a metaphorical-literal distinction in this communication. The lack of a detailed analysis of the metaphorical aspect of myth emerges as an important problem especially in the theories of myth presented above since this study argues that there cannot be a comprehensive analysis of myth without taking into account its metaphorical nature. These theories deal with this topic either just in passing or totally ignore it.

Two twentieth century philosophers who present a more comprehensive view on the role of the subject and its imagination in the production of metaphor and on the interrelatedness of metaphor and myth are the German neo-Kantian philosopher Ernst Cassirer and the French phenomenologist Paul Riceour. The

ideas of these philosophers are of great importance for the purpose of this study and thus will be elaborated on in the next chapter.

When the theories of myth are handled in relation to the ideas of metaphor, it can be observed that both groups of ideas can be placed on the same plane. As soon as we accept the proposition that myth is metaphorical, we can handle myth in terms of the ideas of metaphor, and metaphor in terms of the ideas of myth. This approach seems to be especially valid in the study of romantic poetry because in this poetry metaphor almost always appears in the form of myth and myth in the form of metaphor.

1.2 Statement of Purpose

This thesis studies the metaphorical aspect of the myth and the mythical aspect of the metaphor in the poetry of the English Romantic poets William Wordsworth, Percy Byshhe Shelley and John Keats by combining Romantic and modern theories of imagination, metaphor and myth. The study argues that a comprehensive analysis of metaphor and myth in the poetry of these poets is impossible without taking into account the privileged role of the subject[1] over the object[2] in the act of perception and the imagination as a creative and manipulative faculty. Placing the subject and its imagination at the center of poetic and linguistic creation leads to the assimilation or absorption of the object by the subject and, thus, the literal by the metaphorical. On this ground, in Shelley's words, "language" becomes "vitally metaphorical." This study contends that if language is metaphorical as a whole, then, it follows that metaphor can only be taken on the discourse level in the poetry of these poets. Myth should also be taken on discourse level like metaphor because metaphor and myth, as argued above, are faces of the same coin and they are both modes of expression for the subject and its imagination. The imagination perceives and re-creates natural phenomena by

[1] 'Subject' is used here to mean a human subject in the Kantian sense that with its mind gives form to reality and constructs objects of perception.
[2] 'Object' is used here to mean anything in nature that is tangible or visible and is stable in form, and that gains meaning with the intervention of the human mind.

imbuing them with qualities foreign to them via metaphor and myth. The argument of the study concerning the use of myth in the poetry of these poets is that myth is not used as an element representing or referring to an ancient narrative; mythopoeia [3] is stressed in them to suggest the associative faculty of the imagination and to show that myth is something that is created time and again by poetic imagination. This thesis asserts that the study of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats's poetry in the light of this theoretical background will bring a more comprehensive dimension to the understanding of this poetry.

1.3 Methodology

This thesis will not distinguish between such terms as metaphorical and literal in the study of the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. In the most general and traditional sense, the literal meaning of a word is that comprehended by users as the standard and actual one; on the other hand, metaphor is "the application of a word or expression which in literal usage denotes one kind of thing or action…to a distinctly different kind thing or action, without asserting a comparison" (Abrams 66-7). However, in *Metaphors We Live By* Lakoff and Johnson argue that "metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. We shall argue that, on the contrary, human *thought processes* are largely metaphorical. This is what we mean when we say that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined" (6). In this respect, there is no such thing as literal meaning in speech because meanings of words reshape time and again in human thought processes. What we know as literal meanings derive from other literal meanings and thus each literal meaning is in fact a metaphor in relation to a previous, maybe lost, 'literal' meaning. So, it is impossible to trace the source or standard meaning of a word in language. Similar to Lakoff and Johnson's conception of metaphor, this study proposes that language is by its very nature imaginative and thus metaphorical because imaginative forms of speech are always connotative and 'the work of resemblance,' that is, metaphorization is the

[3] Mythopoeia is the Greek word for 'myth-making.'

characterizing faculty of the imagination. As it gives shape to natural phenomena and imbues objects of nature with features that are by nature alien to them, all language becomes subsumed to the act of metaphorization in the human imagining processes. In this respect, since imagination and its construction of phenomena is central to the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats, the study will not presuppose a 'literal meaning' in the poetry of these poets and thus it will not try to dig out a stable 'literal' meaning behind the metaphorical frame. It will approach each poem as a metaphorical entity or utterance through which imagination imbues objects of nature with spiritual, ideational and mythical contents and thus defamiliarizes what is actually familiar.

Relying on Kant, Rousseau, Vico, Herder, Riceour, Cassirer and the major Romantic poets' ideas of metaphor and myth, the study will not take myth and metaphor as separate forms. The imagination's transforming objects of nature into alien entities by imbuing them with human, spiritual and sometimes divine features will be taken as an act of both metaphorization and mythologization because, depending on Riceour's idea, the act of *seeing* something *as* something else (i.e. a tree *as* a nymph, a rock *as* a human being, the clouds spreading along the sky *as* the hair of a frenzied woman and so on) is an essentially metaphorical act, and, depending on the theories of myth, a mythological act, too. Besides, language and imagination will not be taken independently because, relying on Kantian, Romantic and neo-Kantian ideas of language, language will be considered as an inherent aspect of the imagination or mind. It will be taken as a cognitive faculty, a conscious act that cannot be separated from the acts of perception and creation.

The study will analyze mythopoeia and metaphor in the poetry of William Wordsworth, Percy Bysshe Shelley and John Keats mainly in two regards: firstly, with regard to the construction and re-creation of natural phenomena by the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination; secondly, to show how myth is something that is re-created time and again by poetic imagination, with regard to the reconstruction and re-creation of ancient mythical figures. In both regards,

poetic imagination appears as a formative power that constructs, defamiliarizes and re-creates via mythologization and metaphorization. In the analysis chapters, the poems are not handled in chronological order but are grouped according to their subject matter and to the way metaphorization and mythologization take place.

The study includes three body chapters: in the first body chapter, Kantian, Romantic and modern Neo-Kantian ideas of imagination, metaphor and myth are presented; in the second one, the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats is studied in terms of the metaphorization and mythologization of objects of perception; and in the third body chapter, Romantic mythography and re-creation of precursor myths in Shelley's and Keats's poetry are handled.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

As said above, the study will analyze the use of myth and metaphor in the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. The reason why these poets are chosen is that their conceptions of the role of the perceiving subject and its imagination in myth-making and metaphor are similar to each other. In their poems myth-making and metaphor are observed to be an indispensable aspect of the perception of natural phenomena. However, a comprehensive study of the idea of imagination in the Romantic poetry cannot be done without reference to Samuel Taylor Coleridge's theory of imagination and its application in his poetry. Coleridge presents in his *Biographia Literaria* a theory of imagination which seems to have had a great influence on the formation of Romantic poetics. However, his idea differs from those of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats in that he conceives of imagination as a transcendental and godly power that creates without 'sensory impressions.' Likewise, his poetry does not directly present a perceiving subject and its imagination mythologizing and metaphorizing in the perception of nature and it does not deal with the reconstruction of mythical figures from ancient Greek and Roman mythology. Thus, although in the following chapter Coleridge's idea of imagination is mentioned, in the analysis chapters his poetry is excluded for the

sake of consistency and this is the greatest limitation of this study. Another limitation is that the study does not mention William Blake's idea of myth and poetry. Blake is considered as one of the most important figures of Romantic poetry and he created in his poetry his own mythological system that is based on a rereading of Christianity and that bears almost no resemblance to the idea of myth as incarnation of nature and reconstruction of ancient Greek and Roman mythological figures seen in Wordsworth's, Shelley's and Keats' poetry. Thus, since Blake's poetry and conception of myth are a great deal different from those of other Romantic poets and may be the subject of another thesis and since this study methodologically concerns itself with the act of myth-making as incarnation of nature and reconstruction of ancient mythological figures instead of studying structural aspects of mythological systems like that of Blake, Blake's poetry is also left out in this study. The last limitation is that the study only handles the ideas of myth and metaphor from the eighteenth century (beginning with Vico, Kant, Rousseau and Herder) to the 1970s (until Riceour); it does not present the ideas of myth and metaphor from Aristotle to the Medieval Ages, and to the eighteenth century and thus it does not present the evolution of these ideas along the history of ideas. A more comprehensive study should take into consideration these limitations.

CHAPTER II

ROMANTIC AND MODERN NEO-ROMANTIC IDEAS OF METAPHOR AND MYTH AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF ENGLISH ROMANTIC POETRY

2.1 THE ROMANTIC IDEA AND ITS PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, there was a great change in approaches to life, nature, the human subject and the relationship between subject and object. This change was represented by two main philosophical trends: on the one hand, that which thought of the human subject as the main agent of not only all artistic creation but also all human perception; and, on the other, that which saw the primitive man as ideal and—contrary to the modern/urban man—as unified with nature. The first trend was represented by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant and the other trend by the French philosophers and sociologists Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gottfried Herder. The common point in both trends was their imbuing the human subject with an important role in perception, and their rejection, although in different ways, of the distinction between subject and object. The change in philosophical ideas also caused a change in the conception of metaphor and myth. Metaphor was no longer thought of as an extra-addition to language; it was a characteristic of language. And, if there was not a distinction between subject and object, then there was also no such distinction as metaphorical-literal. In the romantic poet Percy Bysshe Shelley's words, "language is vitally metaphorical" ("A Defence of Poetry" 325). In this conception,

it may be said that myth is something that indicates the metaphorical characteristic of language.

In literature, the change in philosophical ideas was represented by the Romantic Movement. A reading of Vico, Kant, Rousseau and Herder indicates that according to romantic poetics, the subject (in this case the poetic genius) has a primary role in perception and artistic creation, and nature and man in their primitivity represent the pure and innocent side of human life while modern-urban life represents the impure and deformed side. Such distinctions as subject-object and metaphorical-literal are the result of the urban, social, logical and deformed side of human life. Besides, if the human subject is central in perception, then the object is present only as modified by the subject. According to the Romantics, metaphor is the subject's mode of expression and it is a means through which the subject's modification of natural phenomena is represented. In this respect, all language is metaphorical. This study contends that myth is not independent of the subject's mind and the metaphorical aspect of language in romantic poetry. It is something that is re-created time and again according to the modifications of the subject.

In this part of the study, a philosophical and theoretical background will be prepared for the study of romantic poetry. Thus, from the field of philosophy the ideas of Kant, Rousseau and Herder, and from literary theory the ideas of the critic-poets Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley will be studied. Another theorist who will be handled in terms of his contribution to the romantic idea of metaphor and myth is Giambattista Vico. Vico lived before Kant, Rousseau and Herder and his ideas seem to have an impact on their ideas and on the formation of romantic poetics.

2.1.1 The Philosophical Background

As have already been suggested, such philosophers as Vico, Kant, Rousseau and Herder had a direct influence on Romantic poetics. They influenced Romantic poets with their ideas of the primary role of the subject and its

imagination in the conception of reality and creation of art. However, the ideas of these philosophers cannot be understood without reference to Plato because the primary role of the subject in constructing reality was first established in Plato's philosophy of art and subject.

Plato's ideas have affected critical theories throughout history. However, until the middle of the eighteenth century (Vico is an exception), only Plato's idea of the deceptive role of art in conveying truth and the abusive character of poetic language were taken into consideration (from Quintilian and Cicero to Medieval and Enlightenment critics). What was of concern was the idea Plato presents in Book X of *The Republic* that all poetical imitations have "a destructive influence on the minds of those who hear [them]" (595b5-6) and that the artist "fool[s] children and people with no judgment" (598c3-4). This understanding of Plato's ideas culminated in the ideas of the Age of Enlightenment philosophers. One of these philosophers was John Locke (1632-1704), who, following the trend of the language debates in the Royal Society, criticized poetic/metaphorical language in his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* as follows:

> Since wit and fancy finds easier entertainment in the world than dry truth and real knowledge, *figurative speeches* and allusions in language will hardly be admitted as *an imperfection or abuse* of it…But yet, if we would speak of things as they are,…all the artificial and figurative application of words eloquence hath invented, are for nothing else but to insinuate wrong ideas, move the passions, and thereby mislead the judgment, and so indeed are perfect cheat. (qtd. in de Man, "The Epistemology" 13)

Plato's idea of the nature of art and its relative and arbitrary relation to 'reality' did not attract the attention of the critics and philosophers until the middle of the eighteenth century. However, in his *Republic* Plato does not talk only about the deceptive nature of art. He also defines the nature and position of art, which played an important role in the formation of romantic poetics. Plato states that what the artist imitates is itself an imitation of imitation. Every object that the artist imitates has a 'Form' or 'Idea,' and above it there is the creator of all Forms,

the Actual Form. According to Plato's metaphysical theory, there is an aspect of reality beyond the experiential one, which is even more 'real' in essence. This aspect of reality, the intelligible realm, is comprised of unchanging, eternal, absolute entities, which are called "Forms."

Then, each Form is an imitation of the Actual Form, the natural phenomenon the imitation of its Form and the work of art an imitation of this phenomenon. In this respect, the art of imitation "imitate[s] what appears;" so, Plato says, it is "a far cry from truth… It grasps just a little of each thing –only an image at that." Thus, the artist is a "creator of appearances" (598b-c4). So, Plato's philosophy presupposes a conceptual system based on Forms revolving around an omni-present Subject/Actual Form.

In the well-known allegory of the cave in the *Republic,* Plato exemplifies his idea of nature and the position of art. In the cave, the prisoners whose feet and heads are bound cannot look behind and see that the fire they think burning behind them is a reflection of the light of the sun coming from a narrow entrance. Besides, they take "shadows cast by the fire on the wall of the cave in front of them" to be the most real things (514a2-515a7-8). What is noteworthy in the allegory of the cave is the idea that art represents shadows, which are themselves reflections of other shadows. In this idea the subject (Forms and Actual Form) is made central and art's relationship to reality is blurred. The artist, like Lady Shallot in Tennyson's "The Lady of Shallot," 'weaves' in his work of art not the real things but their reflection.

Although Plato devalues imagination for pragmatic reasons, he magnifies it as something divine in his *Ion* (which seems to show his sincere appreciation of art). In this work, Plato argues that the artist is inspired directly by gods, and thus, he has some divinity in him. With his imagination inspired by the Muse, the artist creates 'sublime' works. Talking about Homer, Socrates says to Ion:

> As I've said earlier, that's not a subject you've mastered –speaking well about Homer.; it's a divine power that moves you, as a 'Magnetic' stone moves iron rings. (That's what Euripides called it; most people call it

> 'Heraclean') This stone not only pulls those rings, if they're iron, it also puts power in the rings, so that they in turn can do just what the stone does –pull other rings –so that there there's sometimes a very long chain of iron pieces and rings hanging from one another. In the same way, the Muse makes some people inspired herself, and then through those who are inspired a chain of other enthusiasts is suspended. (533d2-e6).

The important point in Plato's idea is that in art there is no such thing as 'objective reality' independent of the subject, and art's relation to such 'reality' is relative and arbitrary. Art is not an imitation of objects; it is only an imitation of appearances or images. When this idea is taken into consideration, it can be argued that in Plato's idea there is no subject-object division because object is submitted to the subject; and, in terms of metaphor, there is no such division as literal-metaphorical, because if art represents appearances and has no direct relation to reality, then the idea emerges that there is no such thing as 'literal' in poetic language. Since truth (Actual Form/Idea/God) is far beyond poetic language, then poetic language is purely metaphorical. And to move one step further, if the subject is at the center of being, then it can be argued that in terms of Plato's philosophy not only poetic language but all language is metaphorical.

Plato's idea of the nature of art played an important role in the development of the romantic theory of art. However, the philosopher who played the most critical role in this respect is Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), whose idealist philosophy is a developed, re-interpreted and modernized form of Plato's philosophy. What is modern in Kant is his bringing Plato's subject (the Actual Form/Idea) down to earth and focusing on—instead of Plato's Actual/Omnipresent subject—the human subject and its cognitive faculties in the act of perception.

In his *Critique of Judgment* Kant studies some judgments such as 'the judgment of taste,' the 'judgment of beauty,' the 'judgment of pleasure,' 'aesthetic judgments,' etc. and comes to the conclusion that the subject/human mind plays a primary role in these judgments. These judgments are "subjective judgments in the literal sense of being of the subject" (Crawford 31). Kant defines the subject's relation to object with the idea of 'purposiveness.' He argues, "purpose is the

object of a concept, insofar as we regard this concept as the object's cause (the real basis of its possibility); and the causality that a *concept* has with regard to its *object* is purposiveness" (CJ §10 220). Then, the existence of the object depends on the purpose of the human mind when conceiving it, that is, on the determining will of the subject. Here, like Plato's 'Forms,' each object has a concept, which is its purpose and the cause of its existence; "the object itself – its form and existence – is regarded as an effect possible only by means of a concept of the object" (Crawford 93). Crawford clarifies the meaning of 'purpose' as follows:

> purposes are tied to human motives and actions. An object is said to have a purpose when its form and existence is conceived as the result of a plan or rule (concept). Concepts are supplied by human beings. Thus, purposes are linked to wills…the conception of it in some mind with a will [is] the cause of its existence. (93-94).

In this regard, as Gilles Deleuze puts it, in Kant's philosophy, "the object in general is the correlate of the 'I think' or of the unity of consciousness; it is the expression of the *cogito*, its formal objectivization" (15). In other words, the important thing in Kant's philosophy is not the thing perceived but the human subject that perceives it. In Gilles Deleuze's terms, Kant "rejected the idea of a pre-established harmony between subject and object; substituting the principle of a necessary submission of the object to the subject itself" (22).

This idea of the subject is very important for the development of Romantic aesthetics. However, this is not the only point that played a part in this development. The way the subject perceives the object, the role of reflection and imagination in this perception and Kant's idea of the sublime are other issues in Kant's philosophy that seem to have had great effect on the romantic theory of art.

In his Introduction to the *Critique of Judgment* Kant distinguishes two types of judgment, determinant and reflective. While determinant judgment concerns the legislative function of reason, reflective judgment represents the interplay of the faculties of understanding and imagination. Kant claims,

> in judging an object with respect to its beauty, whether in nature or art, the faculty of judgment is exercised in its reflective capacity. Particular representations are perceived and reflected upon, with the mental powers attempting to discern whether the elements and relationships are organized in a purposive way (qtd. in Crawford 18).

What takes place in the experience of the beautiful is to "reflect upon" or "contemplate" via the cognitive faculties of imagination and understanding the concept of an object with respect to its beauty (Crawford 90).

For the purpose of this study, Kant's idea of the imagination and the sublime is important and bears close similarity to that of the Romantics. For Kant, imagination is a reproductive and productive faculty of the mind. It works by way of synthesis and schematization of the object of perception. In Kant's philosophy, synthesis is "the act of putting different representations together and of grasping what is manifold in them in one act of knowledge" (Caygill 382); it is "the tying of elements together into a single object or unified content of a representation" (Brook 34). There are two aspects of synthesis: first, synthesis of apprehension, which locates something in time and often in space; second, synthesis of reproduction, which associates current representations with earlier ones and which recognizes that past representations are related to present ones (Brook 35, 129). Thus, synthesis can be taken as the core principle of the mind's ability of metaphorization because, as already said, metaphor is seeing similarity in the dissimilar and creating wholes by relating different elements, that is, 'putting different representations together.'

For Kant, with its acts of synthesis, the imagination *schematizes*. Deleuze argues that we should not confuse synthesis and schema in the imagination. Schematization occurs when the faculty of understanding enters into the scene. "The schema of the imagination is the condition under which the legislative understanding makes judgments with its concepts" (Deleuze 18). Schematization, Caygill defines, "works in two directions: it prepares the intuition for being determined by the concept, but also adapts the concept for application to

intuition." In both cases "it enables judgments to take place by 'offering rules of synthesis of the imagination" (361)

In the above-mentioned function, the imagination works according to a certain rule. However, when confronted with the 'Sublime,' "the imagination surrenders itself to an activity quite distinct from that of formal reflection" (CJ §23 247). When defining sublimity, Kant argues in *Critique of Judgment* that the sublime is formless in that it is boundless. Unlike the beautiful, which is the concept of an object, the sublime can be found in the mind. He states, "for the beautiful in nature we must seek a basis outside ourselves, but for the sublime a basis merely within ourselves" (CJ §23 247). The sublime is "the expansion of the imagination" (§25 250). When we call nature sublime, it is merely because "it elevates our mind, (making) it exhibits those cases where the mind come to feel its own sublimity, which lies in its vocation and elevates it even above nature" (§28 262). Then, sublimity "is not contained in any thing of nature, but in our mind, insofar we can become conscious of our superiority to nature within us, and thereby to nature outside us. Whatever arouses this feeling in us, and this includes the *might* of nature that challenges our forces, is then called sublime" (§28 264). As it will be seen later in this study, this idea poses a direct parallelism with that of Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats.

The artistic genius is one that has the capacity to create such sublimity via the imagination. The artistic imagination cannot represent sublimity by following a certain rule because the sublime has a different nature and thus "no language can express it completely and allow us to grasp it" (§49 314). This imagination is very powerful in creating another nature by free association. To represent the sublime the imagination "goes beyond the limits of experience," creates ideas of invisible beings, such as "the realm of the blessed, the realm of hell, eternity, creation and so on" and presents them with completeness for which no example can be found in nature" (§49 315). Since they do not "constitute the exhibition of a given concept itself, but are supplementary presentation of the imagination" and express "the concept's implications and its kinship with other concepts," these ideas are called

"*attributes* of an object, of an object whose concept is a rational idea and hence cannot be exhibited adequately" (§49 315). For instance, Jupiter's eagle with the lightning in its claw is an attribute of the mighty king of heaven, and the peacock is an attribute of heaven's stately queen. Unlike logical ones, these attributes present our concepts of sublimity (they are imaginative) and thus they present something different from what can be conceived in logical terms, something "that prompts the imagination to spread over a multitude of kindred presentations that arouse more thought that can be expressed in a concept determined by words" (§49 315). Thus, the aesthetic attributes function to "quicken the mind by opening up for it a view into an immense realm of kindred presentations" (§49 315-6).

As can be observed in the above, in Kant's philosophy the mode of expression the imagination uses to represent sublimity is a metaphorical one. And this metaphorical mode of expression is not one that presupposes a subject-object or literal-metaphorical division. Literary language, according to this philosophy, is basically metaphorical. What Kant calls 'attributes' and 'kindred representations' of an object show the metaphorical basis of the language the artistic genius uses to present sublimity.

Kant's imbuing the subject with a central role, the role of the imagination in the act of perception, its faculty of synthesis, the sublime and nature as representation of the imagination and the metaphorical mode of expression the artistic genius uses to present sublimity are all ideas that can also be found in Romantic literary theory. In this regard, Kant is one of the most important philosophers (perhaps the most important one) whose ideas have a direct influence on the Romantic idea of literature; and he prepared a background for the Romantic idea of myth and metaphor as creation of the synthesizing and schematizing act of the poetic imagination.

Another philosopher whose ideas are equally crucial in the development of Romantic ideas is Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). If Kant had a direct influence on a group of Romantic poets, Rousseau had such influence on another group. So, both figures played an almost equally influential role in the formation

of Romantic ideas. However, they have very little in common. As Ernst Cassirer puts it: "for the entire range of the history of philosophy we can hardly find two spirits so little in tune with each other" (*Rousseau, Kant and Goethe* 2). While Kant focuses on the primary role of the subject in perception and studies the cognitive faculties of this subject, Rousseau studies the evolution of society and from primitive to modern times and presents the modern society as corrupted and the primitive one as ideal. However, there are also common points between them. Similar to Kant, Rousseau also sees the subject in a position that modifies reality but he does not focus as much on the subject's cognitive faculties and does not imbue the subject with so central a role as Kant does. Likewise, Rousseau also objects to any subject-object division, but, unlike Kant, he thinks that such division was absent only in the life of the primitive man.

One of the most important of Rousseau's ideas for the purpose of this study is his idea of the language of the savage man. Rousseau argued that all language grows by a process of meaning transfer, i.e, by figuration. We transfer words because of our "passionate fascination" with new discoveries, and only afterwards do we invent proper words for the new objects. Rousseau argues that in primitive life there were no proper names because language was essentially metaphorical. The savage man's language was the cry of nature, stemming from mere instinct. In his essay *On the Origin of Languages* Rousseau argues that the language of the first man was figurative. There was no such distinction as figurative meaning-literal/proper meaning because this distinction is the result of logical and abstract thinking. He states,

> As man's first motives for speaking were of the passions, his first expressions were tropes. Figurative language was the first to be born. Proper meaning was discovered last. One calls things by their true name only when one sees them in their true form. At first only poetry was spoken; there was no hint of reasoning until much later. (Rousseau 12).

He then illustrates his idea that there was no proper meaning at that time as:

> Upon meeting others, a savage man will initially be frightened. Because of his fear he sees the others as bigger and stronger than himself. He calls them *giants*. After many experiences, he recognizes that these so-called giants are neither bigger nor stronger than he. Their stature does not approach the idea he had initially attached to the word giant. So he invents another name common to them and to him, such as the name *man*, for example, and leaves *giant* to the fictitious object that had impressed him during his allusion. That is how the figurative word is born before the literal word, when our gaze is held in passionate fascination.(13)

This quotation indicates that Rousseau thinks the metaphorical-literal/proper meaning to be the production of the civilized society and its logical thinking. However, what is noteworthy in his idea is that there was no such distinction in the language of the primitive man.

Rousseau's idea of the savage man, his state of nature and the language used by him were also held by other philosophers, because this idea seems to have been popular in the Romantic intellectual atmosphere of the period. One of these philosophers is Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). In his essay *On the Origin of Language* (whose title is almost the same as Rousseau's article on language) Herder argues that the primitive man, like animals, was unified with nature. Unlike the artificial language of the developed society, his language was the language of nature. Although artful language has displaced this language of nature and the civilized way of life and social urbanity have "damned in, dried out, and channeled off the torrent and the ocean of our passions, the most violent moment of feeling," still the language of nature

> reclaims its right…without mediation, through accents. The surging storm of a passion, the sudden onslaught of joy or pleasure, pain or distress, which cut deep furrows into the soul, an overpowering feeling of revenge, despair, rage, horror, fright, and so forth, they all announce themselves, each differently after its kind. (Herder 88-89).

He compares the primitive man to an animal and claims that what makes the language of this man direct and natural is his having little need for language. Language, in its full sense, is the creation of logical thinking. Instead of such a

kind of language, the language of the primitive man is minimal and it consists of sounds, signs and utterances that have a direct relationship to his experience:

> The narrower the sphere of an animal, the less its need for language. The keener its senses, the more clearly focused on one object its conceptions, the compelling the drives: the more contracted is the mutual comprehension of its possible sounds, signs, and utterances. It is a living mechanism, a ruling instinct that speaks and perceives. (Herder 106).

The similarity of Herder's theory to that of Rousseau can clearly be observed. In both theories the primitive man, his oneness with nature and the nature of his language are privileged over the 'social man' who is estranged from nature and whose language is a logical and abstract one. In both theories the idea is that the subject was not isolated from the object or vica versa at those times. There is also a similarity in terms of the idea of metaphor. Like Rousseau, Herder "conceives of primitive man thinking in symbols, and connects metaphor with the beginning of speech itself" (Hawkes 38).

From Rousseau and Herder's ideas it can be concluded that metaphor was the primitive man's mode of expression. The language of the social man is logical, estranged, corrupted and abstract; it has the capacity only to make truth-claims. It presupposes such distinctions as metaphorical-literal and subject-object. In terms of myth, although neither Rousseau nor Herder speaks directly of myth, from their idea it can be concluded that the primitive mind that creates metaphor should also be the creator of myth. Rousseau suggests this idea in the quotation just given from his essay on language. In that quotation Rousseau argues that the savage man names a man or animal bigger and stronger than himself as *giant* or such other name. Is it not possible that in this act of creating metaphor the primitive man also creates some story about this giant? In other words, is it not possible that this metaphorical naming is also a myth-making process? When taken from this point, it can be argued that there is some Kantian element in the metaphorical naming and myth-making process because the primitive mind's cognitive faculty of imagination is involved in this process. It is an act in which the imagination of the

primitive mind gives shape to and creates fictions about his natural surrounding. Likewise, for Herder, the earliest language was 'a dictionary of the soul of the primitive man' and in it "metaphors and symbols combined to create 'mythology and a marvelous epic of the actions and speeches of all beings, a constant fable with passion and interest'" (Hawkes 38).

A similar idea had been proposed before Rousseau and Herder by Giambattista Vico (1668-1744), who seems to have had a great influence not only on Rousseau and Herder but also on the Romantic poets. In his *The New Science* Vico states,

> The first gentile peoples, by a demonstrated necessity of nature, were poets who spoke in poetic characters…The poetic characters of which they speak were certain imaginative genera (images for the most part of animate substances, of gods or heroes, formed by their imagination) to which they reduced all the species or all the particulars appertaining to each genus. (22)

Vico contends that the language of the imagination of those primitive people is inevitably metaphorical. In this regard, as it is in Rousseau's and Herder's idea, myth is the creation of this metaphorical thinking; it is a metaphor on the discourse level. He argues,

> All the first tropes are corrolaries of this poetic logic, and of these the most luminous, and hence the most necessary and frequent, is metaphor. This is ever most praised when it gives sense and passion to things which lack them, in accordance with the metaphysics reasoned out above, in which the first poets gave to bodies the being of animate substances, with only as many capacities as they themselves possessed, that is those of sense and passion, thus creating the fables [myths] from them, so that every metaphor made in this way becomes a miniature fable. (*Selected Writings* 223)

The idea present in this quotation is very important for the purpose of this study; it will be handled in relation to Riceour's view of metaphor as discourse and to Romantic poetry that is thought to represent this view. In his *The Poetics of Myth*

Meletinsky underlines this point as: "Vico's subtle understanding of the metaphorical nature of myth and of the mythological genesis of many poetic tropes, as well as his emphasis on the fact that every metaphor or metonym is at heart a miniature myth, broadly anticipates not only the Romantic interpretation of myth but also the modern view" (Meletinsky 5). In Vico's perspective, as well as in the perspectives of the Romantic poets, metaphor is not a matter of the word or sentence but of discourse.

So, according to Vico, 'primitive' legends and myths were not *lies*; they were the result of the metaphorical responses of the gentile/primitive people to the world. There were no such distinctions as subject-object or metaphorical-literal in the thinking of these people. Indeed, the very distinction we make between the 'literal' and the 'metaphorical' is only available in societies which acquired the capacity for abstract/rational thinking. It is unavailable where thought is 'concrete.' For Vico, the poetic wisdom of the gentile world began "with a metaphysics not rational and abstract like that of learned men now, but felt and imagined as that of these first men, who, without power of ratiocination, were all robust sense and vigorous imagination" (*The New Science* 116).

The constant reference to the role of human imagination in the process of artistic creation shows the proximity of Vico's ideas to those of Kant, Rousseau and Herder as well those of the Romantic poets. Just like these, in Vico's idea the creations of the imagination are 'sublime'; he states,

> In such fashion the first men of the gentile nations, children of nascent mankind, created things according to their own ideas…they did it by a virtue of a wholly corporeal imagination. And because it was corporeal, they did it with marvelous sublimity; a sublimity such and so great that it excessively perturbed the very persons who by imagining did the creating, for which they were called 'poets,' which is Greek for 'creators.' Now this is the three fold labor of great poetry: 1). To invent sublime fables suited to the popular understanding, 2) to perturb to excess, with a view to the end proposed, 3) to teach the vulgar to act virtuously, as the poets have taught themselves. (*The New Science* 179)

Vico's idea that those primitive people created "sublime fables" with their rigorous imagination indicates his view of 'myth,' 'metaphor' and 'sublimity' as closely interrelated to each other and as being direct creations of poetic imagination.

As can be seen, in all the ideas handled so far the subject and its imagination are endowed with a constitutive role in poetic creation. In this regard, poetic creation is taken as an essentially metaphorical and mythic act. However, they differ from each other in that while Vico, Rousseau and Herder take this metaphorical and mythic act of the imagination as a characteristic of only primitive people, Kant sees it as faculty of the human mind common to all human beings.

2.1.2 The Romantic Conception

Vico, Kant, Rousseau and Herder's ideas had direct influence on the development of the English Romantic poetry and theory. Almost all Romantic poets—from William Blake to William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Percy Bysshe Shelley and to John Keats—were somehow influenced by those ideas. All these poets saw poetic imagination as a constitutive factor in poetic creation, conceived the human imagination as a form-giving faculty that subjects natural phenomena to its act of construction, and took man's relation to nature as a factor that inspires the imagination to employ mythical and metaphorical modes of expression.

William Wordsworth is one of these poets. With his idea of nature, natural man and language, Wordsworth comes closer to Vico, Rousseau and Herder than to Kant. However, still there is a Kantian element in his idea of poetry.

In his 1802 version of the Preface to *Lyrical Ballads* Wordsworth claims that poetry should take rustic/natural life and its people as its principal object and represent these people with a language really used by them. Describing his aim in the *Lyrical Ballads*, in terms reminiscent of Vico, Rousseau and Herder, he states that his main aim in these poems has been to choose "incidents and situations from

common life," relate them "in a selection of language really used by men," and "to throw over them a certain colouring of the imagination, whereby ordinary things should be presented to the mind in an unusual way" ("Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*" 286). Low and rustic life has been chosen,

> because in that condition the essential passions of the heart find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity, are less under restraint, and speak a plainer and emphatic language; because in that condition of life our elementary feelings co-exist in a state of greater simplicity, and, consequently, may be more accurately contemplated, and more forcibly communicated. (286-7)

And the language of rustic people has been adopted, because "such men hourly communicate with the best objects from which the best parts of language is originally derived" (297).

As seen, Wordsworth's idea of poetry indicates the influence of Vico, Rousseau and Herder. However, while Rousseau and Herder name the man of nature as a primitive or savage man and Vico named him as 'a man of the gentile nations,' Wordsworth calls him the rustic or common man; but in both cases, the man they describe is one who is unified with nature and thus who does not experience subject-object division.

However, there is also a Kantian aspect in Wordsworth's idea because he does not only describe the kind of man, language and way of life that poetry should choose as its subject matter but also the relation of poetry to its creator and the role of the poet's mind in the process of creation. He defines poetry as "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings" ("Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*" 287). This does not mean that it is a sentimentalist art, because "it takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquility." Then, the feelings or emotions are filtered in the mind before being expressed, which means that this process is not a 'spontaneous' one and the kind of expression is not an 'overflow.' The emotion is "contemplated till, by a species of reaction the tranquility gradually disappears, an emotion, kindred to that which was before the subject of contemplation, is

gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind" (295). In other words, our "influxes of feeling are modified and directed by our thoughts" and "by contemplating the relation of these general representatives to each other we discover what is really important to men" (287).

His idea of the role of perceiver and his mind in perception becomes clearer in "The Sublime and the Beautiful," a prose work on the 'sublime' in nature Wordsworth wrote supposedly between 1811 and 1812. In this work, Wordsworth argues that "to talk of an object as being sublime or beautiful in itself, without references to some subject by whom this sublimity or beauty is perceived, is absurd" ("The Sublime and the Beautiful" 271). For Wordsworth, the perceiving subject is important in the perception of sublimity because sublimity is something that emerges only when "the comparing power of the mind" perceives similitude in dissimilitude and forms a whole out of actually unconnected natural phenomena. To exemplify his idea, he asks the reader to turn his eyes towards "that cluster of Mountains at the head of Windermere." These mountains will not seen as sublime without perceiving at the same time "the Pikes of Langdale and the black precipice contiguous to them." Thus, "the whole complex of impression is made of these elementary parts, and the effect depends on their co-existence" (265). Here, "the capability of perceiving these qualities, and the degree in which they are perceived, will of course depend upon the state and condition of the mind" (265).

Wordsworth gets closer and closer to Vico, Rousseau and Herder when presenting sublimity as a characteristic of 'primal' feelings and imaginations. For Wordsworth, adult/logical thinking mitigates and destroys the sensation of sublimity objects create in our minds. However,

> It cannot be doubted that a Child or an unpracticed person [in Vico's terms 'the earliest gentile person,' or in Rousseau and Herder's terms 'the primitive man] whose mind is possessed by the sight of a lofty precipice, with its attire of hanging rocks and starting trees, &c., has been visited by sense of sublimity, if personal fear and surprise or wonder have not been carried beyond certain bounds. For whatever suspends the comparing power of the mind and possesses it with a feeling of or image of intense unity, without a conscious

> contemplation of parts, has produced that state of the mind which is the consummation of the sublime. (265)

Sublimity, then, depends on the condition of the mind of the perceiver. In this respect, studying sublimity, Wordsworth states, "the true province of the philosopher is not to grope about in the external world…or to set himself the task of persuading the world such is a sublime or beautiful object, but to look into his own mind and determine the law by which he is affected" (271).

We see the same common point with Vico, Rousseau, Kant and Herder's ideas also in Wordsworth's idea of imagination. In "*Preface* to Poems" (1815) Wordsworth thinks that poetic imagination is not a faithful agent of copying external objects; it is "of a higher import, denoting operations of the mind upon those objects, and processes of creation or of composition, governed by certain fixed laws" ("Preface to *Poems*" 377). For Wordsworth, these processes of imagination are carried on "either by conferring additional properties upon an object, or abstracting from it some of those which it actually possesses" (379). Thus, it is not only a 'modifying' power; it also shapes and creates (380). In this regard, poetic imagination is a prophetic one, one which can be seen in the lyrical parts of the Holy Scriptures and the works of Milton, "who was a Hebrew in soul" (382). According to Wordsworth, these works are "grand store-houses of enthusiastic and meditative Imagination, of poetical, as contradistinguished from human and dramatic imagination" (381). Thus, Wordsworth conceives imagination as a transcendent and prophetic agent that creates reality.

From his ideas we can arrive at the conclusion that metaphor is the linguistic expression of the natural man. This language is also essentially mythical. It is an agent through which thoughts of external objects are incarnated with extraordinary characteristics. In the third essay of "Essays Upon Epitaphs" (1810) Wordsworth argues that "words are too awful an instrument for good and evil to be trifled with…an incarnation of thought…like the power of gravitation or the air we breathe" (361). Wordsworth exemplifies the mythical and metaphorical power of language to incarnate thought by studying, in the second essay on epitaphs, an

epitaph written by Marquis of Montrose upon being informed of death of his Master Charles 1st. The epitaph goes as follows:

> Great , Good, and just, could I but rate
> My griefs, and thy so rigid fate;
> I'd weep the world to such a strain,
> As it should deluge once again.
> But since thy loud-tongued blood demands supplies,
> More from Briareus hands than Argus eyes,
> I'll sing thy Obsequies with Trumpets sound,
> And write thy Epitaph with blood and wounds
> (in "Essays Upon Epitaphs" 346)

On this epitaph Wordsworth states that the writer of these lines uses "the most tremendous event in the history of the Planet, namely, the Deluge" to express the physical image of tears. For him, using such a dissimilar idea to represent a physical activity (in other words, the activity of seeing similitude in dissimilitude – which is a metaphorical act)

> passes into the region of Fable [myth] likewise; for all modes of existence that forward his purpose are to be pressed into the service. The whole is instinct with spirit, and every word has its separate life; like the Chariot of the Messiah, and the wheels of that Chariot, as they appeared to the imagination of Milton aided by that of the Prophet Ezekiel. ("Essays Upon Epitaphs" 346).

As can be observed, Wordsworth's idea of poetry, imagination, sublimity in nature, metaphor and myth bears resemblance with those of Vico, Rousseau, Herder and Kant. For Wordsworth, poetic language is an inherent character of poetic imagination and myth an immanent character of this poetic language. And if, for Wordsworth, the imagination is an active force of tremendous power, sufficient "to produce such changes even in our physical nature as might almost appear miraculous" ("Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*" 287), then metaphor is a mode of expression for representing the modification and creation of phenomena by the imagination, and myth is an immanent aspect of this act of modification and creation.

Another romantic poet whose ideas are important in the romantic literary theory is Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Unlike Wordsworth, Coleridge bases his idea on Kant and Plato's ideas. And he differs from all of them by employing most of the time Biblical and Hebrew understanding. As will be remembered, such understanding is also sometimes employed by Wordsworth. However, it is not so prevalent in Wordsworth and, furthermore, where it appears it is thought to be a result of Coleridge's influence.

It is impossible to understand Coleridge's idea of language and myth without knowing the distinctive character of his philosophy. Like Kant, Coleridge thinks that the subject's mind and its cognitive faculties play a primary function in perception and in the act of creation. The most important faculty in this regard is imagination. Coleridge also employs Kant's ideas of synthesis and schematization to define the way imagination works when 'creating' reality.

However, his definition of imagination and dividing it into 'primary' and 'secondary' in his *Biographia Literaria* makes his idea parallel in some ways to Plato's idea of Forms. He famously defines 'primary' imagination as "the living Power and prime Agent of all human perception…the repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM"; and the 'secondary' imagination as:

> The secondary I consider as an echo of the former [the primary imagination], co-existing with the conscious will, yet still as identical with the primary in its kind of its agency, and differing only in degree, and in the mode of its operation. It dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create; or where this process is rendered impossible, yet still, at all events, it struggles to idealize and to unify" (167).

As seen, the primary imagination is just like Plato's 'Actual Form' and the secondary like Plato's 'Forms.'

As a matter of fact, Coleridge does not give a detailed explanation of what he means by primary and secondary imaginations. We derive this meaning from his religious ideas and his constant reference in his prose writings to God and his

'Supreme Imaginative Power' (what he calls 'primary imagination), the Bible as 'the Word of God' (just like the creation of artistic imagination) and human imagination (what he calls 'secondary imagination') as an agent immanent in the Supreme Power. This is why Robert Barth terms Coleridge's imagination as "scriptural imagination" and states that Coleridge handles "imagination as it is manifested in the Bible" (Barth 135). When speaking on "the histories and political economy" in *The Statesman's Manual* he states,

> [They] are the *product* of an unenlivened generalizing Understanding. In the Scriptures they are the living *educts* [those things that are educed] of the Imagination; of that reconciling and mediatory power, which incorporating the Reason in Images of the Sense, and organizing (as it were) the flux of the Senses by the permanence and self-circling energies of the Reason, gives birth to a system of symbols, harmonious in themselves, and consubstantial with the truths, of which they are the conductors. These are the Wheels which Ezekiel beheld, when the hand of the Lord was upon him, and he saw visions of God as he sat among the captives by the river of Chebar. *Whithersoever the Spirit was to go, the wheels went, and thither was their spirit to go: for the spirit of the living creature was in the wheels also*. The truths and the symbols that represent them move in conjunction and form the living chariot that bears up (for us) the throne of the Divine Humanity. Hence, by a derivative, indeed, but not a divided influence, and though in a secondary yet in more than a metaphorical sense, the Sacred Book is worthily intitled *the* Word of God. (in *Norton Anthology: Vol II* 409-410)

His meaning becomes clearer when he says:

> The fact therefore, that the mind of man in its own primary and constitutional forms represents the laws of nature, is a mystery which of itself should suffice to make us religious: for it is a problem of which God is the only solution, God, the one before all, and of all, and through all! (411).

We can understand better what he means by 'primary' and 'secondary' imaginations and see the Platonic aspect of his idea when he defines 'symbol' as "characterized by a translucence of the Special in the Individual or of the General

in the Especial or of the Universal in the General. Above all by the translucence of the Eternal through and in the Temporal" (411).

Like God, the poet creates his work of art with his 'synthesizing' and 'schematizing' imagination. The poet "diffuses a tone and a spirit of unity that blends and fuses, each into each, by that synthetic and magical power to which we have exclusively appropriated the name of imagination" (*Biographia Literaria* 174). To represent this character of the imagination, Coleridge presents the term 'esemplastic,' by which he means "to shape into one." In other words, the imagination creates "similitude" out of "dissimilitude," which is a fundamentally metaphorical activity:

> This power [imagination], first put in action by the will and understanding, […] reveals itself in the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities: of sameness, with difference; of the general, with the concrete; the idea, with the image, the individual, with the representative; the sense of novelty and freshness, with old and familiar objects. (174)

Coleridge's idea of language and myth is in accord with his philosophy. Just like Plato and Kant, he thinks of language as the mode of expression for the omni-Present Subject, as 'the Word of God.' This language is essentially metaphorical and presumes no subject-object, metaphorical-literal divisions because all being is immanent in the Subject. The fundamental notion that emerges from Coleridge's thinking is that "the ultimate realization of the imagination takes a linguistic form, and that form is most obviously manifested in the sort of association of ideas which generates metaphor" (Hawkes 43). In other words, "Coleridge conceives of metaphor as Imagination in action" (Hawkes 43). If imagination is "the shaping spirit" that projects the world, metaphor, then, is the mode of speech that represents this process. As Coleridge writes to James Gillman in 1827, "Imagination stretches the mind because it 'stretches' reality by the linguistic means of metaphor. Given this, metaphor cannot be thought of as simply a cloak for pre-existing thought. A metaphor *is* a thought in its own right" (qtd. in Hawkes 55)

However, according to Coleridge's philosophy, language cannot be taken in isolation from myth because the 'Word of God' or the language of poetic imagination has a mythical character. In *Aids to Reflection* (1825) he states, "If words are not THINGS, they are LIVING POWERS, by which the things of most importance to mankind are actuated, combined and humanized" (10). And, in 1824, he wrote to John Murray: "Language is the sacred Fire in the Temple of Humanity; and the Muses are its especial & Vestal Priestesses" (qtd. in Jaspers 23). In *Coleridge's Figurative Language* Tim Fulford argues that Coleridge employs and re-interprets Hebrew mythology in his idea of myth. Relying on Robert Lowth's *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, in which the Old Testament is treated as poetry, Coleridge thinks that

> the Hebrew poets' imagination is a power producing pleasure by its discovery of similarity between apparently unrelated things…A new discovery of relatedness, beyond the dissimilarity of appearances, suggests a unity underlying the finite world, stemming from the unity of God. (Fulford 84).

Then, for Coleridge, in the Hebrew thinking imagination is seen as forming unity between dissimilar things. Thus, it is an agent whose main mode of expression is metaphorical language. Such poetic language, Coleridge thinks, can best be found in the Hebrew Psalms, who, with their rigorous imagination, create wholes out of dissimilar things. In this respect, the kind of poet presumed by Coleridge is a prophet-like figure who creates and modifies with his artistic imagination. And myth is a kind of metaphorical expression employed by the vigorous imagination of prophetic figures because it is something that is 'created' and 'reconstructed' by this imagination.

Percy Bysshe Shelley is another romantic poet who pointed to the synthesizing faculty of the imagination and to the role of metaphor as a mode of expression in this process. In his *A Defence of Poetry* he argues that the imagination is "the principle of synthesis, and has for its objects those forms which are common to universal nature and existence itself" (323). Contrasting reason and

imagination, he says, "reason respects the differences, and imagination the similitude of things. Reason is to Imagination as is the instrument to the agent, as the body to the spirit, as the shadow to the substance" (324). Consequently, if the imagination works by building similitude between things and if metaphor, in Coleridge's words, is the conception of "similitude in dissimilitude," then it can be said that for Shelley the imagination works in a metaphorical way. Likewise, if "language is arbitrarily produced by the imagination," then it is "vitally metaphorical" (325).

Shelley states that poetry may be defined as "the expression of the Imagination." He argues that the imagination works by building association between past, present and future. Like the 'stream of consciousness' technique used in the first half of the twentieth century, the imagination connects the past, the present and the future and fuses the elements of the past and the future in the present. He states, "the future is contained within the present as the plant within the seed" (*A Defence* 325). And the poet is someone who "not only beholds intensely the present as it is" but also "he beholds the future in the present, and his thoughts are the germs of the flower and the fruit of latest time" (325). He is someone who "participates in the eternal, the infinite, and the one" (325).

This idea of the Imagination with metaphorical language as its mode of expression also sheds light on Shelley's understanding of myth. If the Imagination is a 'connective' or 'associative' power that 'boils' the past and future in 'the eternal present,' then myth is not a historical narrative belonging to the past but something which is modified by the imagination, associated with the present, and used for present political purposes. And if the imagination works in a metaphorical way, then myth is a metaphorical narrative.

Shelley illustrates his idea of myth in "Essay on the Devil and Devils," supposedly written in 1819. In this essay Shelley argues that such images as that of the Devil belonging to Biblical mythology are personifications "of the struggle which we experience within ourselves, and which we perceive in the operations of external things as they affect us, between good and evil" ("Essay on the Devil and

the Devils" 265). This can be proved with the fact that the image of Devil did not exist in Greek mythology; "the poetical imagination" of the Greek philosophers "abstained from introducing a living and thinking Agent, analogous to the human mind, as the author and superintendent of the world" (265). This image first appeared in the Book of Job, where the "magnificence and purity, indeed, of the poetry and the irresistible grandeur of the poem suggest the idea that it was a birth of the vigorous infancy of a community of men" (265) In *Paradise Lost* Milton revised the myth and represented the Devil, according to Shelley, as a 'romantic hero' objecting to God's authority. In this regard, "he has conferred on the modern mythology a systematic form" (267) and "clothed [the Devil] with the sublime grandeur of a graceful but tremendous spirit – and restored him to the society" (268). Then, Shelley handles myth as something modifiable and re-creatable by poetic imagination. His handling of the Prometheus myth in his *Prometheus Unbound* exemplifies his understanding of myth. In Aeschylus' work, as Hogle puts it, the myth does not go "beyond the ultimate submission to high authority that is set up as the destined end of the Titan's [Prometheus's] defiance" (Hogle 170). Instead of the traditional conception that has taken myth in terms of commonly accepted values and knowledge, Shelley places himself "in the line of those 'Greek tragic writers'" and Milton "who refused to adhere to the common interpretation" (171). These predecessor mythopoeists "all begin with established mythological schema that they proceed to reveal as transient and modifiable" and subject it to "critique and reconstruction" (171). Just like these predecessors, Shelley takes the Prometheus myth and reconstructs it so that Prometheus becomes a romantic hero rejecting authority.

Until now, Shelley appeared to be a Kantian poet-critic. However, his idea about the infancy of society and the origin of poetry is very similar to those of Vico, Rousseau and Herder. He states,

> In the infancy of society every author is necessarily a poet, because language itself is poetry; and to be a poet is to apprehend the true and the beautiful, in a word the good which exists in the relation, subsisting, first

> between existence and perception, and secondly between perception and expression. Every original language near to its source is in itself the chaos of a cyclic poem: the copiousness of lexicography and the distinctions of grammar are the works of a later age, and are merely the catalogue and the form of the creations of Poetry. (*A Defence* 325)

As seen, like Vico, Rousseau and Herder, here, Shelley thinks that in the infancy of society every author is a poet because language itself is poetry – that is "vitally metaphorical." And again, like them, he thinks that there is no subject-object, metaphorical-literal distinction in the life of the primitive man. However, different from them, he thinks that these things do not exist only in the primitive society. In the civilized society also language is metaphorical and there are no subject-object and metaphorical-literal distinctions, because what makes language metaphorical and destroys such distinctions is the Imagination, which has been present throughout history. Imagination is even something which associates the elements of the 'infancy of society' with the present and makes them belong to the present. In this regard, it can be argued that there is no 'infancy of society' as a historical/chronological element; 'the infancy of society' is in language because it is "eternal, infinite and one" (*A Defence*" 325). This idea sheds light on our understanding of myth in two aspects: first, the way myths were created in 'the infancy of society'; second, the idea that we are constantly making/re-making myths.

From these ideas we can arrive at the conclusion that, like Wordsworth and Coleridge, Shelley conceives language as a metaphorical and mythical mode of expression for poetic imagination in its act of constructing and modifying natural phenomena. Meanwhile, Shelley's idea lies parallel to those of Vico, Rousseau, Herder and Wordsworth in that he thinks that in the infancy of society people were poets speaking in metaphor and creating fables in their communion with nature. Apart from that, in his general view of myth Shelley thinks that myth should be handled in terms of the example of the ancient Greek tragic writers and Milton, who subject myth to constant reconstruction.

From the above analysis it can be concluded that the Romantic idea of metaphor and myth relied on two philosophical trends which cannot be isolated from each other: one that was represented by philosophers from Plato to Kant, that conceived the subject in a central position and saw the object as dependent on or as constituent of the subject; and the other one that was represented by philosophers such as Vico, Rousseau and Herder and that saw metaphor and myth-making as the primitive man's mode of expression. However, as can be derived from this argument, there were common points between these two philosophical trends: both of them imbued the subject and its imagination with a central position and saw metaphor and myth in relation to the subject. Taking into consideration the ideas of the Romantic poets studied above, it can be said that Wordsworth was closer to Vico, Rousseau and Herder than to Kant, Coleridge to Kant more than the other philosophers, and Shelley was equally influenced by all these philosophers. However, all three poet-critics saw the imagination or the human mind as an agent that articulated 'objective reality,' and conceived of metaphor and myth in a function that actualized this process. Likewise, all three poets think that myth is something that is 'created' and 'reconstructed' by the rigorous poetic imagination. It is not a historical narrative that passes from age to age without modification. It is an artistic creation that is re-interpreted, created and modified time and again.

2.2 MODERN NEO-ROMANTIC IDEAS: ERNST CASSIRER AND PAUL RICOEUR

The Romantic/Kantian ideas of metaphor and myth were re-interpreted and re-constructed in a modern philosophical context by the German philosopher Ernst Cassirer and the French thinker Paul Ricoeur. Both of these philosophers approached metaphor and myth relying on the Romantic/Kantian ideas, taking the human mind and imagination as important constitutive factors in linguistic and artistic creation and in the conception of reality. However, Romantic/Kantian ideas will not suffice to understand or explain their theories; it is also necessary to have

certain background knowledge about the philosophical atmosphere of the first half of the twentieth century.

The philosophical atmosphere of the first half of the twentieth century was pervaded by various ideas of phenomenology. The philosophical perspective and method of phenomenology was established by the German thinker Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) in *Ideas: A General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology* (1913). Husserl's philosophy studies the structures of experience as they are represented in consciousness. For Husserl, there exist objective phenomena independent of consciousness but these objective phenomena do not mean anything by themselves; they gain meaning through sensory perception and consciousness. Then, the important thing for Husserl's phenomenology is to see how the conscious world of the perceiver acts in the physical world of objects. In this regard, Husserl proposes his idea of "intentionality," which means the directedness of consciousness towards its object in the process of structuring it, fixing it in some context or imbuing it with some meaning.

The idea of phenomenology had a great impact on the philosophers and literary theorists of the first half of the twentieth century. From Heidegger to Henri Bergson and Jean-Paul Sartre in the field of philosophy and from the author-centered idea of E.D. Hirsch to the reader-response theories of Roman Ingarden, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Wolfgang Iser, Stanley Fish and Norman Holland in the area of literary criticism, many philosophers and literary theorists employed a phenomenological view and assumed a primary role for consciousness either in human perception in general or artistic creation and reception in particular.

As can clearly be seen, this idea is not a production of the twentieth century philosophy and criticism. Its roots can be traced back to Kantian philosophy and Romanticism and even further back to Plato and his metaphysical thinking. This line of thought sees consciousness as an agent constitutive of natural phenomena. However, Husserl differentiates his philosophy from the Kantian/Romantic thinking by assigning a more important role to natural phenomena in perception and less importance to the idea of synthesis and

intellectual construction. He does not "confine himself to the spontaneity of the intellect and the process of categorical constitution" (Kaufmann 810). Instead, he studies the 'phenomenal experience' of individual consciousness in the conception of natural phenomena and assumes a freer plane of movement for consciousness. In Husserl's philosophy 'intention' is always preceded by fulfillment, and perception by impression.

Ernst Cassirer and Paul Ricoeur, like the phenomenologists of the twentieth century and the idealist philosophers of the Romantic and pre-Romantic period, assign to the human mind/consciousness/imagination a primary role in the act of perception and artistic creation. They think that consciousness is a constructive agent. What makes them distinct from other modern philosophers and critics and relevant to this study is their focus on the study of metaphor and myth, their handling of them as interrelated and natural modes of expression for the mind/imagination, and establishing their theories by relying much more openly than others on the Kantian/ romantic ideas.

2.2.1 Ernst Cassirer and the Role of 'Human Spirit' in Linguistic and Artistic Creation

Ernst Cassirer based his ideas mainly on Kant's philosophy but differed from Kant by expanding Kant's idea to the study of language and myth and employing some aspects of Husserl's phenomenology. He took Kant's idea of 'synthesis' and 'schema' and saw consciousness as a constructive/form-giving faculty; but he realized the fact that human consciousness could not be understood only by studying epistemological and categorical thinking and extended Kantian philosophy to encompass the study of myth and language. In this way, Kant's critique of reason became "a generalized critique of culture, showing how all content of culture presupposes and involves a primordial act of mind, an act of creative integration" (Werkmeister 795). Furthermore, unlike Kant and later neo-Kantians but like Husserl, he did not take the constitutive act of consciousness in strict categorical terms; he speaks throughout his work of "the infinite complex of

contents" consciousness creates out of the "flux of sensory impressions." He seems to have realized the fact that the study of language and myth itself negates such categorical thinking. All these factors make Cassirer a philosopher whose main point of reference is Kant but who extends Kant's philosophy by doing a comprehensive study of language and myth and by employing some characteristics of Husserl's idea of phenomenology.

In the three volumes of *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (the first volume being on language, the second on mythical thinking and the third on the language of scientific knowledge) Cassirer studies the interrelation between language, myth and science—which he calls symbolic forms—and the role of human consciousness, or as he terms it, "the human spirit" in their creation. For Cassirer, these forms are not "mere structures which we can insert into a given world"; they are "functions by means of which a particular form is given to reality and in each of which specific distinctions are effected" (*The Philosophy: Language* 91). Cassirer argues that these three areas are different ways of expression for consciousness in its manipulation and synthesis of the objective phenomena; they are "all directed toward the one goal of transforming the passive world of mere *impressions*, in which the spirit seems at first imprisoned, into a world that is pure *expression* of the human spirit" (80-1). In other words, they are means of 'objectification,' of establishing "a unity in the flux of sensory experience" (Stephens 159).

What concern this study are his ideas of language and myth. Cassirer's ideas occupy an important place in this study because they deal directly with language and myth and take them as the result of the symbolic/metaphorical nature of perception and conception.

Cassirer sees language as a symbolic representation inherent in the very character of human consciousness and assigns great importance to it "in the construction of the world of pure imagination" (Montagu 366). For Cassirer, as Montagu puts it, "the essential function of language is not arbitrarily to assign designations to objects already formed and achieved: language is rather

indispensable to that formation" (362). Cassirer thinks that language and consciousness are inseparable. He employs the Kantian concept of consciousness and argues that consciousness acquires knowledge of any content or entity by way of synthesis and 'schematization'; but he adds to this notion the symbolic aspect to express the meaning of human experience and perception. According to Cassirer, the consciousness first formulates concepts or schema out of sensuous impressions of natural phenomena in its act of synthesis. However, the formulation of a concept presupposes "fixed characteristics by virtue of which things may be recognized as similar or dissimilar, coinciding or not coinciding" (Cassirer, *The Philosophy: Language* 24). Then, before the intellectual work of conceiving and understanding of phenomena, the work of *naming*—which is a metaphorical act—takes place. In this respect, the properties of an object are not already given to consciousness; they are posited by consciousness with the help of the naming/symbolic character of language.

Thus, the analysis of language, for Cassirer, cannot be done without studying consciousness and the way it works. Consciousness, for Cassirer, is a symbolizing, "form-giving" (*The Philosophy: Language* 61) activity, which "does not merely copy but rather embodies an original formative power. It does not express passively the mere fact that something is present but contains an independent energy of the human spirit through which the simple presence of the phenomenon assumes a definite 'meaning,' a particular ideational content" (78).

As said above, consciousness endows sensory impressions with symbolic and conceptual content by the act of synthesis and schematization. As Werkmeister puts it, "the cognitive process begins when in the flux of sensuous impressions certain 'units' are 'fixed' and retained as centers of integration" (Werkmeister 770). In the natural phenomena objects are independent of each other; no connection exists between them. Such connection is built by cognition, by subjecting "the multiplicity of phenomena to the unity of a 'fundamental proposition.' […] Essentially cognition is always oriented toward this essential aim, the articulation of the particular into a universal law and order" (*The*

Philosophy: Language 77). Cassirer thinks that we do not know objects as if they were independently determined and given; we know them "by producing certain limitations and fixating certain permanent elements and connections within the uniform flow of experience" (qtd. in Stephens 159).

Consciousness constitutes unity employing mainly two modes of combination: "juxtaposition" in *space* and succession in *time*; in other words, the combination of material properties in such a way that "one is apprehended as a '*thing*,' the other as an '*attribute*,' or of successive events in such a way that one appears as the *cause* of the other" (*The Philosophy: Language* 94). The space and time here should be taken not in physical terms but in ideational/cognitive terms. By situating an object in ideational space or placing it in a certain content, consciousness, through language, makes the local distinctions of the content apparent and establishes relations for it with other contents. It posits "an infinite number of potential *directions*, and only the sum of these directions constitutes the whole of our spatial institution" (100). Then, in the process of perception, consciousness constitutes "a highly complex totality of spatial relations" (101). Understood in this light, "space is by no means a static vessel and container into which ready-made things are poured: it is rather a sum of ideal functions, which complement and determine one another to form a unified result" (101). As seen so far, Cassirer does not take the constitutive act of consciousness in strict categorical terms and ignores sensory impressions as Kant does. Similar to Husserl's phenomenology, it seems that the creations of consciousness are, according to him, intermingled and tinted with sensory impressions.

Cassirer argues that establishing time relations is much more difficult than establishing space relations because consciousness does not intuit time relations simultaneously as it does space relations. In other words, the intuition of such spatial items as "here" and "there" is much more simple and immediate than that of temporal items as "now," "earlier," and "later." Cassirer states, "the units, the parts, which in spatial intuition seem to *combine* of themselves into a whole, here exclude one another: the existence of one specification signifies the nonexistence

of the others and vice versa." (*The Philosophy: Language* 215). In this regard, combination and synthesis is easier in spatial representation. The elements of time seem combined "because consciousness 'runs through' them and in so doing differentiates them" (215). Thus, an entity which is posited in time (as succession) requires a higher level act of consciousness than that in space. Cassirer points to the fact that language cannot reach this level immediately but is subject to "the inner law/the human spirit that governs its entire formation" (216). Consciousness posits an object in time by moving backward and forward, between the "no longer" of the past, the "now" of the presence and the "not-yet" of the future. In this respect, it functions as a cross section in which the "no-longer," the "now" and the "not-yet" are merged.

For Cassirer, consciousness transforms spatial relations into temporal ones and temporal ones into spatial ones in its act of synthesis. For instance, it transforms the spatial "here" to the temporal present (because both suggest proximity and immediacy) and the spatial "there" into temporal past (because both imply distance). This indicates how in the intuition of time and space the nature of a content of consciousness is; Cassirer argues that the content of consciousness "exists only in so far as it immediately goes beyond itself in various directions of synthesis." For him,

> The consciousness of the moment contains reference to temporal succession; the consciousness of a single point in space contains reference to space as the sum and totality of all possible designations of position; and there are countless analogous relations through which the form of the whole is expressed in the consciousness of the particular. (*The Philosophy: Language* 104-105).

Then, one content of consciousness is represented in and through another, and between these contents there is an *analogous*[*] relationship. He states, "It lies in the very nature of consciousness that it cannot posit any content without positing a complex of other contents" (97). This activity of creating analogous

[*] *Italic* is mine.

contents for representing one content is essential for the structure and formal unity of consciousness.

Cassirer seems to be inconsistent in his idea of time because he defines time on the one hand as 'succession' (in the Newtonian sense) and on the other as "merging" (in the Bergsonian sense). The question arises here as to how a complex of analogous contents and space transformed into time can be represented in consciousness in succession. This is a question that is left in ambiguity in Cassirer's idea.

As it is seen, like Kant, Vico and the Romantic poets, for Cassirer, too, consciousness works in a metaphorical way. Its giving form to objective phenomena, the way it synthesizes spatial and temporal intuitions, the infinite number of directions, relations, attributes and analogous contents it creates indicate how, according to Cassirer, it transforms the sense impressions of natural phenomena into metaphorical entities or representations. In this regard, language, which is defined as an inherent characteristic of consciousness, is metaphorical. And to apply Ricoeur's terminology, it is metaphorical on discourse level. Furthermore, as it can clearly be seen in the above discussion, Cassirer thinks that in language there is no distinction between subject and object because, for Cassirer, "the name...is the essence of its object" and "the real potency of the real thing is contained in its name" (*The Philosophy: Language* 3). If we take the name in Aristotelian terms to mean metaphor, it can be said that according to Cassirer language is a metaphorical/ideational being in which the object takes place as formed, synthesized and fixed in some context.

Cassirer's idea of myth occupies an important place in his philosophy. Cassirer thinks that science, philosophy and all other modes of thinking originated in myth. The origin of their language was also mythical language. He suggests that with the development of logical/conceptual thinking the languages of these modes of thinking were differentiated from the language of myth. However, there is still a mythical element in them, such as the handling of numbers and directions in natural sciences, the application and employment of some metaphors in

philosophy whose roots lie in myth, and so on. This fact was recognized by the great Greek philosopher Plato, who, in his *Republic* was opposed to myth and poetry but accepted its including a conceptual content. He even used such mythical images as 'the cave' in his philosophy.

Cassirer employs the Kantian/Romantic mode of thinking in his study of myth. The idea that consciousness is a form-giving agent and that synthesis is an important factor in this form-giving activity is also present in Cassirer's idea of myth. Likewise, Kant's idea that the imagination employs a different mode of expression in artistic creation is also seen in Cassirer's philosophy because in this philosophy, too, artistic expression and mythical thinking are different from those epistemological. However, unlike Kant, the Romantic and pre-Romantic thinkers, he does a comprehensive and theoretical study of myth, analyzes the processes of its creation and studies the characteristics that make it and its language distinct from scientific and philosophical language and modes of thinking. And again unlike the Kantian/Romantic ideas, he does not see myth as a mere production of the imagination and human mind. Although he accepts the fact that it is the production of consciousness and that it takes form in the process of human perception, he argues that the ideational content of myth gradually becomes an element of life and reality. In other words, people begin to live in accordance with their own myths, which are their own creations. Cassirer states, "the mythical form of thought, which attaches all qualities and activities, all states and relations to a solid foundation, leads to…a kind of materialization of spiritual contents" (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 55). If we take "spiritual contents" to be the mythical creations of consciousness (remembering that in his work Cassirer uses the word 'spirit' to mean the 'creative force' of consciousness), it can be said that people materialize their mythical creations by shaping their lives according to them. Rituals, ceremonies, folk dances, the belief in supernatural and demonic powers all indicate the materialization of spiritual contents in mythical thinking.

As the above argumentation indicates, myth and language are inseparable and condition each other in their process of formation. It has already been shown

that scientific and philosophical languages employ mythical elements. However, language is more indispensable to myth than myth is to scientific and philosophical language. In myth the word and name do not merely have a function of describing or portraying but "contain within them the [spiritual/ideational] object and its real powers. Word and name do not designate and signify, they are and act" (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 40). In Walt Whitman's words, "all words are spiritual" (qtd in Ogden and Richards 24); and as Ogden and Richards put it: "The whole human race has been so impressed by the properties of words as instruments for the control of objects, that in every age it has attributed to them occult powers" (*The Meaning of Meanings* 24). In other words, the name and word in myth are linguistic entities materialized or animated in the socio-cultural life of the individual. Cassirer asserts that the essence of each mythical figure could be directly learned from its name because "the name of a thing and the thing itself are inseparably fused; the mere word or image contains a magic force through which the essence of the thing gives itself to us" (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 89). Accordingly, the notion that name and essence bear a necessary and internal relation to each other, that the name does not merely denote but actually is the essence of its object, that the potency of the real thing is contained in its name – "that is one of the fundamental assumptions of the mythmaking consciousness itself" (3). The implications of this statement are important for the purpose of this study. Taking into consideration Aristotle's definition of metaphor as 'name' and keeping in mind the fact that for Cassirer name is a kind of ideational form given to the object, it can be said that according to this statement the language of myth is a metaphorical one which has an ideational/spiritual character.

Likewise, the idea in the above statements that the name is the essence of its object, the thing is contained in its name, and that the thing and its name are inseparably fused show that there is no distinction between object and subject, name and thing, metaphorical and literal because the object is contained in the metaphor, which is the ideational/spiritual content of myth; as Cassirer states, "the separation of the ideal from the real, the distinction between a world of immediate

reality and a world of mediate signification, the opposition between 'image' and 'object,' is *alien* to [myth]" (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 38).

However, what makes mythical thinking distinct from scientific and philosophical modes of thinking is that every name is real in myth; the name, the image or the mythical figure does not 'represent' the thing but is the thing itself. It is a material content 'idealized' and an idealized content 'materialized.' It is idealized because the material content is given ideational form and it is materialized because this ideational form is made an element of the individual's life. While in other modes of thinking contents are organized by consciousness according to "some fundamental proposition" or law, in mythical thinking

> all contents crowd together into a single plane of reality; everything perceived possesses as such a character of reality; the image like the word is endowed with real forces…Thus image magic and object magic are never sharply differentiated…A man's shadow plays the same role as his image or picture. (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 42).

For Cassirer, mythical thinking also differs from other modes of thinking by its concept of causality, which also conditions its concept of 'objectification.' In other modes of thinking consciousness synthesizes concepts by following the rule of association and combination and by analyzing the similar and dissimilar. It "dissects an event into constant elements and seeks to understand it through the complex of mingling, interpretation, and constant conjunction of these elements" (46). However, in mythical thinking "every simultaneity, every spatial coexistence and contact, provide a real causal 'sequence'" (45). Every contact in space and time is taken as an immediate relation of cause and effect. For instance, animals which appear in a certain season are commonly looked upon as the cause of this season. For example, in the mythical view the swallow is seen as the maker of summer and its migration is taken as the end of summer and the beginning of winter (In John Keats' "To Autumn" this mythical concept of causality is used: towards the end of the poem there is the image of the migration of swallows that suggests the end of summer and coming of winter). Mythical thinking "has a free

selection of causes; everything can come from anything, because anything can stand in temporal and spatial contact with anything" (46): the cosmos comes into being by being fished out of the depths of the sea; the earth is shaped from the body of a great beast, and so on. When contrasting mythical language with scientific and philosophical language, Cassirer is paradoxically seen to handle scientific and philosophical thinking in Kantian/strict categorical terms. However, as we have already seen in his argumentation on epistemological language, he does not always think of scientific and philosophical language as such. The question arises here as to whether the associative character of epistemological thinking and language sometimes suggested in Cassirer's work indicates the presence of a mythical element in this mode of thinking and language.

Cassirer argues that the representation of space and time in mythical thinking is also different from other modes of thinking. To begin with, the intuition of space is a basic factor in mythical thinking. In other modes of thinking consciousness posits some limitations to the representation of space based "on the discovery of a realm of fixed figures amid the flux of sensory impressions" (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 85). However, mythical thinking posits objects of perception in space according to the opposition between the sacred and profane. Here no theoretical and conceptual distinctions are made; all thought, sensory intuition and perception are represented in myth according to some feeling or fantasy that labels some objects as demonic and some others as sacred. The space consciousness forms to represent these opposite provinces are also important in understanding mythical space. For instance, it pictures the profane in darkness/night/winter/a dark forest full of demonic forces, whereas it pictures the sacred in light/day/spring/idyllic-pastoral scene and so on. We can exemplify this idea of Cassirer with William Blake's poetry. In Blake's "The Tiger" the profane is represented with a tiger and the setting is a dark forest and night, while in his "The Lamb" the sacred is represented with a lamb and the setting is a light pastoral scene in daytime. For Cassirer, the sacred and profane are sometimes represented in myth through the division of space into such directions and zones as east, west,

north, south, upward, lower, right and left, which, for Cassirer, exist almost in every culture including Christianity. We can exemplify this idea of Cassirer as in the following: the four ends of the Cross are identified with these directions; in religious mythology as well as in literary works employing this mythology such as Dante's *Divine Comedy* and John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Hell is represented in the lower part and Heaven in the upper part; in Homer's *Odyssey*, Virgil's *Aeneid* and religious mythology death represented in the lower part whereas life in the upper part; according to some supernatural beliefs left is identified with the profane and right with the sacred and so on.

The representation of time in mythical thinking is quite different from that of other modes of thinking. While in other modes of thinking time is represented either as 'succession' or 'merging,' in mythical time there is always the idea of the origins:

> All the sanctity of mythical being is first revealed when it appears as the being of origins. All the sanctity of mythical being goes back ultimately to the sanctity of the origin. It does not adhere immediately to the content of the given but to its coming into being, not to its qualities and properties but to its genesis in the past. (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 105).

Then, in mythical time there is absolute past, which rigidly "divides the empirical present from the mythical origin" (106). For Cassirer, "by being thrust back into temporal distance, by being situated in the depths of the past," a particular content is established as sacred, as mythically and religiously significant. (105).

For Cassirer, representation in time always presupposes representation in space and only with the definite means of expression created through space consciousness can draw temporal relations and specifications. For instance, such mythical representations as the interchange of light and darkness/day and night—which are handled in the presentation of mythical space—indicate articulation in time as well as space. Cassirer states,

> And the same schema of orientation, the same purely felt distinctions between the quarters of the heavens and the directions, governs the division both of space and time into clear-cut sections. We have seen that the simplest spatial relations, such as left and right and forward and backward, are differentiated by a line drawn from east to west, following the course of the sun, and bisected by a perpendicular running from north to south – and all intuition of temporal intervals goes back to these intersecting lines. (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 107)

As has been shown, in Cassirer's philosophy language and myth are seen as inherent characteristics of consciousness through which consciousness gives form to sensory impressions. Then, the natural phenomenon never appears as it is in these symbolic forms; it is formed, synthesized and posited by consciousness. In this regard, they are metaphorical types of expression which presuppose no distinction between subject and object or name and thing, and place every entity in human life in a spiritual/ideational content.

Cassirer's idea of language and myth is close to those of Kant, the Romantic and pre-Romantic thinkers, all of whom assume the presence of a certain subject at the center of the creation of metaphorical language. However, Cassirer differs from them by doing a comprehensive study of myth and employing some elements of Husserl's phenomenology in his philosophy.

2.2.2 Paul Ricoeur, the Discursive and Imaginative Character of Metaphor and Its Implications for the Study of Myth

Like Cassirer, Paul Ricoeur also develops his philosophy with the influence of Kantian and phenomenological ideas. However, unlike Cassirer, he does not see the human mind and the creating subject as the sole producer of meaning and he is closer to phenomenology than Kantianism. In his introduction to *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences,* a collection of selected essays of Ricoeur, John B. Thompson states that Ricoeur discovered the requisite method for his philosophy in the phenomenological writings of Edmund Husserl and that "his views too deeply rooted in the tradition of phenomenology" (2, 3). In his work Ricoeur applies the idea of phenomenology to his idea of interpretation and

reading. And he employs Kant's ideas of the transcendental character of imagination, synthesis and schematization. However, he departs from both philosophers with his idea of language, which he sees as 'discourse' in which both the creating and reading subjects participate. In "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics" (1981) Ricoeur criticizes in Husserl's phenomenology the idea of perception that assigns importance to the experiencing of the object in constituting subjectivity and the idea of consciousness that reduces consciousness to the 'psychological intention' of the perceiver. Instead, he develops a philosophy of hermeneutics relying on some aspects of Kantian philosophy and Husserl's phenomenology, on Heidegger's idea of 'being-in-the-world,' structuralist and post-structuralist ideas of language and discourse, and on Hans-Georg Gadamer and Wolfgang Iser's reception theories. In "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics" he defines his philosophy as:

> Hermeneutics can be defined no longer as an inquiry into the psychological intentions which are hidden beneath the text, but rather as the explication of the being-in-the-world displayed by the text. What is to be interpreted in the text is a proposed world which I could inhabit and in which I could project my ownmost possibilities. Recalling the principle of distanciation [a term coined by Ricoeur to define the text's distance from both the intention of its author and natural phenomena] mentioned above, it could be said that the fictional or poetic text not only places the meaning of the text at a distance from the intention of the author, but also places the reference of the text at a distance from the world articulated by everyday language. Reality is, in this way, metamorphosed by means of what I shall call the 'imaginative variations' which literature carries out on the real. ("Phenomenology and Hermeneutics" 112)

It should be noted that what Ricoeur objects to here is the intentional theory of literature that seeks the meaning of the text in the authorial intention and the realist theories that see literature as imitation of natural and social phenomena; as will be seen in his idea of metaphor and myth, he does not object to the kind of subject proposed by Kant. He thinks that a kind of 'transcendental imagination' synthesizes and schematizes discordant linguistic and discursive elements into meaningful wholes. He also assumes the presence of 'imaginative variations'

immanent in the text (by which Ricoeur seems to mean the representation of extra-textual factors—author, reader, social factors, etc.—as metamorphosed, synthesized and modified in the text).

What concern this study are his idea of metaphor and its implications for the analysis of myth. Ricoeur's idea will contribute to this study because it takes metaphor on a discourse level, handles it on the same level as a work of art or language, and combines psychological theories (that take metaphor as a mode of expression for the subject) and semantic/linguistic theories (that take metaphor in terms of language and meaning and whose most important representatives are I. A. Richards, Max Black, Nelson Goodman and Monroe Beardsley) of metaphor. In this regard, Ricoeur's theory will prepare a background for this study to take metaphor on the discourse level and to handle imagination not as something detectable in the discursive and metaphorical structure of the text.

In all the works in which he studies metaphor—"Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language" (1973), "Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics" (1974), *The Rule of Metaphor* (1978), "The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination and Feeling" (1978), "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality" (1979), "Mimesis and Representation" (1980), "The Narrative Function" (1981), and "The Human Experience of Time and Narrative (1978)—Ricoeur argues the discursive character of metaphor and establishes a relation between metaphor, language, discourse and fiction by relying on Aristotle's idea of *mimesis*. Aristotle defines metaphor as "giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy" (*The Rule of Metaphor* 13). For Aristotle, Ricoeur states, the making of metaphor requires the productive imagination of a poetic genius (*poiesis*) because "to metaphorize well" is "to see resemblance," "to see the similar in the dissimilar," or not merely to 'see' but 'to see as' (23). Ricoeur argues that throughout his work Aristotle handles metaphor as part of *leixis*, which play an important role in his idea of *mimesis*. When defining tragedy, Aristotle considers six parts that constitute

tragedy: fable or plot (*mythos*), character, diction (*leixis*), spectacle and melody. Ricoeur argues that the most important factors of Aristotle's idea of *mimesis* are *leixis* (which Aristotle defines as 'the composition of the verses') and *mythos* (which Aristotle defines as 'the combination of the incidents of the story').

Ricoeur defines *leixis* as something that "belongs to a group of discursive procedures – using unusual words, coining new words, abbreviating or extending words – which all depart from the common use of words" ("Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics" 179). For Ricoeur, what constitutes the unity of *leixis* is its relation to *mythos*, which is in Aristotle's language the 'sense,' 'fable' or plot of tragedy. He explains this relation stating that "the fundamental trait of *mythos* is its character of order, of organization, arranging and grouping" (*The Rule of Metaphor* 36). For him, this character of order affects all the other factors of tragedy: the arrangement of the spectacle, coherence of character, sequence of thoughts, and finally the ordering of the verses. Thus, "*mythos* is echoed in the discursive nature of action, character and thought" (36). Ricoeur asks what role *leixis* plays in this ordering of the *mythos* and thus of all the other factors of tragedy. He answers this question arguing that Aristotle sees *leixis* as the organizing principle of tragedy because only by "metaphorizing well" can "the similar in the dissimilar" be seen and thus the "dissimilar" discourse particles be organized for the creation of *mythos*. Ricoeur claims: "the function of *leixis* [takes] shape as that which exteriorizes and makes explicit the internal order of *mythos*" (37).

When the role of *leixis* and *mythos* is taken with regard to *mimesis*, Aristotle's idea of *mimesis* acquires an important artistic dimension. Aristotle defines tragedy as the "imitation of human action." However, it is an imitation that elevates, that magnifies, ennobles. In this regard, Ricoeur argues, Aristotle does not define *mimesis* as a duplication of reality, as a copy. *Mimesis*, for Aristotle, is *poiesis*, that is, construction, creation ("Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics" 180). With *mythos* it becomes a rearrangement of human action into a more coherent form and with *leixis* a structuring that elevates this action. It

is "the structure of the plot (*mythos*)" and the constitutive character of metaphor (*leixis*) that constitute *mimesis*. Thus, *mimesis* is something that "composes and constructs the very thing it imitates" (*The Rule of Metaphor* 39). In this regard, *mimesis* is an imitation that has a double reference: a reference to reality and a self-reference, a representation of human action and a construction/structuring of that action. So, the reference of tragedy to reality is not a direct one but a 'suspended' one.

Relying on this background knowledge, Ricoeur argues that *mythos* and *leixis* are two inseparable constitutive factors of tragedy. In modern terminology, metaphor and event, metaphor and narration or, we can go so far as to say, metaphor and myth are two inseparable factors that constitute literary discourse. To limit ourselves at the moment to the study of metaphor, for Ricoeur, this indicates that even in Aristotle's idea metaphor is not seen on the level of the word but on the level of discourse.

For Ricoeur, Aristotle's idea of *mimesis* sheds light on the relationship between discourse and metaphor. In " Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics" (1974) Ricoeur tries to answer the question why metaphor is a matter of discourse rather than of the word; to what extent can metaphor be treated as "a work in miniature"? Can a work, or a poem, be considered "as a sustained or extended metaphor"? Ricoeur answers these questions by studying the close relationship between discourse and metaphor in linguistic and semantic terms. For Ricoeur, "all discourse is produced as an event" and "has a fleeting existence" ("Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics" 167): it appears and disappears because, just like *mimesis*, it has a double reference and its reference to reality is a suspended one. Likewise, the discourse particles are not connected to each other. However, discourse can be identified and reidentified as meaning because the 'fleeting' discourse particles are set into context and the 'dissimilar,' discordant discourse units are brought together. Thus, as in Aristotle's *mimesis*, difference and sameness, 'fleeting' and construction stand side by side in literary discourse. As will be remembered from the study of Aristotle's idea of *mimesis*,

construction by bringing together dissimilar or discordant discourse particles indicates the metaphorical character of discourse. In this character "the conceptual structure of resemblance opposes and unites identity and difference." Ricoeur states,

> It is not due to oversight that Aristotle assimilates 'similar' to 'same': to see sameness in what is different is to see similarity. Now, metaphor reveals the logical structure of 'the similar' because, in the metaphorical statement, 'the similar' is perceived *despite* difference, *in spite of* contradiction. Resemblance, therefore, is the logical category corresponding to the predicative operation in which 'approximation' (bringing close) meets the resistance of 'being distant.' In other words, metaphor displays the work of resemblance because the literal contradiction preserves the difference within the metaphorical statement; 'same' and 'different' are not just mixed together; they also remain opposed. (*The Rule of Metaphor* 196)

As can be understood from the above statements, metaphor is the constitutive factor of discourse. However, this factor cannot exist without the active participation of the human mind/imagination because only poetic imagination can 'metaphorize well,' see resemblance in the dissimilar and cause the same and the different to stand side by side. Before proceeding further, it should be noted at this point of the study that Ricoeur does not focus only on the imagination of the subject that creates the work but also on the imagination of the reading subject that can as well 'create' the work by combining discourse particles in the reading process. However, we will not plunge into this issue deeper. We will handle 'productive imagination' as the creating agent without identifying it either with the reading or writing subject.

In "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality," "The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination and Feeling" and *The Rule of Metaphor* Ricoeur elaborates on Aristotle's statement that the gift of making good metaphors relies on the capacity to contemplate similarities and to have an insight into likeness, and on the idea that it is in 'the work of resemblance' that a pictorial or iconic moment is implied in metaphor.

Then, for Ricoeur, imagination plays an important role in establishing the similarity; it is the place where the 'work of resemblance' takes place. To describe how the imagination works when establishing similarities, Ricoeur refers to Kant's concept of productive imagination as "schematizing a synthetic operation." This will allow us, he says, "to adjust a psychology of imagination to a semantics of metaphor, or to complete a semantics of metaphor by having recourse to a psychology of imagination. ("The Metaphorical Process" 145). He argues that imagination brings together discordant discourse particles and semantic patterns by way of what he calls *predicative assimilation*, which enables the imagination "to see as." This is one faculty of the imagination that helps the setting of resemblances. The assimilation consists "in 'making' similar, that is, semantically proximate, the terms that the metaphorical utterance brings together" (145). Ricoeur states, "imagination is the apperception, the sudden insight of a new predicative pertinence, specifically a pertinence within impertinence"("The Function of Fiction" 25). This process includes seeing the similarities as well as the differences. When conceiving the similarity, the imagination preserves 'remoteness' within 'proximity.' In this case, "to see 'the like'" becomes "to see the same in spite of, and through, the different." For Riceour, this tension between sameness and difference characterizes the logical structure of likeness. Imagination, accordingly, is this ability to produce new kinds by assimilation and to produce them not above the differences but in spite of and through the differences ("The Metaphorical Process" 146-7).

Apart from 'predicative assimilation,' imagination has also a *pictorial* dimension. In defining this aspect Ricoeur draws again on Kant's idea of imagination as 'schematizing a synthetic operation' and states that one of the functions of the schema is to provide images for a concept. What is at issue is "the development from schematization to iconic presentation" ("The Metaphorical Process" 148). In "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality" he clarifies the meaning of 'iconic presentation' by defining 'icon' as "the matrix of the new semantic pertinence which is born of the collapse of the semantic kinds under the

clash of contradiction," in other words, as "the schematization of metaphorical attribution" (126). Then, with 'iconic presentation' Ricoeur draws attention to the process by which a certain production of images channels the schematization of predicative assimilation. To imagine, then, is not to have a mental picture of something but to display relations in a depicting mode; metaphor is the verbal representation of this process.

In this regard, the mental picture or image is not a direct representation of a phenomenon in the mind because "there is…no intuition without construction" (*The Rule of Metaphor* 195). It is an 'iconic augmentation' whose reference to this phenomenon is 'suspended'; the reference is both absent and present, the absent part being more prevalent. Riceour thinks that poetic language, which is brought about by imagination, is both referential and non-referential. Thus, the function of the imagination to create mental pictures includes the negation of reality and the effort to produce a totally poetic/non-referential object. However, reality cannot be negated totally; in some way or the other it affects the metaphorical process. As seen in his argument above, in his study of mental picture or image Ricoeur employs both Kantian and phenomenological ideas. His drawing attention to the process of 'schematization' and 'synthesis' in the production of images is a Kantian idea, whereas the idea that the image has a referential aspect originating in the experience of the object indicates the phenomenological aspect of his philosophy.

As can be observed in the study of the image, it can be seen that according to Ricoeur the image is not a 'reproduction' of reality but a 'production' of it. In "The Narrative Function" (1981) he states that image "has a distinctive intentionality, namely to offer a model for *perceiving things differently*, the paradigm of a new vision" (292). In "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality" he argues,

> To form an image is not to have an image, in the sense of having a mental representation; instead, it is to read, through the icon of a relation, the relation itself. Image is less 'associated' than evoked and displayed by the

> schematization. Language remains the bearer of the predicative relation, but in schematizing and illustrating itself in a pictorial manner, the predicative relation can be read through the image in which it is invested. The seeing created by language is therefore not a seeing of this or that; it is a 'seeing as.' (127).

This idea of image has important implications for understanding the relationship between reality and fiction/literature. If the relation of the image to the objective phenomenon is 'suspended,' relative and arbitrary, then, as in Aristotle's idea of *mimesis*, the same situation is also valid for the relation of literary discourse to this phenomenon. Meanwhile, just like the image and Aristotle's *mimesis*, literary discourse is also a rediscription, production, or construction of phenomena. It is not "an instance of reproductive imagination, but of productive imagination" ("The Narrative Function" 293). Thus, literary discourse has the function of shaping reality; Ricoeur states, "it is the poetic work as a whole, the poem, that projects the world" (*The Rule of Metaphor* 243). With the productive imagination at work, poetic fictions or metaphor as 'poem in miniature' "affect the metamorphosis of reality" ("The Function of Fiction" 135).

Ricoeur thinks that historical texts, too, can be understood in terms of Aristotle's idea of *mimesis* as metaphorical/fictional writings that magnify the very thing they represent. Ricoeur argues that history is a kind of narration in which certain historical events are 'constructed' in a chronological/ sequential order. In "The Narrative Function" he states, "to be historical, I shall say, an event must be more than a singular occurrence: it must be defined in terms of its contribution to the development of a plot" (277). He defines a story as a narration that describes a sequence of actions and experiences of a certain number of characters, whether real or imaginary. Drawing attention to the phenomenological act of following a story, he says that following a story is to understand the successive actions, thoughts and feelings "as displaying a particular directedness" (277). The capacity to read history, Ricoeur argues, depends on the capacity to follow a story because they are constructed in the same way. Likewise, the acts of narrating history and story are also similar. Both have two dimensions: chronological and non-

chronological. For Ricoeur, the first may be called 'the episodic' or sequential dimension. This dimension characterizes the story as made out of events. The second dimension is "the 'configurational one, according to which the plot construes significant wholes out of scattered events" ("The Human Experience of Time" 108); it is to "grasp together successive events…to extract a configuration from a succession" ("The Narrative Function" 278). Every narrative, whether a story or history, can be conceived in terms of a competition between its episodic dimension and its configurational dimension, between sequence and figure. To explain the configurational dimension, Ricoeur employs Kant's idea of 'reflective judgment' and states that the narrative operation has the character of a judgment because to follow a story is not only to follow episodes but also "'to reflect upon' events with the aim of encompassing them in successive totalities" (279). In this regard, Ricoeur notes, the configurational dimension can be said to be 'the thought' or, in Aristotle's words, the *mythos* or Fable of the narrative.

Then, Ricoeur argues, the act of *narrating* history and the fact of *being* in history, *doing* history and *being* historical are not the same things. Just like Aristotle's *mimesis*, history, for Ricoeur, is a literary 'artifact' in which 'past' events are 'constructed' as plot or *mythos* and 'past' human actions are magnified, ennobled. Likewise, with the configurational act of narrating—in other words, by 'metaphorising well'—resemblance is seen between 'scattered events' and a total meaning is extracted from succession. This does not mean that history has nothing real in it. Ricoeur states,

> I should like to emphasize that however fictional the historical text may be, it claims nevertheless to be a representation *of* reality. In other words, history is both a literary *artifact* (and in this sense a fiction) and a representation of *reality*. It is a literary artifact in so far as, in the manner of all literary texts, it tends to assume the status of a self-sufficient system of symbols. It is a representation of reality in so far as the world it depicts-and which is 'the world of the work' – claims to hold for real events in the real world. ("The Narrative Function" 291)

He also notes that he does not claim that history is a narration which does not have any distinctive characteristics. For him, "only history can claim to speak about events which really happened, about the real action of men in the past" (288). For this purpose, it makes use of archives and documents. However, narrative fiction ignores the burden of proof. He states his aim as to show that "there is more fiction in history than the positivist conception of history admits" (289).

As in all other metaphorical 'constructions,' in history, too, the 'telling' subject and its imagination play a crucial role in narrating history. Ricoeur asserts that "the historicity of human experience can be brought to language only as narrativity…For historicity comes to language only so far as we tell stories or tell history" ("The Narrative Function" 294). This process is not a naïve one; it "involves 'the representative function of the imagination'" (Kearney 179). In history events are manipulated and given some form by the historian and his productive imagination. In "The Human Experience of Time and Narrative" Ricoeur states,

> By telling stories and writing history we provide 'shape' to what remains chaotic, obscure, and mute…historical narrative and fictional narrative *jointly* provide not only 'models of' but 'models for' articulating in a symbolic way our ordinary experience of time. (115).

The historian does this by selecting only those events that, in his estimation, should not be forgotten and structures them in narrative order. Moreover, with the use of *leixis*, that is, metaphor, he highlights the events that he thinks memorable and overshadows those that should be forgotten. Then, the narrative imagination of the historian represents not what it 'sees' but what it 'sees as.' In this regard, the act of narrating history is a 'schematizing' and 'synthetic' operation in which 'dissimilar' events are 'configured.'

Ricoeur has written very little directly on myth. We can derive some implications for myth from his idea of metaphor and history. Keeping in mind Cassirer's idea of myth, we can derive the following conclusions regarding myth

from Ricoeur's idea of metaphor, literary discourse and history. Like literary and historical discourses, it is needless to say that myth also is a metaphorical discourse. As Ricoeur states in an interview with Richard Kearney, "myth is essentially symbolic" (*Reflection and Imagination* 487). Like these discourses, it 'constructs' and 'produces' a world of its own. It is literary discourse in the sense that it has a totally fictional world and it is historical in the sense that, as Cassirer thinks, it deals mostly with 'origins' and situates its events in the past.. However, as in Ricoeur's idea of history, it magnifies, elevates and fictionalizes the history of the 'origins' and 'heroes.' In it, too, imagination plays a crucial role; in the production of myth, the imagination does not represent what it sees but what it 'sees as.' It conceives similarity in the different and brings dissimilar elements together to create a new world out of them.

However, there are some crucial differences between myth and literary and historical discourses. Remembering Cassirer's idea of the non-referential/self-referential character of myth, it can be said that myth differs from literary and historical discourses with the apparent absence of a reference in it. In other words, while literary and historical discourses have both referential and non-referential aspects and their reference to reality is 'suspended,' myth is rather non-referential; and, in it, even such a 'suspended' reference does not seem to exist. In myth, the productive imagination constructs a seemingly non-temporal/ahistorical/synchronic world of fiction. In it, the world of objective phenomena is metamorphosed into a totally 'alien' one. In this regard, unlike Aristotle's *mimesis*, it is a rather self-sufficient metaphorical discourse.

Another difference is that, unlike literary and historical discourses, time is not employed in myth in chronological/sequential form. In his study of the quest element in the Russian tales handled in Vlademir Propp's *Morphology of Tales*, Ricoeur states,

> Before projecting the hero forward for the sake of the quest, many tales send the hero or heroine into some dark forest where he or she go astray or meets some devouring beast…These initial episodes bring the hero or

> heroine *back* into primordial space and time which is more akin to the realm of dream than to the sphere of action. Thanks to this preliminary disorientation, the linear chain of time is broken and the tale assumes an oneiric dimension which is more or less preserved alongside the heroic dimension of the quest. Two qualities of time are thus intertwined: the circularity of the imaginary travel and the linearity of the quest, as such…The imaginary travel suggests the idea of a metatemporal mode…This timeless—but not atemporal—dimension duplicates, so to speak, the episodic dimension of the quest and contributes the 'fairy' atmosphere of the quest itself. ("The Human Experience of Time" 112-3)

As Cassirer puts it, the time of myth is absolute past and it always deals with 'beginnings.' In this regard, it is more circular than linear.

Applying Aristotle's idea of *mimesis* to his idea of metaphor, Ricoeur views metaphor as an important factor of literary and historical discourses that makes these discourses constructions of reality rather than copies of it. Relying on Aristotle's idea, Ricoeur studies the discursive character of metaphor and its capacity to form reality. Likewise, combining Aristotle's idea that "to metaphorize well" requires to see resemblance in the dissimilar with Kant's idea of 'schematization,' 'synthetic operation' and imagination and Husserl's idea of phenomenology, Ricoeur comes to the conclusion that the human mind and imagination play an important role in the production of metaphor and literary and historical discourses. In this regard, he comes close to the Kantian/Romantic ideas and Cassirer's philosophy, which take the cognitive faculty of the subject's imagination as an important component of metaphor and, consequently, of literary discourse. Also, just like the Romantics and Cassirer, Ricoeur does not assume the existence of such thing as literal meaning, because the imagination and, consequently, the human mind, work by building up similarities between things through 'predicative assimilation' and by 'synthetic operation.' However, Ricoeur differs from Kant and the Romantics and resembles Cassirer and Husserl by drawing attention to the referential (though it is a 'suspended' one) function of metaphor and discourse; but he departs from them by assigning importance to language more than human consciousness and by seeing imagination as something detectable in literary discourse. And he departs from all these philosophers by also

studying the metaphorical aspect of historical discourse and applying Aristotle's idea of *mimesis* to historical discourse.

Relying on Ricoeur's ideas of metaphor, historical and literary discourses, this study arrives at the conclusion that myth also is a metaphorical discourse which has both a fictional and a historical character. It is fictional in the sense that in it the world of objective phenomena is metamorphosed into something different and it is historical in the sense that it deals with 'origins' or 'beginnings' by using past time. Likewise, in myth, too, the productive imagination plays a central role. However, it differs from both discourses with its non-referential/self-sufficient character, its dealing with absolute past, its employment of a rather circular and non-chronological time and with its seeming timelessness. In this regard, it can be said that the productive imagination seems to work differently in the creation of myth. It does not seem to work by way of schematization and synthesis because it does not have a logical structure and, as Ricoeur suggests, it is like the content of a dream.

2.3 THE CRITERIA DERIVED FROM THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The criteria derived from the theoretical framework and which will be applied in the study of the English Romantic poetry are as follows:

1) Metaphor and myth are two indispensable modes of expression for poetic imagination in its creating, modifying, and form-giving activity.
2) Both metaphor and myth are products of the synthesizing and schematizing faculty of the productive imagination.
3) Metaphor is an act of seeing similitude in dissimilitude and creating unity out of dissimilar elements. Myth, too, is an act of establishing similitude between two dissimilar entities and thus it is a metaphorical agent. However, as it has already been seen in Wordsworth's study of epitaphs and Cassirer's understanding of myth, this time the comparison is between two totally different entities. For instance, as in the epitaph handled by

Wordsworth, physical tears are represented as Deluge, or as Cassirer exemplifies, the world is metamorphosed into an egg.

4) Since artistic creation is the act of forming unity out of dissimilar entities, metaphor and myth are inherent characters of this creation. This creation, as Shelley puts it, is like the creation of God, who created the Universe by bringing together reluctant and discordant elements and formed a whole out of them ("Essay on the Devil or Devils" 266). In this regard, artistic creation is a prophetic act, a time-crunching activity of combining the past, the present and the future.
5) Metaphor and myth are not means of copying reality but of 'creating' a new reality. This is an idea that puts into question the referentiality of art and language.
6) As Ricoeur puts it, metaphor is a characteristic of discourse, not of the word. In other words, as Vico thinks, metaphor is "a poem in miniature." Then, in this study poems will be handled as metaphorical productions of poetic imagination.
7) Myth is something that is re-created time and again by the mythopoeic imagination of poets.

CHAPTER III

METAPHORIZATION AND MYTHOLOGIZATION AS INDISPENSABLE ASPECTS OF PERCEPTION AND IMAGINATION IN THE POETRY OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH, PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY AND JOHN KEATS

In "Structure intentionelle de I'image romantique" Paul de Man states that in Romantic poetry language strives to become nature. The words must, in a phrase of Hölderlin's, "arise like flowers."

> Sometimes romantic thought and poetry seem about to surrender so completely to the nostalgia for the object that it becomes difficult to distinguish between object and image, between imagination and perception, between expressive and constitutive language and mimetic and literal language. (qtd. in Wellek 130).

In "To My Brother George" John Keats says that when a poet gets enchanted with the beauties of nature, he sees nothing in 'water, earth and sky, but poesy' (line 22); he sees in air "white coursers paw, and prance, / Bestridden of gay knights, in gay apparel,/ Who at each other tilt in playful quarrel" (26-8); and through the light of "sheet-lightning" (29) he sees "horsemen swiftly glide"(34) while "their ladies fair /Fit for the silv'ring of a seraph's dream," with their "rich brimm'd goblets" incessantly run "[l]ike the bright spots that move around the sun" (37-40). Paul de Man's idea and Keats's poem suggests how, in Romantic poetry, poetic imagination imbues objects of nature in the process of perception with an ideational and mythical content and thus transforms objects of perception into unfamiliar and alien entities. Depending on the Kantian, Neo-Kantian and

Romantic idea that symbolic language is an inherent character of the imagination, these quotations also show how metaphorical and mythical language is an indivisible aspect of the imagination. This function of poetic imagination and its working via metaphor and myth seem to be the most outstanding aspect of the major poems of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. As such, with the transformational function of metaphorical and mythical language, the act of perception becomes for the imagination an act in which natural phenomena are incarnated and imbued with spiritual and sometimes divine features. However, the interaction between poetic imagination and nature appears in different forms in this poetry. As will be seen in the following analysis, in some poems, especially in those of Wordsworth, poetic imagination sees 'genii,' that are spirits, in objects of nature and mythologizes nature as a feminine figure 'mothering' the poetic imagination of 'her' child/the poet and educating him about the ways of the world. Handling the poet's communion with nature as a mother-child relationship, one of the most important themes of these poems becomes nature's impact on the growth of poetic imagination and poetic imagination's growing ability of metaphorization and mythologization. In some other poems, especially those of Keats and Shelley, natural phenomena are endowed with a divine and mythical content by relying on and making direct references to Hellenistic culture and mythology. Keeping in mind Riceour's idea of double-reference and the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure's idea of the arbitrary relation of the sign to its referent, it can be said that in the poems of the first category, the poetic imagination is observed to metaphorize and mythologize without totally detaching the sign from the referent; in other words, the existence of the objective/extra-textual nature behind the one mythologized in poetic language can easily be realized while reading the poems. However, in the poems of the second category, due to the constant references to the Greek and Roman mythologies, language becomes so metaphorical that the sign almost totally loses its relation to its referent and the poems become self-referential, synchronic and spatial.

Speaking in thematic terms, it can be said that the sense of loss, transience of human life, and the immortality of natural beauty and art seem to be the prevailing themes of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats's poems. However, while in Wordsworth's poetry these themes appear with a poet-subject's nostalgia for childhood experiences and sense of loss due to old age, in Shelley and Keats's poetry they are seen with the poet's creation via mythologization of a transphenomenal and intransient world of beauty for self-transcendence. As will be seen in the following study, in the poetry of the three poets, the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination of the speaking and perceiving subject connotes childhood, young age and happiness with such mythemes as spring and morning; old age and suffering with autumn, noon and evening; and death with winter and night. Apart from these themes, especially in some of Wordsworth and Shelley's poems, the Mind mythologized as a forming, creating and omnipresent power emerges as the central theme. Another theme that is seen in this poetry is the question of education. Having one foot in Rousseau and Herder's theories, some poems, especially those of Wordsworth, question institutionalized education and pose education in nature as an alternative.

The poems studied in this chapter are categorized according to their themes and the mythemes that emerge in the act of metaphorization and mythologization. The difficulty to categorize these poems arises from the fact that in all of them, though in different forms, the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination is seen as defamiliarizing the familiar by setting resemblances between dissimilar entities and transforming the object of perception into the alien world of myth by endowing it with human, spiritual or divine features.

3.1 Mind and Nature: Interaction or Construction?

3.1.1 Grown Up with the Breathing Soul of Nature: The Mind Learning to Authorize Its Mother

When Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats's poems are studied, one of the most common aspects of these poems is seen to be the mind's relation to nature and its

act of construction of phenomena. With the imagination's act of figuration, nature is transformed into 'a breathing soul' that inhabits the spirits or genii of the earth. Especially in Wordsworth's poetry, nature is mythologized as a feminine figure that 'mothers' its child/the poet about the ways of the world. Thus, a paradoxical situation arises here because nature is presented as a mothering figure giving shape to her child's poetic imagination, though, in fact, 'her child' gives shape to her by way of metaphorization and mythologization. One of the poems in which this idea is exemplified is Wordsworth's *The Pedlar* (1803-4), in which a Pedlar tells how his mind is 'mothered' by nature. The theme of the poem is common to the most major poetry of Wordsworth. It is about the growth of a poet's mind but here the principal poetic consciousness is a Pedlar's not the speaker's. *The Pedlar* relates the growth of poetic imagination with the primitive music of such manifestations of nature as the wind, the mountain echoes, and the murmurs of the river. In the poem "the spirits 'form' their favored being much as a musician composes a melody, combining a variety of tones and timbres, harmony and discord' (Harding 74). What makes this poem different from Wordsworth's other 'recollection' poems is that although in most of Wordsworth's major poetry nature appears as a mother figure that teaches and guides her child (who is the poet-subject or some other person with a poetic imagination) about life, in *The Pedlar* this idea is the main subject of the poem. As Northrop Frye says in "The Drunken Boat," "Nature to Wordsworth is a mother-goddess who teaches the soul serenity and joy, and never betrays the heart that loves her" (21). Nature appears in this poem as a mythologized female figure that the Pedlar thinks authorizes his poetic imagination.

The Pedlar tells the speaker how his poetic imagination began to take shape in nature at a very early age. The speaker says:

> While yet a child and long before this time
> He had perceived the presence and the power
> Of greatness [in nature], and deep feelings had impressed
> Great objects on his mind with portraiture

And colour so distinct that on his mind
They lay like substances, and almost seemed
To haunt the bodily sense.
(28-34)

From these lines, it can also be understood that the Pedlar began to metaphorize and mythologize natural objects at this early age because, the lines say, the power of greatness and deep feelings caused the Pedlar's mind to endow these objects with colour and create portraiture on them so that they began to 'haunt the bodily sense.'

'The rolling seasons' (line 46) in his life in nature matured his poetic imagination and increased his ability of metaphorizing and mythologizing natural objects. With the 'mothering' of nature, he attained an "active power to fasten images on his brain" (40), which caused these images to acquire "the liveliness of dreams" (43). In other words, speaking in Kantian terms, his imagination acquires the ability to synthesize, that is, to build up similarities between dissimilar things.' Consequently, he developed a capability of endowing every object with a spiritual content and linking it to the all-encompassing mind of nature. The speaker says:

… in the after day
Of boyhood, many an hour in caves forlorn
And in the hollow depths of naked crags
He sate, and even in their fixed lineaments,
Or from the power of a peculiar eye,
Or by creative feeling overborne,
Or by predominance of thought oppressed,
Even in their fixed and steady lineaments
He traced an ebbing and a flowing mind,
Expression ever varying.
(48-57)

Thus, he had no need of books because he is taught by nature; "those supernatural beings who 'peopled' the dark northern woods" functioned as "a source of imaginative stimulation" for him (Harding 64). The Pedlar tells the speaker:

… Many a tale
Traditionary round the mountain hung,
And many a legend peopling the dark woods
Nourished imagination in her growth,
And gave the mind that apprehensive power
By which she is made quick to recognize
The moral properties and scope of things.
(58-64)

By posing education in nature as an alternative to institutionalized education in the poem, Wordsworth employs a revolutionary view of education similar to that of Rousseau[4]. In the poem, the Pedlar says that he learned to look at nature "with a superstitious eye of love" (139) and this 'superstitious eye' can be seen to be the main factor that leads the Pedlar to endow natural objects with spiritual aspects so that each object began to possess a tale or a mythos. This view evinces Cassirer's idea that myth originates in the human mind's interaction with nature.

The Pedlar's ability of metaphorizing and mythologizing reaches its climax when he began to perceive that all things in nature "breathed immortality, revolving life,/ And greatness still revolving, infinite" (Lines 123-5). Drawing on the well-known metaphor of the world as book (God's Book), the Pedlar states that in the objects of nature he saw "the mighty orb of song, / The divine Milton" (145-6). "…His [the Pedlar's] eye / flashing poetic fire he would repeat / The songs of Burns" (318-20).

---

[4] In *Emile*, Rousseau claims that "God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil." Therefore, he insisted on educating children in a natural way. He asserted that, since man possesses an inherent "natural goodness," his "nature" should be developed as it exists originally. Education, as advocated by Rousseau, aims to develop people naturally through eliminating factors that obstruct the development of their natural gifts, such as indoctrination by established culture and by moral and religious teachings. The image of the ideal person in Rousseau's theory of education was that of a "natural man," and the purpose of education, in his view, was to nurture "natural man" and realize the ideal republican society, in which "natural man" would become a citizen.

The most important thing he learned from nature is "the lesson deep of love" (89), "to feel intensely" (91). He learned to "look on Nature with a humble heart" (137). From Nature and her overflowing soul he had received so much that all his thoughts were steeped in feeling. The most important thing the Pedlar seems to have learned from nature is the ability of metaphorizing and mythologizing because "with her hues, her forms and the spirit of her forms, / He clothed the nakedness of austere truth" (161-3). He saw in truth a "holy spirit and a breathing sound" (181). "He reverenced [Nature] and trembled at her look,/ When with a moral beauty in her face / She led him through the worlds" (182-4). In the objects of nature "he saw one life, and felt that it was joy. / One song they sang, and it was audible" (218-9).

When he over-brimmed with feeling and knowledge, he set out to experience the ordinary world of men. In his travels, much did he see of men, their manners, enjoyments and pursuits. In the society of people he sympathized with man and laid his heart open to all that enjoyed his presence and need his hel He suffered with those whom he saw suffer and did not turn aside from wretchedness with cowardly fears. In his "various rounds / He had observed the progress and decay/ Of many minds, of minds and bodies too" (287-9).

The speaker says that though the Pedlar was not taught in schools, "[h]e yet retained an ear which deeply felt /The voice of Nature in the obscure wind, / The sounding mountain, and the running stream" (327-29). He states,

> From deep analogies by thought supplied,
> Or consciousness not to be subdued,
> To every natural form, rock, fruit, and flower,
> Even the loose stones that cover the highway,
> He gave a moral life; he saw them feel,
> Or linked them to some feeling. In all shapes
> He found a secret and mysterious soul,
> A fragrance or spirit of strange meaning.
> (330-37)

He had an eye which "looked deep into the shades of difference / As they lie hid in all exterior forms" (347-8); an eye which "from a stone, a tree, a withered leaf, /To the broad ocean and the azure heavens /Spangled with kindred multitudes of stars, /Could find no surface where its power might sleep" (350-3).

As can be seen above, although the Pedlar seems to think that nature authorizes his mind, in fact it is visa versa; that is, speaking in terms of the Kantian, Romantic and Neo-Kantian ideas handled in the previous chapter, the Pedlar's mind authorizes nature. With its ability to metaphorize and mythologize, his imagination endows objects of nature with characteristics foreign to them; it transforms them into entities or signs that are alien to their referents. It detaches the sign from its referent. As Paul de Man argues in "Time and History in Wordsworth," "The restoring power, in Wordsworth, does not reside in nature, or in history, or in the continuous progression from the one to the other, but in the persistent power of mind and language." In this sense, "the imagination in Wordsworth is independent of nature and […] it leads him to write a language, at his best moments, that is entirely unrelated to the exterior stimuli of the senses" (De Man 69).

In *The Pedlar* it is seen that the pedlar's interaction with nature or his being mothered by her when he was a child developed in him a metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination and taught him the ways of the world. A distinguishing feature in the handling of this issue in *The Pedlar* is that, in it, being grown up is not taken as a detachment from childhood or as the loss of childhood and spontaneity in figuration but as something that is directly grounded on childhood experience and on 'the knowledge of the world' acquired in that phase of life. In this regard, *The Pedlar* handles the growth of poetic imagination in philosophical terms indicating the educational implications of the interaction with nature. Another poem in which being mothered by nature in childhood is represented as the essential factor of the growth of poetic imagination is Wordsworth's *The Two-Part Prelude* (1799). This poem, too, tells of the growth of poetic imagination with the 'mothering' of nature and represents how poetic imagination develops the act

of mythologization and metaphorization in the prime of life. Although in some places the speaker approaches the pastness of childhood with senses of sadness and longing for a lost Eden, he, as in *The Pedlar*, builds his perception of things on childhood experience and thus explains how what he learned in childhood has guided him in his later life. Evincing Vico, Rousseau and Herder's ideas of the relationship between primal/primitive experience and figuration and myth-making, the speaker suggests the role of primal experiences in the growth of his poetic imagination. The poem consists of two parts, the first one relating some childhood experiences and the second one some adolescent ones.

The speaker suggests how in his primal and adolescent life—just like the primitive man in Vico, Rousseau and Herder's ideas—he metaphorized and mythologized in the act of perception. In Hartman's words, in his perception, "Nature led him beyond nature. But the Nature is not Nature as such, but Nature indistinguishably blended with imagination" (qtd in Wellek 126). The speaker recalls the Derwent river, the "beauteous stream," that "river of the mind" (248) (an image that also exists in Shelley's "Mont Blanc"). In his recollection, he imagines his boat as an "elfin penance" and likened its movement on the water to a "swan" (106). To use Riceour's terminology, the 'predicative imagination' of the speaker metaphorizes and mythologizes phenomena by setting a resemblance between non-animate objects and animate and spiritual beings. For instance, the speaker recalls "the *trembling* lake[5]" (147) he encountered in his childhood and tells how when passing by a "rocky steep," "a huge cliff/As if with voluntary power instinct,/ Upreared *its head*" and how it "[R]ose up between [him] and the stars…with measured motion/ Like a living thing/*Strode* after [him]" (107-114). As he went along the water, he says: "the solitary cliffs wheeled by me, even as if the earth had rolled /With visible motion *her* diurnal round" (181-2).

Harding argues that *The Two-Part Prelude* is mythological in the sense that "its landscape is peopled with spirits and genii in the manner of Thomson, Akenside, Collins and Burns, a literary mode that Northrop Frye has designated

[5] Italics are mine

'imaginative animism'" (60-1). The speaker perceives tutelary spirits in the objects of nature: he addresses natural phenomena as "ye beings of the hills" (130), "ye powers of the earth" and "genii of the springs" that have their "voices in the clouds" (186-187), "ye spirit of the evening air" (134), and "ye mountains, and ye lakes /And sounding cataracts, ye mists and winds /That dwell among the hills where I was born" (470-2). Addressing objects of nature with the second person pronoun 'ye' as if they were human makes these objects seem incarnated. Reminiscent of the Pedlar's perception of nature in *The Pedlar*, the speaker says:

> …in all things
> I saw one life, and felt that it was joy;
> One song they sang and it was audible-
> (459-461).

The imaginative animism in the poem, for Harding, "becomes the agent of the poet's own perceptions and development. Imaginative animism is reworked to become part of the poet's own myth" (Harding 69). As said before, the most important aspect of the poem is its handling the role of childhood experience in "the growth of mental power" (257). In this regard, the poem can be said to present a history of the mind's maturation process in metaphorization and mythologization. Nature's mothering role in childhood is represented as the starting point of this process, the 'fountain' of "the river of the mind;" the speaker proclaims:

> The mind of man is fashioned and built up
> Even as a strain of music. I believe
> That there are spirits which, when they form
> A favoured being, from his very dawn
> Of infancy do open out the clouds
> As the touch of lightning, seeking him
> With gentle visitation.
> (67-73)

He suggests that his mind developed a skill for metaphorization and mythologization because the "quiet powers" (73) "communed" (77) with him in

the "dawn" of his life. When he was a child, the speaker suggests, he was 'mothered' by nature so that "from Nature and her overflowing soul" he "received so much that all [his] thoughts/Were steeped in feeling" (446-8). Like *The Pedlar*, he mythologizes nature as a mother, as "a monitory voice" (18) that tames her child. Likening himself to a babe being nursed in its mother's arms, the speaker says:

> Blessed the infant babe
> …
> blest the babe
> Nursed in his mother's arms, the babe who sleeps
> Upon his mother's breast, who, when his soul
> Claims manifest kindred with an earthly soul,
> Doth gather passion from his mother's eye.
> (268-274)

The speaker does not relate his life as a simple narrative in past time but, as M. H. Abrams puts it in "Wordsworth's Long Journey Home," "as the present remembrance of things past, in which forms and sensations 'throw back our life' and evoke the former self which coexists with the altered present self in multiple awareness that Wordsworth calls 'two consciousness'" (Abrams 90). The speaker of the poem says that there is a wide "vacancy" between the I now and the I then,

> Which yet have such self-presence in my mind
> That, sometimes, when I think of them, I seem
> Two consciousness, conscious of myself
> And of some other Being.
> (II, 28-31)

What connects the two consciousnesses is memory, in which kindred representations are collected. The events he experienced in nature as a child "impressed [his] mind with images to which in the following years /Far other feelings are attached" (283-5) and, as such, they formed what archetypal critics

would call "archetypes" of perception that "know no decay" (287) in his mind[6]. The speaker elaborates further on these "traces" of a primal being in the mind as follows:

> There are in our existence spots of time
> Which with distinct preeminence retain
> A fructifying virtue, whence, depressed
> By trivial occupations and the round
> Of ordinary intercourse, our minds –
> Especially the imaginative power –
> Are nourished and invisibly repaired.
> Such moments chiefly seem to have their date
> In our first childhood.
>
> (288-296)

It is the "spots of time" existing in the mind as archetypes that make the poem a history of the mind's maturation process. Harold Bloom (1986) describes the poem as "an autobiographical myth-making…Supreme among Wordsworth's inventions is the myth of renovating 'spots of time,' crucial in the entire basis for the imaginative energy of *The Prelude*" (Bloom 3-4). As said in the lines above, "spots of time" function to "repair" the mind in later life; they "mellow down" selfishness," temper "the pride of strength" and "the vainglory of superior skill" (68-9) and make the speaker "feel the self-sufficing power of solitude" (77). Most importantly, they developed in the speaker a metaphorizing and mythologizing mind/imagination.

However, as is the case in *The Pedlar*, although nature is said to master the mind, in fact it is vice versa; it is the mind that authorizes nature. As D. E. Simpson puts it in "The Spots of Time: Spaces for Refiguring:"

> The mind must 'figure' the materials which are to hand into redisposed forms, providing whatever degree of activity or passivity nature seems not to provide. This is exactly how Wordsworth describes the

[6] This idea is strikingly susceptible to Jungian archetypal criticism.

> imagination, a faculty inescapably figurative in that it does not seek *to reflect* but *to refract* or *reconstruct* what is before it[7] (Simpson 138).

Reminiscent of Kant, Cassirer and Riceour's ideas of the human mind, the speaker describes his mind as "a plastic power" (411) "a forming hand" (412); he says:

> …An auxiliary light
> Came from my mind, which on the setting sun
> Bestowed new splendour; the melodious birds,
> The gentle breezes, fountains that ran on
> Murmuring so sweetly in themselves, obeyed
> A like dominion, and the midnight storm
> Grew darker in the presence of my eye.
> Hence my obeisance, my devotion hence,
> And *hence* my transport.
> (417-425)

Like the synthesizing imagination in Kant's theory, the mind metaphorizes by seeing similarity in dissimilarity and creating a whole out of differences; it is

> …prompt and watchful, eager to combine
> In one appearance all the elements
> And parts of the same object, else detached
> And loth to coalesce.
> (277-280)

In other words, with the "monitory" function of nature, he developed an ability in his imagination to see "affinities /In objects where no brotherhood exists" (433-4). With his ability of metaphorization, "the power of truth" (440) came in "revelation" (441) and he began to see "blessings spread around [him] like a sea" (444); and "the earth and common face of Nature" seemed to speak to him "rememberable things" (418-420). The speaker says:

> I held unconscious intercourse
> With the eternal beauty, drinking in

[7] Italics are mine

A pure organic pleasure from the lines
Of curling mist, or from the level plain
Of waters coloured by the steady clouds.
(394-8)

As seen, with the mind's ability to see "affinities in objects where no brotherhood exists," nature began to seem different from what it is. As Simpson puts it, the mind does not 'represent' but 'refracts' nature and this is the main achievement of the speaker's mind in the maturation process.

3.1.2 Separation from 'the babe nursed in its mother's arms': Man's Alienation from Nature

As said above, the most distinguishing feature of *The Pedlar* and *The Two-Part Prelude* is their handling the spontaneous interaction between a child/primitive man and nature as the basis of the growth of poetic imagination and the ability of figuration. In these poems, the early phase of human life in which the mind is mothered by nature is represented as the starting point in the history of imagination, and what the mind acquires from nature during this phase continues to guide it throughout this history. In this regard, a certain continuity is presupposed in the history of imagination because the 'spots of time' of early experience continue their guidance in later life. However, in some poems a breach is observed to be opened in this history because of the entrance of civilization in human life and man's destruction of nature. In these poems childhood experience, which is also associated with primitive life in this context, is recalled with a sense of loss. Being grown up, according to these poems, represents the loss of primeval feelings, spontaneity and a non-charted look at nature. In them, as Paul H. Fry argues in "Wordsworth's Severe Intimations," the poet locates "primitive society or early selfhood in a region that he still calls sacred" (Fry 60). Thus, unlike *The Pedlar* and *The Two-Part Prelude*, in these poems being an adult represents not continuity but discontinuity in experience and the history of imagination. On this ground, it represents a separation from childhood/primitivity, whose loss is taken

as loss of an edenic world. Such sense of loss is the prevalent theme of Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" (1802-4). As in *The Two-Part Prelude*, in "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" figuration (myth and metaphor-making) is presented as an aspect of childhood experience and as a result of the child's blissful, spontaneous and 'semiotic'[8] relationship with Nature, which, as that in *The Prelude* and *The Pedlar*, is mythologized as a mother figure 'rearing' her child. The poem, whose full title is "Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood," as Harding puts it, "pursues the phantom of permanence and finds 'the fountain light of all our day,' the 'master light of all our seeing' in 'those first affections, / Those shadowy recollections'" (Harding 169). In the poem the speaking-subject recollects childhood experience, his spontaneous and uninterrupted relationship with nature as a child, and his act of metaphorizing and mythologizing in the process of perception, in the speaker's meaning, when playing in his mother's lap. Similar to the speaker of *The Two-Part Prelude*, he recalls how "the babe [he as a child] leaps up on his mother's arm" while "the sun shines warm" (48-9). Grown up, he thinks that he has lost contact with nature and therefore the ability of figuration.

In his childhood, the speaker reflectively says,

> The earth, and every common sight,
> To me did seem
> Apparelled in celestial light –

[8] Not to be confused with semiotics, the semiotic is a term developed by the Post-structuralist French feminist Julia Kristeva and represents the 'other' of language, that is, the phase before the child's mind and body are regulated by the logical language of what Lacan calls the Law of the Father. Because it stems from the pre-Oedipal phase, the semiotic is bound up with the child's contact with the mother's body. As it will be remembered from the previous chapter, Vico, Rousseau and Herder's theories propose that figuration and myth-making are characteristics of primitive life, that is, the 'childhood' of humanity and that the destruction of figuration or the appearance of 'the literal' as opposed to 'the metaphorical' took place with the emergence of logical thinking in the civilized society, in Kristevan terms, with the interruption of the 'Law of the Father into the 'other' of language and metaphorical relationship between the child and its mother. The term is used in the context of Wordsworth's poem because the relationship between the child and Nature is presented as child-mother relationship whose main feature is figuration, which, according to the poem, is lost when grown up (or, as Kristeva would put it) with the logical thinking of the Law of the Father in language).

The glory and the freshness of a dream.
(1-5)

However, that time is past; "the things I have seen I can see no more" (9). Nevertheless, the speaker says that every being in nature still seems incarnated to him; "the moon doth with delight /Look around her when the heavens are bare" (12-3), "Waters on a starry night /Are beautiful and fair" (14-5) and the "sunshine is a glorious birth" (16); "the cataracts blow their trumpets from the steep" (25)" and "all the earth is gay" (29):

Land and sea
Give themselves up to jollity,
And with the heart of May
Doth every beast keep holiday;
(30-33)

Mythologizing earth as a mother figure (as in the other poems studied above) and connoting children with the fresh flowers of the earth, the speaker says that he still perceives how "the earth herself is adorning /This sweet May-morning," while her "children are pulling on every side /In a thousand valleys far and wide /Fresh flowers" (43-8).

The speaker can still see a breathing soul in nature and hear its music but he has lost the primitive feelings and spontaneity that characterized his perception of things in childhood. Thus, he says, "there hath passed away a glory from the earth" (18) and everything in nature "speak[s] of something that is gone" (53). He cannot look at nature as he looked when he was a child because "the visionary gleam," "the glory" and "the dream" that are characteristics of childhood experience no longer exist. In other words, speaking in Vico, Rousseau and Herder's terms, the primitive feelings that are the base of these features are displaced by a 'thinking' and 'categorizing' mind that created 'the literal' and privileged it over 'the metaphorical.' He proclaims that human life is merely "a sleep and a forgetting" (58), that human beings dwell in a purer, more glorious

realm before they enter the earth because "the soul that rises with us, our life's star, /Hath had elsewhere its setting, /And cometh from afar; "Heaven," he says, "lies about us in our infancy!" (66) As children, we still retain some memory of that place, which causes our experience of the earth to be suffused with its magic. At that time earth, "with something of a mother's mind" (79), "fills her lap with pleasures of her own" to nourish her child but that magic dies as the baby passes through boyhood and realizes "at his feet" "some little plan or chart /Some fragment from his dream of human life" (90-1). This represents the introduction of logical thinking or 'the Law of the Father' into the child's blissful life in nature. As growing up, in the speaker's words, as traveling from the East to the West of his life (that is, from the morning to the evening of his life), "shades of the prison-house begin to close about [him]" (67). At length, man perceives that "Nature's priest" no longer guides him on his voyage. Nature-mother is replaced with the "homely nurse" who does all she can to make "her foster-child" "forget the glories he hath known, /And that imperial palace whence he came" (81-4). From that time on, "a wedding or a festival, /A mourning or a funeral" (93-4) or "dialogues of business, love, or strife" (98) began to frame "his song" (96). As soon as one part is played in life, "the little actor cons another part" (102),

> Filling from time to time his 'humorous stage'
> With all the persons, down to a palsied Age,
> That life brings with her in her equipage –
> As if his whole vocation
> Were endless imitation.
> (103-7)[9]

Instead of the little child "glorious in the might of untamed pleasures" (124-5) there becomes the pensive man on whom "custom" lies upon "with a weight as heavy as frost, and deep almost as life" (130-1).

[9] Wordsworth's likening life to a 'humorous stage' bears close resemblance to Macbeth's speech in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, which read as: "Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player /That struts and frets his hour upon the stage, /And then is heard no more" (Act V, Scene V, lines 23-25)

For the speaker, being an adult does not mean a total loss, for the affections experienced in childhood, "those first shadowy recollections" (152) are "the fountain light of all our day, /…a master light of all our seeing" (154-5); they

> Uphold us, cherish us, and make
> Our noisy years seem moments in the being
> Of the eternal silence: truths that wake
> To perish never;
> (156-9)

Thus, the speaker relates,

> What though the radiance which was so bright
> Be now forever taken from my sight,
> Though nothing can bring back the hour
> Of splendour in the grass, of glory in the flower,
> We will grieve not, rather find
> Strength in what remains behind-
> (178-183)

The speaker says that we will find strength in the "primal sympathy" (184) that we acquired in childhood and in the "soothing thought that spring /Out of human suffering" (186-7), which, when combined with ideas drawn from adult life, "bring the philosophic mind" (189). However, this idea, which is philosophized upon as a positive aspect of adulthood in *The Pedlar*, seems to be only a consolation for the speaker's sense of loss in "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" because the sense of sadness pervading the whole atmosphere of the poem indicates his discomfort with the 'autumn' of life.

Wordsworth's *Home at Grasmere* handles the sense of loss caused by man's detachment from nature in a broader sense, bearing more open suggestions for man's loss of contact with nature with the intrusion of civilization in his life. *Home at Grasmere* is written as a 'Prospectus' to *The Excursion* in 1814. It was intended as Book One of Part One of the projected epic *The Recluse*, and it is the only part of the epic poem that was written.

When compared with *The Pedlar* and *The Two-Part Prelude*, imaginative animism and the mind's act of metaphorization and mythologization are also the characterizing features of *Home at Grasmere.* However, instead of the maturation process of the mind, similar to "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," its efforts to get re-united with nature and to close the gap between the poet-narrator and nature are the main focus of the poem. In some parts of the poem, the mind's relationship with nature appears in the form of 'interaction' (that is, relationship between equal parties), especially where the referent is easily visible behind the generated signs. However, in many other cases, as in the other three poems studied above, the mind masters nature. In other words, with the active manipulation of the mind/imagination, nature becomes, in Hartman's words, "the Imagination experienced as a power distinct from [objective] Nature" (In Wellek 126). *Home at Grasmere* also differs from the other three poems in that, particularly towards the end of the poem, poetic imagination metaphorizes and mythologizes by directly relying on ancient Greek, Roman and Miltonic mythology and this makes the referent (objective nature) disappear in the unfamiliar world of myth. Besides, whereas in the other poems nature is mythologized only as a 'nurturing mother,' in *Home at Grasmere* it is mythologized in the beginning as a mother and towards the end as a wife to the mind.

In *Home at Grasmere* the speaker relates his accommodation in Grasmere, the natural setting which he visited as a child, and recollects his childhood experience of the setting, contrasting this experience with the adult world of urban life. In the poem, looking at the natural setting that 'embowers' him at the moment, the speaker remembers with "stirred spirit" (34) how he perceived the self-same objects that surround him when he was a child. He recollects the "clouds that sail on winds," the "breezes that delight to *play* on water, or in endless *chase* /*Pursue* each other through the liquid depths" (25-7), and the "sunbeams, shadows, butterflies and birds, /Angels, and winged creatures that are lords /Without restraint of all which they behold" (31-3). He was so overpowered with joy that the place seemed to him "as beautiful in thought as it had been /When present to

[his] bodily sense" (45-6). He loved to look at the things 'breathing' vitality in nature, "to stand and read /Their looks forbidding, read and disobey. As in the other three poems, it is "Nature" that tamed him when he was a child; mythologizing nature as a mother teaching her child about the ways of the world and suggesting its educative function in contrast to institutionalized education, he says:

> …hath Nature tamed and bade me seek
> For other agitations or be calm,
> Hath dealt with me as with a turbulent stream –
> …Her deliberate voice
> Hath said, 'Be mild and love all gentle things;
> Thy glory and thy happiness be there.
> Yet fear (though thou confide in me) no want
> Of aspirations which have been –of foes
> To wrestle with and victory to complete,
> Bounds to be leapt and darkness to explore.
> (934-948)

As he grew up, the speaker says, he went to the city, where "the realities of life" were "so cold, so cowardly, so ready to betray, so stinted in the measure of their grace" (54-6). However, "the mind of Nature" (95) that is implanted in his soul guided him in the turbulent stream of life. Reminding Rousseau's idea of return to primitivity, the speaker says that the hard realities of urban life are now past because he is back where he belongs to with Emma, his sister. Because they abandoned her, "stern was the face of Nature" but they "rejoiced in that stern countenance" (227-8). Endowing each object in nature with a spirit, the speaker says that they sipped with joy as the things of nature spoke with them; the "icy brooks" appeared to ask them "Whence come ye;" the shower seemed to say "what would ye;" and the sunbeam said, "Be happy." "They [objects of nature] were moved—/All things were moved—they round us as we went, /We in the midst of them" (234-6). They experienced there "two months unwearied of severest storm" (270), until "the gates of Spring are opened" and "churlish Winter hath given leave" (277-8). With the coming of Spring,

[all the living things in nature] are pleased,
But most of all, the birds that haunt the flood,
With the mild summons, inmates though they be
Of Winter's household. They are jubilant
This day, who drooped, or seemed to droop, so long;
(281-5)

The birds move round and round and dance in the sky so that the speaker cannot "take possession of [the sky]" (288). They form "hundreds of curves and circlets, high and low, /Backwards and forwards, progress intricate, /As if one spirit was in all and swayed /Their indefatigable flight" (298-301). "They tempt the sun to sport among their plumes; /They tempt the water and the gleaming ice /To shew them a fair image"(307-9).

The speaker says that he and his sister are neighbored in their natural 'bower' by two swans, 'who' came like them to live together there in peace and solitude. Personifying the two swans with his mythical imagination, he calls them "companions, brethren, consecrated friends" (347). The two swans disappear after a few days; a shepherd may have killed them "for the sake of those at home" 354). They are also neighbored by other people who, like them, come there for peace and solitude. Each house has a tale to tell and that is enough to nourish the imagination. The communal feelings abiding in nature, simplicity, peace and solitude are what characterize the human relationships in this small surrounding. In the city, man is alone;

He of the multitude, whose eyes are doomed
To hold a vacant commerce day by day
With that which he can neither know nor love-
Dead things, to him thrice dead –or worse than this,
With swarms of life, and worse than all, of men,
His fellow men, that are to him no more
Than to the forest hermit are the leaves
That hang aloft in myriads-
(809-816)

For the speaker, true society is there; "The community, the noblest frame /Of many in one incorporate…one family, one mansion" (819-822). Metaphorizing on the natural setting that 'enclosed' him and Emma, he says, he is restored to life with the "sense of majesty and beauty and repose, /A blended holiness of earth and sky" (161-3).

Harding (1995) argues that the poem draws on two traditions, which are Jewish and Greek. These two traditions "pull in opposite directions throughout *Home at Grasmere*, each of them broaching a different way of coming to knowledge and a different understanding of what it is to possess the visionary power. In attempting to construct his 'master myth' from the syncretic combination of these two ancient traditions, the poet calls upon two contradictory ways of relating the mind to nature" (Harding 120). The animation of nature that is seen in *Home at Grasmere* is essentially a characteristic of Greek mythological tradition. The mythologization of rivers with river nymphs or gods (such as Xanthus, Thetis, etc.) or oceans with ocean-gods (Poseidon) and so on exemplifies the incarnating aspect of Greek mythology. However, the poem is also seen to draw on Greek mythology with direct references to it. In such cases, the mind in the poem does not seem to represent the mind of a primal being that responds to nature in the terms defined by Vico, Rousseau and Herder. Although it also mythologizes and metaphorizes in the process of perception, its myth-making is a much more sophisticated one, and it seems to work rather as that in the theories of Kant, Cassirer and Riceour.

However, such direct references do not come until the last 200 of the 1045 lines of the poem, in which decoding the meaning of the speaker's words becomes difficult. In these lines the poem seems to move to a totally transphenomenal-transtemporal realm, dealing with questions of self-forgetfulness, temporality and immortality. Mythologizing childhood experience or life spontaneously lived in nature as "Arcadian dreams"[10] (829) and "golden fancies of a golden age" (830)

[10] According to Greek mythology, Arcadia of Peloponnesus was the domain of Pan, the virgin wilderness home of the god of the forest and his court of dryads, nymphs and other spirits of nature.

that existed "before all time" (832) and will continue to exist "when time is not" (833), the speaker suggests that he has separated from the "Arcadian dreams" or "the golden age" of his life, that is, childhood or life in nature. The swans' abandoning him may be interpreted in these terms to be nature's denial of the speaker's neighborhood or intimacy. The speaker says that he "give[s] entrance to the sober truth" (837) that he lost the spontaneity of childhood or primitivity and he and Nature are no longer 'fitted' to each other. Nature does not 'mother' him as when he was a child. Instead, Nature is mythologized as a being that tortures the speaker:

> Nature to this favorite spot of ours
> Yields no exemption, but her awful rights
> Enforces to the utmost, and exacts
> Her tribute of inevitable pain,
> And that the sting is added, man himself
> For ever to afflict himself.
> (838-43)

When "[his] eyes are fixed on lovely objects," the speaker wishes "to part with all remembrance to a jarring world" (835) and forget all about the things that separated him from nature and spontaneity. In *Rhetoric of Romanticism*, Paul de Man points out that there is always in the search of origins an element of denial, of willed forgetting; De Man says: "we can understand origin only in terms of difference: the source springs up because of the need to be somewhere or something else than what is now here" (qtd in Harding 127). When taken on this ground, it can be said that if in *The Pedlar* and *The Two-Part Prelude* there is an effort to create a 'history' for poetic imagination, in *Home at Grasmere* there is an

---

It was a version of paradise, though only in the sense of being the abode of supernatural entities, not an afterlife for deceased mortals. Arcadia has remained a popular artistic subject since antiquity, both in visual arts and literature. Images of beautiful nymphs frolicking in lush forests have been a frequent source of inspiration for painters and sculptors. Mythology inspired the Roman poet Virgil to write his *Eclogues*, a series of poems set in Arcadia. As a result of the influence of Virgil in medieval European literature, Arcadia became a symbol of pastoral simplicity. It became to be seen as the symbol of the spontaneous result of life lived naturally, uncorrupted by civilization.

effort to get rid of the burden of history by forgetfulness. The speaker represents his wish to forget towards the middle of the poem as:

> Thus we soothe ourselves, and when the thought
> Is passed, we blame it not for having come.
> What if I floated down a pleasant stream
> And now am landed, and the motion gone,
> Shall I reprove myself? Ah no, the stream
> Is flowing and will never cease to flow,
> And I shall float upon that stream again.
> By such forgetfulness the soul becomes
> Words cannot say how beautiful.
> (379-387)

The use of the river image to symbolize forgetfulness indicates the speaker's reliance on the myth of the river of forgetfulness, which is Lethe in Greek mythology. Moving and traveling with the stream of the river is presented as the only way of forgetting the past, one's failures and errors.

This idea is close to Nietzsche's idea of forgetfulness in its recognition of the truth in ancient myth that there is no arriving at Elysian peace without first experiencing Lethe. In his essay "The Use and Abuse of History," which appears in *Thoughts out of Season*, Nietzsche writes:

> In the smallest and greatest happiness there is always one thing that makes it happiness: the power of forgetting, or, in more learned phrase, the capacity of feeling 'unhistorically' throughout its duration. One who cannot leave himself behind on the threshold of the moment and forget the past, who cannot stand on a single point, like a goddess of victory, without fear or giddiness, will never know what happiness is. (in Harding 89)

The only way that can remove from the speaker the almost intolerable consciousness of history seems to wed his Mind with Nature and boil up all time (past, future and present) in the eternal present, which brings to mind Nietzsche's idea of Eternal Return. For the speaker, the marriage of the Mind with Nature can

pose "the possibility of a wholeness of life, a joining of the psychic with the physical, of past with future in the present, which the innovations –economic, political, social –of the Napoleonic era threatened" (Kroeber 182). This marriage can be achieved, the speaker seems to suggest, only through art, which Mind and Nature create with "blended might." Relying on Miltonic mythology, he calls Nature "Urania" (974) and "muse" and asks her to play the role of guiding him in his travel through the worlds of death and life and help him "descend to earth and dwell in highest heaven" (976):

> …Urania, I shall need
> Thy guidance, or a greater muse, if such
> Descend to earth or dwell in highest heaven;
> For I must tread on shadowy ground, must sink
> Deep, and aloft ascending, breathe in worlds
> To which the heaven of heavens is but a veil.
> All strength, all terror, single or in bands,
> That ever was put forth in personal forms –
> Jehovah, with his thunder, and the quire
> Of shouting angels and the empyreal thrones –
> I pass them unalarmed
> (974-84)

He asks her to show him "the darkest pit /Of the profoundest hell, chaos, night,/…by help of dreams, can breed such fear and awe /As fall upon us often when we look /Into our mind" (984-989). Thus, with these lines, it is seen that the speaker sees nature as the main agent that can purify his mind from "night, chaos and hell," which seem to symbolize the evil in his unconscious mind. This can be achieved only through art –what he calls beauty. Mythologizing nature this time as a woman showing her love to her husband, the speaker says:

> Beauty, whose living home is the green earth,
> Surpassing the most fair ideal forms
> The craft of delicate spirits hath composed
> From earth's materials, waits upon my steps,
> Pitches her tents before me where I move.

(991-995)

"Once wedded to [nature]" (1000) and forget about the past, the speaker says, he would experience "paradise and groves /Elysian, fortunate islands, fields like those of old /In the deep ocean" (996-8) and would realize that what is a "history" is but a "dream" (999). Using Nietzsche's terminology, in this Dionysian state, that is, in this state of self-forgetfulness, the speaker would sing in solitude "the spousal verse /Of this great consummation" (1003-4). He would sing, he says:

> How exquisitely the individual Mind
> (And the progressive powers perhaps no less
> Of the whole species) to the external world
> Is fitted – and how exquisitely, too –
> Theme this but little heard of among men –
> The external World is fitted to the Mind;
> And the creation (by no lower name
> Can it be called) which they with blended might
> Accomplish – this is our high argument.
> (1005-1014)

As seen in the study of the poem, like "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," a kind of discontinuity is represented in man's relationship with nature in *Home at Grasmere*. Civilization is seen to play the sinister role of detaching man from his 'mother' in both poems. In terms of the act of mythologization and metaphorization, like the other three poems studied before, in *Home at Grasmere* the speaker is seen to endow objects of nature with tutelary spirits in the act of perception. However, this poem differs from the other poems in that especially towards the end of the poem the act of mythologization becomes much more sophisticated and, instead of representing the interaction between mind and nature, it moves to the almost atemporal and ahistorical realm of myth.

3.1.3 Poetic Imagination as the Origin of All Mythology: Keats's "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill"

In "The Drunken Boat" Northrop Frye argues that "in Romantic poetry the emphasis is not on what we call sense, but on the constructive power of the mind, where reality is brought into being by experience" (11). Following this statement, as he describes myth in Romantic poetry, Frye says: "myth is typically the story of the god, whose form and character are human but who is also a sun-god or a tree-god or ocean-god. It identifies the human with the nonhuman, an identification which is also one of the major functions of poetry itself" (15). Taking these quotations as point of departure, it can be said that myth is, according to Romantic poetry, something created by the mind in the act of construction by imbuing nonhuman objects with human qualities. John Keats' "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" (1816) represents the idea that mythopoeia (myth-making) is a result of the perception of natural phenomena. What makes this poem different from the poems studied above is that besides following the ancient Greek tradition of incarnating natural objects, it is full of direct references to figures in Greek and Roman mythology and represents that poetic imagination is the origin of all mythology: Greek, Roman and modern.

Like the other poems studied above, an 'I' subject, who is thought to be the poet, is the central consciousness of "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Little Hill." And just like Wordsworth's poems, in Keats' poem, too, the poetic imagination metaphorizes and mythologizes by presenting two dissimilar things as if they were similar and by incarnating nature with the use of verbs, adjectives and nouns originally used for animate beings.

The 'I' subject of "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Little Hill" perceives "the sweet buds which with *a modest pride*/ Pull droopingly, in slanting curve aside" (lines 3-4). Their leaves and stems are crowned with "*starry diadems*/ Caught from *the early sobbing of the morn*"[11] (6-7). The clouds are pure and white "as flocks new shorn" (8) and "they [*sleep*] on the blue fields of heaven" (9). Among the leaves

[11] *Italics* are mine.

"there [*creeps*] a little noiseless noise" (10). The scene presents a variety of natural objects for "the greediest eye, / To peer about upon variety" (14-15), to picture out "the quaint, and curious bending/Of a fresh woodland alley" (19-20) and to guess "where the *jaunty* streams *refresh* themselves" (22). Looking at this lively scene, the poet says that he feels as light and free as though "the fanning wings of Mercury had played upon [his] heels" (23-24).

In the examples above, natural objects have a myth and poetry-generating function. The poetic imagination of the speaker metaphorizes and mythologizes when perceiving objects of nature by setting a similarity between animate and non-animate beings or between dissimilar objects. In these examples, the buds, just like human beings, have a modest pride; the morning is personified and the morning dew is presented as the result of the morning's sobbing; the streams are happily refreshing themselves; the heaven is likened to fields on which newly-shorn sheep [clouds] feed themselves; and the poet feels as free and light as though the fanning wings of Mercury played upon his heels. Such incarnation of nature can be seen throughout the poem: Swarms of minnows "show their little heads,/ Staying their wavy bodies 'gainst the streams, /To *taste* the luxury of sunny beams /Tempered with coolness" (72-5); and "the ripples seem right *glad* to reach those cresses/ And cool themselves among the em'rald tresses" (81-2); "the blue sky here, and there, serenely *peeping*/ Through tendril wreaths fantastically *creeping*" (169-170).

In *Imagination and Myths in John Keats' Poetry* D. Brotemarkle points to Wordsworth's influence on Keats' idea of myth and states, "Wordsworth found the origin of myths in the Creative Imagination and Keats followed suit." "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" is, for Brotemarkle, Keats' first stated interest in the origin of mythology because it shows mythology to be something the poet's imagination creates in its interaction with nature (115). Like Wordsworth's poetry, the most important aspect of this poem, too, seems to be the mythologizing of nature. Like Wordsworth's poems that are studied above, Nature is presented throughout the poem as a female figure, or a Muse that is a source of inspiration for the poet.

Keats carries Wordsworth's myth-making a step further and mythologizes nature as a goddess in the human form departing the scene with the evening fall:

> Than the soft rustle of a maiden's gown
> Fanning away the dandelion's down;
> Than the light music of her nimble toes
> Patting against the sorrel as she goes.
> How she would start, and blush, thus to be caught
> Playing in all her innocence of thought.
> O let me lead her gently o'er the brook,
> Watch her half-smiling lips, and downward look;
> O let me for one moment touch her wrist;
> Let me for one moment to her breathing list
> And as she leaves me may she often turn
> Her fair eyes looking through her locks auburne.
> (93-106)

As nature departs, another female figure, maybe her sister, appears: "the moon lifting her silver rim/Above a cloud, and with a gradual swim /Coming into the blue with all her light" (114-5). These natural beauties make the mind of the poet (in a quite Keatsian manner) "hover till it dozes" (108). Looking spell-bound at the animate Nature and the Moon, the poet exclaims:

> O Maker of sweet poets, dear delight
> Of this fair world, all its gentle livers;
> Sprangler of clouds, halo of crystal rivers,
> Mingler with leaves, and dew and tumbling streams,
> Closer of lovely eyes to lovely dreams,
> Lover of loneliness, and wandering,
> Of upcast eye, and tender pondering!
> (116-22)

Validating Cassirer's idea that the mythical imagination creates myth in the perception of nature, the speaker thinks that it is nature and its objects that inspire poetic imagination to create myths:

> Thee must I praise above all other glories

That smile us on to tell delightful stories.
(123-4)

For the speaker, it is nature and its beautiful objects that also gave rise to ancient Greek and Roman mythology:

For what has made the sage or poet write
But the fair paradise of Nature's light
In the calm grandeur of a sober line,
We see the waving of the mountain's pine;
And when a tale is beautifully staid,
We feel the safety of a hawthorn glade:
(125-30).

The speaker says that it is nature that "inspired a band of old to sing/Narcissus pining o'er the untainted spring" (163-4) and seeing "a meek and forlorn flower, with nought of pride,/Drooping its beauty over the watery clearness,/ To woo its own sad image into nearness" (172-4). Nature also inspired old poets to sing Psyche's tale:

How Psyche went
On the smooth wind to realms of wonderment;
What Psyche felt, and Love, when their full lips
First touch'd; what amorous and fondling nips
They gave each other's cheeks;
. . .
Their woes gone by, and both to heaven upflown
To bow for gratitude before Jove's throne
(142-150)

And when he "pull'd the boughs aside" and "look into a forest wide," the old poet caught a glimpse of "Fawns, and Dryades /Coming with softest rustle through the trees" (151-4). Garlands of sweet flowers would tell us "how fair, trembling Syrinx fled /Arcadian Pan, with such a fearful dread. /Poor Nymph— poor Pan—

how did he weep to find/ Nought but a lovely sighing of the wind/Along the reedy stream" (157-161).

The speaker says that the old poet was one from whose "warm head out-flew/That sweetest of all songs" (181-2) and who brought with him "shapes from the invisible world" (186). He was a poet who "brought in faintness solemn, sweet and slow /A hymn from Dian's temple" (196-7) and made "silken ties, that never may be broken" (238).

Thus, in "I Stood Tip-toe upon a Hill," speaking in Riceour's terms, the act of 'seeing as,' that is, 'seeing' nonanimate objects 'as' animate is presented as the cause of all mythology. Figuration is represented as the characterizing feature of perception, a cognitive faculty that incarnates nature and constructs stories/myths out of its objects. In this respect, the poem also presents an answer to the question about the origin of Greek and Roman mythology by positing poetic imagination as the originator of all mythology.

3.1.4 "Some Unseen Pow'r Floats Around" Beings of Nature: The Tremendous Power of the Mind

As has been said, the poems studied above indicate the role of nature in the iconic function of the imagination/the human mind and center the mind in the metaphor and myth-making act. However, there are Romantic poems that elaborate mainly on the mind as a creating and forming power and mythologize it as a transcendental and omni-present being.

A poem in which the mind is centralized in the perception of phenomena is Shelley's "Mont Blanc" (1816). Shelley is said to have written this poem during his visit of Mont Blanc, which is the highest mountain on the border of France and Switzerland. Thus, the poem presents a perceiving subject's act of metaphorizing and mythologizing an objective phenomenon. As the speaker says towards the end of the poem, "Mont Blanc" is about "the human mind's imaginings" (143). As such, the main theme of the poem seems to be a quite Wordsworthian one: To repeat the lines quoted from *Home at Grasmere*, "How exquisitely the individual

Mind…to the external world is fitted – and how exquisitely, too –…the external World is fitted to the Mind; /And the creation which they with blended might accomplish."

"Mont Blanc" opens with a centralizing of the Mind in the perception of phenomena and with a metaphoric and mythic definition of the universe:

> The everlasting universe of things
> Flows through the mind, and rolls its rapid waves,
> Now dark – now glittering – now reflecting gloom –
> Now lending splendour, where from secret springs
> The source of human thought its tribute brings
> Of waters -…
> (1-6)

In the second part of the poem, the speaker makes his view of the mind clearer:

> My own, my human mind, which passively
> Now renders and receives fast influencings,
> Holding an unremitting interchange
> With the clear universe around;
> (37-40)

According to these two extracts, mind and nature exist in an unremitting interchange in which the life of one feeds the life of the other. Thus, the speaker seems to presuppose the existence of a universe of things independent of the human mind. The universe may seem in these extracts 'a river of things' which the mind can only perceive, not create. However, reminiscent of the 'river of mind' in Wordsworth's *The Two-Part Prelude*, this river flows through the mind and so everything exists as it is perceived and as it is present in the mind. Wasserman argues,

> By defining the universe as constituted of things rather than of thoughts and then by predicating the existence of those things exclusively in mind, Shelley formulated a syntax which, by fusing the externalizing subject (the universe of things) and the internalizing predicate (flows through the

> mind), denies both that 'things' are mental fictions and that there is any real distinction between thing and thought (Wasserman 222).

As said in the beginning of the study of the poem, it is a matter of fact that the referent (the natural phenomenon, that is, Mont Blanc) is definite in the sign-production (that is, metaphor and myth production) of the mind. The universe of things exists out there as the mind metaphorizes and mythologizes it; in other words, as the mind lends "splendour," "gloom" and so on to natural phenomena in the process of perception.

This interaction between Mind and nature, in which the mind 'manipulates' independently existing things, results in some parts of the poem in endowing things—in a Wordsworthian way—with 'tutelary spirits,' in imbuing non-animate objects with animate features. Looking at the natural phenomena in front of him, the speaker realizes "a *feeble* brook" in the wild woods, "among the mountains *lone*," where "waterfalls around it *leap* forever," "woods and winds *contend*, and a vast river /Over its rocks ceaselessly *bursts* and *raves*" (7-11)[12]. The act of incarnation acquires another dimension with the speaker's addressing Mont Blanc with the second person pronoun "Thou" as if it were a human being or a deity. Subsequent to this, he calls Mont Blanc "Ravine of Arve," "the many-coloured, many-voicéd vale, /Over whose pines, and crags, and caverns sail/Fast cloud shadows and sunbeams" (12-5). As Michael Ferber puts it, "to address something inhuman, in the way classical poets in their odes addressed human beings or gods, is to bring the thing nearer, to humanize it, to raise the possibility of conservation with it…is a creative mental act" (40).

In the "cluster of images that are continually put into relation to one another" in the poem there is "an elaborate schema of reciprocity" (Ferguson 47). However, as the poetic imagination of the speaker metaphorizes and mythologizes, the phenomenal things that seem at first to be independent from the mind begin to be subject to the act of perception and, as such, instead of reciprocity, the

[12] Italics are mine

absorption of the referent by the sign begins to take place. As Shelley in *A Defence of Poetry* says: "all things exist as they are perceived: at least in relation to the percipient" (328). Similarly, Paul de Man, in a critique of Wordsworth that in some ways is strikingly parallel to "Mont Blanc," argues that "it is better to pass beyond the Wordsworthian concept of correspondence between nature and consciousness, because only a consciousness independent of nature is capable of interpreting the world" (In Harding 175). In like manner, the relationship between the Mind and nature in "Mont Blanc" is one in which phenomena are authorized with the constructions of the Mind. This can be seen in the mind's constructing a transphenomenal presence out of the phenomenal Mont Blanc. The speaker mythologizes the Mount as a "Power," a transcendent being that "comes down /From the ice-gulfs that gird his secret throne" (16-7). Clinging around this Power is a "giant brood of pines" (20), which are "children of elder times" (21) in whose devotion "the chainless winds come and ever came /To drink their odours" and to hear "their mighty swinging –an old and solemn harmony" (21-24).

Michael O'Neil argues that the speaker uses this scene "as a dramatization of his 'imaginings' about some postulated 'Power,' and makes us aware of the poem as an artifice, something constructed" (42). The artistic and metaphorical character of the object of perception becomes more obvious when the speaker perceives the Power's "earthly rainbows stretched across the sweep" / Of the aethereal waterfall, whose veil/Robes some unsculptured image" (25-7). The speaker's resembling the frozen waterfall to an "aethereal" being whose "veil" (its white frost) "robes some unsculptured image" indicates the metaphorizing imagination at work in the process of perception.

As Keats in "Ode to a Nightingale" and Shelley in "Ode to the West Wind" (two poems that will also be studied in this chapter) do, the speaker mythologizes Mont Blanc as an immortal being. He says that as the fields, the lakes, the streams and all the things in the "deadal [mortal] earth," including earthquake, rain, lightning and "the torpor of the year when feeble dreams /Visit the hidden buds, or dreamless sleep /Holds every future leaf and flower" (88-90), in short, as "all the

things that move and breathe with toil and sound/Are born and die" and "revolve, subside, and swell," "Power dwells apart in its tranquility, /Remote, serene, and inaccessible" (94-97).

The metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination is also seen to be at work in its perception of Mont Blanc (which symbolizes Nature in this context) as a godly figure cooperating with the Sun both for the destruction and renewal of the life on earth. Harding states, "Shelley's earth in 'Mont Blanc' is a flowing, unstable, Heraclitean one" (Harding 172). Mont Blanc is presented as the fountainhead of the flowing 'river' of life on earth. With the help of the Sun, "in scorn of mortal power," Mont Blanc makes "glaciers creep/ Like snakes that watch their prey, from their far fountains, /Slow rolling on"(100-2) until in "many a precipice" they pile

> …dome, pyramid, and pinnacle,
> A city of death, distinct with many a tower
> And wall impregnable of beaming ice.
> Yet not a city, but a flood of ruin
> (104-7)

The frost that "rolls its perpetual stream" (109) from the "boundaries of the sky" (108) destroys the "dwelling place /Of insects, beasts, and birds" and "their food" (114-6). The race of man "flies far in dread" and "his work and dwelling vanish" (117-8). However, these glaciers also give life to nature and cause the life cycle on earth. When they meet in the vale, they give birth to "one majestic River, / The *breath* and *blood* of distant lands;"[13] the River in turn gives birth to the ocean by rolling "its loud waters" to it; and the ocean "breathes its swift vapours to the circling air" (123-6), and the cycle completes as these vapours become snows that "descend upon the Mountain" in the "calm darkness of the moonless nights, /In the lone glare of day" (130-2).

[13] *Italics* are mine

As all these things happen in the mortal and cycling life on earth, in a manner of Keatsian stability and immobility, Mont Blanc stands erect, without being affected with the destructive and diminishing power of time. The speaker says,

> Mont Blanc yet gleams on high: - the power is there,
> The still and solemn power of many sights,
> And many sounds, and much of life and death.
> (127-9)

The Power residing at the top of the Mountain is so high and so isolated from the mortal world that no one can behold the snow descending on it or the flakes burnt by "the sinking sun" (133). It is a power "unseen" and it inhabits in solitude in "the voiceless lightning" (137) and the "infinite dome of Heaven" (140-1). It can be beholden only by poetic imagination, whose "wandering wings" (41), the speaker says,

> Now float above [its] darkness, and now rest,
> Where that or [it] art no unbidden guest,
> In the still cave of the witch Poesy,
> Seeking among the shadows that pass by
> Ghosts of all things that are, some shade of [the Mountain],
> Some phantom, some faint image; till the breast
> From which they fled recalls them.
> (42-8)

Only poetic imagination/human mind can behold it because, the speaker says, "what were [the Mountain], and earth, and stars, and sea, /If to the human mind's imaginings/ Silence and solitude were vacancy" (142-4). Thus, without the human mind's imaginings, the mountain would be inconceivable. In Harding's words, "the entire poem belongs to the realm of 'imaginings' –that is clear from the interflowing of ravine and mind, enacted in lines 1-11" (Harding 180).

As seen, in "Mont Blanc" the human mind/poetic imagination is not a passive receiver as the speaker in some lines of the poem suggests. As Ferber states, "the process of the poem enacts, though it does not assert, a mental creation

of the universe of things" (39). With his sign-generating imagination, the speaker metaphorizes and mythologizes Mont Blanc as an incorporeal Presence, to such an extent that the referent is lost in the 'alien' world of myth.

In "Ode to the West Wind" (1819) Shelley represents his idea of Power this time with a west wind. The speaker mythologizes the West Wind, like Mont Blanc, as an omnipotent power that both destroys and regenerates; "everything subject to the Power [of the West Wind] is in constant flux, but the Power itself is unchanging, acting without interruption or variance" on nature (Wasserman 241). It is like Plato's transcendental Mind authorizing and constructing nature. Associating autumn with death and spring with rebirth, the speaker mythologizes the West Wind as the "breath of Autumn's being" (1), from whose "unseen presence the leaves dead/Are driven, like ghosts from an enchanter fleeing" (2-3). Like "Mont Blanc," it is fountainhead of the cycle of being and thus it is not only the cause of death on earth, but the cause of life and rebirth; it "chariotest to their dark wintry bed/the winged seeds" (6-7) until his "azure sister of the Spring shall blow/Her clarion over the dreaming earth, and fill/…/with living hues and odours plain and hill" (9-13). The West Wind does not show its effects only on the earth but also in the sky and the sea—that is, in matter, air and water, which are the three constituents of the universe. In the sky, under the effect of its stream, "Loose clouds like earth's decaying leaves are shed, /Shook from the tangled boughs of Heaven and Ocean" (16-17), so that the sky begins to rain "like the bright hair uplifted from the head/Of some fierce Maenad, even from the dim verge/Of the horizon to the zenith's height,/The locks of the approaching storm" (20-23). And it shows its effects on the watery side of the earth by wakening from his summer dreams "the blue Mediterranean, where he lay,/Lulled by the coil of his crystalline streams,/Beside a pumice isle in Baiae's bay,/And saw in sleep old palaces and towers/Quivering within the wave's intenser day" (30-34). The under-sea plants, with fear of the West Wind, "Cleave themselves into chasms" and "grow grey with fear,/and tremble and despoil themselves" (38-42). Thus, as the 'Power' in "Mont

Blanc," the West Wind is an omni-present being "which [is] moving everywhere; /Destroyer and preserver" (13-4).

As seen, in the poem the West Wind is presented as an omnipotent power that dominates the whole earth. The iconic imagination of the speaker animates all natural phenomena as it mythologizes the West Wind. The leaves run away from the Wind as if they were 'pestilence-stricken,' the clouds are shed from Heaven and cause rain, the blue Mediterranean is being lulled by the coil of streams, and so on. The speaker also makes direct references to Greek and Roman mythology as he mythologizes the West Wind. In the poem such figures associated with ancient mythology as 'Maenad,' 'Heaven,' 'Ocean,' and 'Mediterranean' are also used. Harding (1995) argues that the poem is based on ancient Greek myth; he states, "though the poem is wildly syncretic, with direct references to the lyre of Apollo, the breath of Pan, and the coils of Neptune, the dominant image in the first two stanzas are bacchanal" (202). The reference in the poem to 'Meneads' (female figures who danced frenziedly in the worship of Bacchus) and to the Mediterranean sleeping in a sense of Keatsian swoon support Harding's idea.

As can be understood in "Mont Blanc" and "Ode to the West Wind" Shelley centralizes the mind in the construction of phenomena with his idea of 'Power.' "I confess," he wrote in *On Life*, "that I am one of those who am unable to refuse my assent to the conclusions of those philosophers who assert that nothing exists but as it is perceived…the solid universe of external things is 'such stuff as dreams are made of'" (qtd. in Wasserman 137). In this regard, for Shelley, existence is relative to the mind's perception.

However, with the idea of 'Power' presented in "Mont Blanc" and "Ode to the West Wind" it is seen that Shelley has in mind a transcendental Mind which bears resemblance to Plato's Actual Form. Like Plato, for Shelley, individual minds are attributes of the One Mind. In "Essay on Christianity," he says:

> There is a Power by which we are surrounded, like the atmosphere in which some motionless lyre is suspended, which visits with its breath our silent chords at will. Our most imperial and stupendous qualities—those

> on which the majesty and the power of humanity is erected—are, relatively to the inferior portion of its mechanism, indeed active and imperial; but they are the passive slaves of some higher and more omni-present Power (qtd. in Weisman 44).

The idea of Power in the extract above may seem to have some theological implications. However, taking into consideration Shelley's pantheistic view, this idea can be said to represent Shelley's idea of Mind, nature and human life.

Shelley elaborates further on this idea of "Power" in "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" (1816), which is written in the form of a hymn to a deity. The poem opens with a representation of 'Power' like Plato's Actual Form:

> The awful shadow of some unseen Power
> Floats though unseen among us,—visiting
> This various world with as inconstant wing
> As summer winds that creep from flower to flower—
> Like moonbeams that behind some piny mountain shower,
> It visits with constant glance
> Each human heart and countenance;
> (2-7)

As seen in this extract, the "unseen Power" is deified by the poetic imagination so that it becomes, just like Plato's Actual Form, an omni-present being that is both immanent to all beings in nature and transcendental. It floats "among us" and visits "[t]his various world" and "Each human heart and countenance." In this regard, what is apprehended as objective phenomena, like Plato's secondary Forms, are "the awful shadow[s]" projected from this being; they are "reminder[s] of an absented presence" (Weisman 45). According to this idea of "Power," every object in nature has a spirit and the One Mind/Power is the totalizing Spirit, which signifies that "the distinction between mind and matter, or thought and thing, [is] superficial, and that all our perceptions of natural things are events in the mind" (Ferber 55).

In the following parts of the poem, the speaker calls this "Power" "Spirit of Beauty." This "Spirit of Beauty" is addressed as though it were a deity, but "the

poem sees 'Beauty as manifesting itself within "human thought or form" (O'Neil 35). The speaker says that with its "hues" "Beauty" shines "upon human thought or form" (14-5). It is a "messenger of sympathies, /That wax and wane in lovers' eyes," a "nourishment" to "human thought" (42-5).

Wasserman argues that the "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" "springs in part from [Shelley's] conviction that man's mind is 'at enmity with nothingness and dissolution,' being incapable of 'imagining to itself self-annihilation'" (190). Taken on this ground, "the Spirit of Beauty" can be said to represent the immortalizing transcendental force within man. According to Shelley, "man's immortality is dependent upon there being an eternal and immutable deity of perfection, not because that guarantees a power of granting an afterlife, but because the immortal part of a human self is only an inconstant expression of that deity" (Wasserman 194). However, this power seems to have abandoned the world because the speaker asks: "where art thou gone? /Why dost thou pass away and leave our state, /This dim vast vale of tears, vacant and desolate?" It is because of its abandoning the world that man's life is mutable. The speaker says: "Man were immortal, and omnipotent, /Didst thou, unknown and awful as thou art, /Keep with thy glorious train firm state within his heart" (39-41).

In the fifth stanza, the speaker says that the shadow of the Spirit of Beauty "fell on" him while he was a boy seeking "for ghosts" (49), "pursuing some high talk with the departed dead" (51-2) and "musing deeply on the lot /Of life," and "at that sweet time when winds are wooing /All vital things that wake to bring /News of birds and blossoming" (55-8). In his *A Defence of Poetry*, Shelley states that poetry "defeats the curse that binds us to be subjected to the accident of surrounding impressions," "spreads its figured curtain or withdraws life's dark veil from before the scene of things," and "creates for us a being within our being" (338). As in the description of poetry in this quotation, Beauty "withdraws life's dark veil in the scene of things" for the boy and, instead of being "subjected to the accident of surrounding impressions" and seeing 'ghosts' and evil features in

things, he comes to perceive the vitality in life, the singing of the birds and "blossoming" in nature.

Harold Bloom claimed that Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" is a model for Shelley's "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" (qtd. in O'Neil 37). The fact that Shelley's poem handles Beauty as falling on the speaker when he was a small boy bears close resemblance to the child's act of figuration in Wordsworth's poem. It will also be remembered that in the Romantic aesthetics (particularly, in Rousseau, Herder, Vico and Wordsworth's ideas) childhood and primitive life are taken as equivalent phases in human life that are closest to nature and in which mythologization and metaphorization of natural phenomena was the most characteristic feature of perception. Wordsworth's representation of childhood in "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" as the stage in human life in which the act of metaphorization and mythologization is most intense exemplifies the idea of childhood in the Romantic aesthetics. In like manner, as said in the previous chapter, Shelley thinks that "in the infancy of society" every person was a poet because language itself was poetry ("*A Defence"* 235). When taken to symbolize art or artistic creation, Beauty's coming to the speaker during his childhood may represent, as in Wordsworth's poem, the existence of Beauty in childhood and the 'infancy of society,' which abandoned the world with the introduction of logical thinking and categorical reasoning into human life.

This meaning becomes more obvious when, similar to Wordsworth's poem, the speaker mourns for the loss of childhood experience in the last stanza. He says: "The day becomes more solemn and serene /When noon is past" (73-4). However, as suggested by the speaker of Wordsworth's poem in the end, and, by the speaker of Keats' "To Autumn," the "Songs of Spring" are past but "autumn" has its own music, too. Similarly, Shelley's speaker says: "there is a harmony /In autumn, and a luster in the sky, /Which through the summer is not heard or seen, /As if it could not be, as if it had not been!"(73-6).The poem ends with the speaker's prayer for the "Spirit fair" (83) to redeem him from his mortal state and let its power descend upon him to renew his artistic abilities and make him "love all human kind" (84).

Thus, in the poem Intellectual Beauty is presented as an omni-present being both immanent to all beings of nature and transcendent; like Plato's Actual Form, it is a totalizing Mind to which individual minds are mere shadows. However, similar to the 'Beauty' in Keats's "Ode to a Nightingale" and "Ode on a Grecian Urn" (that will be studied later in this chapter), it also represents the immortal and transcendental aspect of art or figuration that comes to man particularly in young age (in the spring of his life) but leaves him as he is grown up (as he is in the 'autumn' of his life).

3.2 Evening and Autumn as Mythemes of Mortality and Transience

As can be concluded from the poems studied above, mortality and the transience of human life are two of the most common themes of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats's poetry. The iconic imagination that is presented as the central consciousness of this poetry handles these themes, as all others, in mythological and metaphorical terms, by seeing similitude between the phases of human life and the phases of a day or seasons of a year. In this regard, as can also be seen in the above-quoted lines of "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty," morning and spring are connoted with childhood and young age; summer and noon with middle age; autumn and evening with old age; and winter and night with death. As will be remembered from the introduction chapter, theorizing these mythemes in literature, Northrop Frye argues in *Anatomy of Criticism* that the mythical patterns or images appear in literature in certain forms of, what he calls, 'cyclical movements,' the most important of which takes place with the death or rebirth, or the disappearance and return, or the incarnation and withdrawal, of a god (Meletinsky 82). This divine activity is usually identified with one or more cyclical processes of nature. The god may be either a sun-god, dying at night and reborn in the morning, or a god of vegetation, dying in winter and reviving in spring. Another cyclical movement is presented by the "fire world of heavenly bodies." Most obvious is "the journey of the sun-god across the sky." According to Frye, the symbols of cyclical

movements are usually divided into four main phases—the four seasons of the year or the four periods of the day (dawn, noon, dusk, night) being the most important ones. In the four phases of the day, dawn is associated with spring and birth, noon with summer, marriage and triumph; dusk with autumn and death; and finally night with winter and desolation (Meletinsky 82). A similar idea is presented by James Frazer, who in *The Golden Bough* studies myths that are linked to seasonal cycles, and the kind of myth he is most interested in is that concerning a fertility god and goddess and his/her death and rebirth. In Frazer's view, there is "a magical connection between the drama of the dying and reviving god on the one hand, and the seasonal cycle on the other. The king is dead; long live the king" (Coupe 25).

The metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination in Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats's poetry seems to work by employing the mythemes theorized by Frye and Frazer, by handling human life in terms of day and seasonal cycles. One poem in which mortality, transience and old age are handled in these terms is Wordsworth's *An Evening Walk* (1793). In *An Evening Walk*, too, the main focus is man's alienation from his mother (nature) who nursed him in his childhood. However, differently from *Home at Grasmere* and similar to "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," *An Evening Walk* deals with ideas of transience, mortality and old age. The sense of loss felt for the lost Eden of life (childhood, primitivity, being one with nature) and old age are represented in the poem with evening. In *An Evening Walk*, as in "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," the speaker visits in the dusk of his life the natural setting where his childhood passed and 'recollects in tranquility' his youthful experiences and perceptions of this setting. However, similar to "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" the senses of loss, sadness and longing for childhood dominate the whole atmosphere of the poem because, in the words of the speaker, the poem is about "the history of a poet's ev'ning" (52).

Harding states that *An Evening Walk* is mythological in the sense that "its landscape is peopled with spirits and genii" (60) and that Wordsworth employs

"the Greek poets' habit of endowing natural objects with tutelary spirits" (64). Like Greek mythology, in Wordsworth's poem, too, objects of nature are embodied with spiritual or ideational contents. The speaker metaphorizes and mythologizes nature to such an extent that he perceives 'breathing' spirits in its objects. As "the yellowing sun declines" (97), with 'Memory at [his] side' (43), the speaker wanders "thro' grey dell, high wood, and pastoral cove," (2). However, the nature he perceives at the moment is not the same joyful one that mothered him as a child. The sun is declining not only in nature but also in his life and thus, as in *Home at Grasmere* and "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," he cannot feel oneness with nature as in childhood. It is as if objects of nature deny any kind of intimacy with him. The mythologizing and metaphorizing imagination of the speaker perceives the "giant yews *frown* on Rydale's mere" (8), "the *shy* Winander *peeps* / Mid' clust'ring isles, and holly-sprinkled steeps" (13-14),[14]the "willows, *weeping* trees" (101), the "boat-house *peeping* thro' the shade" (106) and the "*sombrous* pine," (334). In the twilight of his life, nature seems to have lost its former liveliness and to be hostile to man. Unlike those communing spontaneously with the child or primitive man, the objects here are shy with the speaker and they 'peep' at him as a stranger interrupting their lives; the trees 'weep' (possibly for what civilized man has done to them), the pine is 'somber,' the 'shadowy' streams are 'reposing in the dark' and the twilight, as if having lost purpose in life, is 'roaming astray.'

It is as if something sinister has happened in nature. In contrast, in "youth's wild eye the livelong day was bright, /The sun at morning, and the stars of night/ Alike, when first the vales the bittern fills, /Or the first woodcocks roam'd the moonlight hills" (23-26).

For instance, when the speaker remembers the joys he experienced in childhood, he says:

> … I taught, 'a happy child,'
> The echoes of your rocks my carols wild:

[14] Italics are mine.

Then did no ebb of chearfulness demand
Sad tides of joy from *Melancholy's hand*;
. . .
Return, Delights! With whom my road begun,
When *Life rear'd* laughing up *her* morning sun;
When *Transport kiss'd* away my april tear,
'Rocking as in a dream the tedious year';
(19-30)[15]

The speaker's words "Return, Delights! With whom my road begun" represents his longing for the lost Eden of childhood. The fact that all the above-mentioned abstractions begin with capital letters and are identified with such personal pronouns as 'he,' 'she,' and 'they' and are used with adjectives, verbs or nouns originally used for human beings show the mythical imagination at work in the act of perception.

However, the most outstanding mythical figures in the poem emerge when the speaker perceives the sun and the moon. As can be concluded from this study, the sun, the moon and Nature are the most important mythical figures created by poetic imagination in the process of incarnation in the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. Like in the poetry of Shelley and Keats, in Wordsworth's *An Evening Walk* these figures are presented as mother or father figures whose interaction causes reproduction or transience in the world of phenomena.

In this context, while observing every movement or beauty in nature, the speaker gets enchanted with the all-pervading power of the sun. The sun, as in other Romantic poems, is mythologized as a male figure that, with its blue light breaking its golden tides, plays the most crucial role in the melancholic atmosphere in nature. Mythologizing the sun as the sun-god journeying in the sky like that of Frye's theory, the speaker observes how the sun is about to complete its journey in the West. He perceives how "[hung] o'er a cloud, above the steep that rears/It's edge all flame, the broadening sun appears," how "a long blue bar" divides the "aegis orb" of the sun and "breaks the spreading of its golden tides,"

[15] Italics are mine.

and how the sun "touches on the purple steep/That flings *his* shadow on the pictur'd deep"(151-6). The speaker relates that the whole scene is pervaded with the blue light of the sun so that all in nature appear "on fire" (158) and all nature prepares for the end of the day. Then, the speaker perceives that the "day-star [the sun] lessens still, /Gives one bright glance, and sinks behind the hill" (173-4).

Reinforcing the idea that the setting of the sun is a mytheme of death, the speaker says that as the sun sets, "with religious awe [its] farewell light /Blends with the solemn colouring of the day"(329-330) and "like Una shining on her gloomy way, /The half seen form of Twilight roams astray"(333-4). The reference to 'Una,' who is the main female figure in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queen*, indicates the speaker's reliance on Spenserian mythology together with the Greek mythological tradition in the act of mythologization. After the setting of the day-star (the sun), the night-star (the moon) appears, which is mythologized as the omnipresent female spirit of the night. Night has its own spirits for the speaker; as he looks at nature, he sees "below Eve's listening Star [the moon]

> Fair Spirits are abroad – in sportive chase
> *Brushing* with lucid wands the water's face,
> While music stealing round the glimmering deeps
> Charms the tall circle of th' enchanted steeps.
> (347-350)

However, instead of the joyfulness of the morning (childhood), the gloom and stillness of the night pervade the scene:

> Mid the dark steeps *repose* the *shadowy* streams,
> As touch'd with dawning moonlight's *hoary* gleams;
> Long streaks of fairy light the wave illume
> With bordering lines of intervening *gloom*
> (339-342)

The words 'repose,' 'shadowy,' 'hoary' and 'gloom' in these lines are presented as the characterizing features of the night.

Under the light of the moon, a mother swan trying to find a prey for her children is fatally wounded with the arrow of a hunter. Wordsworth's use of the image of a swan being hunted by man to symbolize man's destruction of nature and his alienation from it both in *Home at Grasmere* and *An Evening Walk* is noteworthy. With a sense of sympathy and sadness for it, the speaker presents the swan as an affectionate and human mother who does her utmost for her children even when fatally wounded:

> Fair swan! By all a mother's joy caress'd,
> Haply some wretch has ey'd, and call'd thee bless'd;
> Who faint, and beat by summer's breathless ray,
> Hath dragg'd er babes along this weary way,
> …
> With backward gaze, lock'd joints, and step of pain,
> Her seat scarce left, she strives, alas! In vain
> To teach their limbs along the burning road
> A few short steps to totter with their load…
> (241-250)

Under "the Moon's fix'd gaze between the opening trees" (262), in the "interlunar cave of the tomb" (268), the speaker says, "I see her [the swan] now, deny'd to lay her head" (257). "Death, as she turns her neck the kiss to seek, / Breaks off the dreadful kiss with angry shriek (287-8) … Press the sad kiss, fond mother!" The metaphorization of night as 'the cave of the tomb' indicates the speaker's employment of the mytheme of night as death. Besides, the swan's denial to 'lay her head' and die may be taken as a symbol of nature's effort to survive man's destruction. The personification of the moon and the presentation of the swan with human characteristics are examples of how the poetic imagination of the speaker transforms the world of objects and animals into human beings.

As in Frye's theory, the movement of the heavenly bodies and the four periods of the day represent in Wordsworth's poem the periods in human life. In this regard, as can be understood from the speaker's statement that the poem is about "the ev'ning of a poet's life," the setting of the sun and the appearance of the

moon seem to symbolize the 'dusk' or 'autumn' of life in the poem. Also, the rising and setting of the sun and the appearance of the moon symbolize for Wordsworth the voyage of the imagination from its birthplace to its destination. In the first of the *Essays on Epitaphs* Wordsworth states,

> A voyage towards the east, the birth-place in our imagination of the morning, leads finally to the quarter where the Sun is last seen when he departs from our eyes; so, the contemplative Soul, traveling in the direction of mortality, advances to the Country of everlasting life. (qtd. in De Man, "Time and Hisory" 64)

In this respect, the movement of the sun also seems to represent the voyage of the poet' imagination towards its setting.

Towards the end of the poem 'the wakeful bird' pours 'her solemn strains' and heralds the beginning of a new day. As in Frazer's theory, the sun is reborn in the east. However, this rebirth is also a warning for the aged god or man to leave his place to his successor. Thus, the rebirth of the sun does not signal a new beginning for the speaker in *An Evening Walk*. As can be understood from the "solemn strains" of the "wakeful bird," this day cannot be like the previous one (that in childhood) because, to put it in the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclites' words, no one can step in the same river twice. It is impossible for the speaker to re-experience his youthful days in his mature age. The speaker states,

> No purple prospects now the mind employ,
> Glowing in golden sunset tints of joy,
> But o'er the sooth'd accordant heart we feel
> A sympathetic twilight slowly steal,
> And ever, as we fondly muse, we find
> The soft gloom deep'ning on the tranquil mind.
> (379-384)

Time can not be reversed for the speaker and thus although a new day begins in nature, he still experiences evening.

In Keats's "To Autumn" (1819), the evening of human life is this time represented by poetic imagination with autumn. However, unlike *An Evening Walk* the mythologization of nature in "To Autumn" is so intense that the referent disappears in the world of myth. "To Autumn" follows the ritual-mythical tradition of paying homage to a particular goddess, which is the deified season of Autumn in this context. In this regard, the mythical core of the poem becomes apparent when it is observed that the poetic imagination of the speaker-poet mythologizes and metaphorizes natural phenomena by imbuing them with divine and animate features. The act of mythologizing and metaphorizing begins from the first lines with the presentation of two natural phenomena as divine powers: Autumn and the Sun. In the first stanza, the speaker addresses Autumn, describing its abundance and 'her' intimacy with "the maturing sun," "conspiring with *him*"

> …to load and bless
> With fruits the vines that round the thatch-eves run;
> To bend with apples the mossed cottage-trees,
> And to fill all fruit with ripeness to the core;
> To swell the gourd, and plump the hazel shells
> With a sweet kernel
>
> (2-8)

When taken in Frye and Frazer's terms, the word "maturing sun" signals that the sun-god is approaching the end of his journey in the sky, just as Autumn signalizes the year's movement towards its end. However, although the "maturing sun" and Autumn symbolize the approaching end, they also symbolize maturity and full ripeness on earth.

In *Starlit Dome* (1941) Wilson Knight points out that Wordsworth aims at a "fusion of mind with nature to create the living paradise," to which Shelley and Keats "bear stronger immediate witness" than Wordsworth (qtd. in Wellek 127). Validating Knight's argument, with the fusion of mind and nature a living paradise is created in "To Autumn," in which the earth is made pregnant with all kinds of ripened fruit and vegetation, and the living creatures in nature make much of their

time among this fertility without heeding to work, for "[s]ummer has o'er-brimmed their clammy shells" (11).

In "Ode to Autumn" autumn is presented as a mother-goddess equivalent to Wordsworth's mythologization of nature (Frye, "The Drunken Boat" 21). As can be observed, Autumn is mythologized as a female figure, whose marriage or cooperation with the male-Sun has caused fertility on earth. This becomes more apparent in the second stanza, in which the poetic imagination of the speaker mythologizes Autumn as a female goddess in the human form, often seen sitting on the granary floor, her hair "soft-lifted" by the "winnowing wind," or "on a half-reaped furrow sound asleep, /Drowsed with the fume of poppies" (15-17). She is sometimes seen with "laden head" crossing a brook or by a cider-press, watching "the last oozings hours by hours" (20-22). In his canonical essay "The Structure of Romantic Nature Imagery" W. K. Wimsatt states that this stanza of the poem, where "the very seasonal spirit is conjured into reality" indicates how in the poem—as characterizing Romantic poetry in general and Wordsworth's naturalism in particular—"an animate, plastic Nature, not transcending but immanent in and breathing through all things" is represented (30). Wimsatt's idea here about the mythologizing of the season is in total accordance with the general argument of this thesis and the analysis of the poem but one point that seems to be overlooked by Wimsatt is that Keats carries Wordsworth's naturalism one step further in "To Autumn." While the mythical aspect of Wordsworth's poetry oscillates between naturalism and Greek and Miltonic mythologies, Keats's poem is totally mythological and its reliance on the Greek and Roman mythological traditions seems to be much more obvious because certain mythical figures associated with these traditions appear in the poem. The most important one is the mythologization of Autumn in the second stanza as a corn goddess, who is Ceres in Roman mythology and Demeter in Greek mythology (Graves 89). Similar to the representation of Nature in Wordsworth's poetry, Ceres is the goddess of both fertility and motherly love. On this basis, Autumn's interaction with the male-Sun to fecund earth in the first stanza can be related to the interaction between the

female-Nature and male-Sun to vitalize the beings on earth in Wordsworth's poetry.

In *The Hoodwinking of Madeline*, Stillinger argues that Keats' odes as a group may be read "as an investigation of the imagination's ability to cope with time and change" (104). The third stanza of the poem affirms this idea. Reminiscent of Frye and Frazer's ideas of seasonal cycles, the third stanza begins with "Where are the songs of Spring? Aye, where are they? Think not of them, thou hast thy music too," (23-24). However, a sense of sadness and loss permeates the following lines: the "barred clouds" in the sky that "bloom the soft dying day" (25); "in a wailful choir the small gnats mourn/ Among the river sallows" (28-9); "full-grown lambs loud bleat from hilly bourne" (30), "[h]edge-crickets sing" (31), and "gathering swallows twitter in the skies" (33). Thus, the music of Autumn presented in this stanza is redolent of the sense of loss, sadness and death; "the rosy bloom of springtime youth" is replaced now with "the fleeting beauty of sunset," whose premise is "that of transience, or the feel of winter, and the rest of the stanza approaches that cold threshold" (Creaser 119, 49).

While the poetic imagination of the speaker mythologizes Autumn as a season of transience, loss and death, it employs mythical elements corresponding to this theme and represents the concept of causality in mythical thinking. As will be remembered from the previous chapter, Cassirer thinks that mythical imagination "has a free selection of causes; everything can come from anything, because anything can stand in temporal and spatial contact with anything" (*The Philosophy: Mythical Thought* 46). He exemplifies his idea suggesting that animals which appear in a certain season are commonly looked upon as the cause of this season. And for this idea he gives swallows as example; he states that in the mythical view swallows are seen as the makers of summer and thus their migration is taken by mythical imagination to symbolize the end of summer and the beginning of winter. When taken from this stand, the migrating swallows can be seen to contribute to the mythologization of Autumn as the end of the year. Not only the swallows but also the mourning of the gnats, the singing of the hedge-

crickets and the bleating of the full-grown lambs, all the living beings on earth seem to lament the approaching end of the year.

Thus, all nature seems to be lamenting the passing year, and in the midst of the fecundity on earth a sense of death prevails in the scene.

In Shelley's "Autumn: A Dirge,"[16] which can be regarded as a twin poem to Keats's "Ode to Autumn," autumn is, as the title suggests, directly associated with death. The speaker represents autumn as the death of the year and throughout the poem he uses words that strongly connote death. The idea of death is presented from the very beginning of the poem:

> The warm sun is failing, the bleak wind is wailing,
> The bare boughs are sighing, the pale flowers are dying,
> And the Year
> On the earth her death-bed, in a shroud of leaves dead,
> Is lying.
> (1-5)

The speaker's metaphorization of the sun as "failing" and the wind as "bleak" and "wailing" evoke in the reader a sense of death and contribute to the theme of "a dirge" in the poem. The wind is singing its own hymn of lamentation by "wailing" and the boughs join the wind in its mournful song with "sighing." It is also notable that unlike those in Keats's "To Autumn," the boughs here are "bare" and the flowers are "pale." In the second stanza, it is said that other natural beings also respond to the "wailing" of nature for the death of the year:

> The chill rain is falling, the nipped worm is crawling,
> The rivers are swelling, the thunder is knelling
> For the Year
> (12-4)

The mention of a worm "crawling" also contributes to the theme of death because worms are associated with eating away dead things and turning them into dust.

[16] Published by Mary Shelley, *Posthumous Poems*, 1824.

Besides, the “swelling” rivers, the “falling” chill rain and the “knelling” thunder all represent the end of summer and the coming of winter.

As in Keats’s “To Autumn,” some animals are mythologized by the speaker’s poetic imagination to represent the death of the year and the coming of winter. The speaker says: “The blithe swallows are flown, and the lizards each gone /To his dwelling” (15-6). The fact that mythical thinking poses the migration of “swallows” both in Keats’s and Shelley’s poems to symbolize the end of summer and the coming of winter illustrates how Romantic poets worked on common mythical elements.

The speaker’s iconic imagination incarnates natural phenomena to such an extent that every being in nature joins in the mourning for the death of the year. Not only objects of nature but also the Months join in the funeral. The speaker calls the Months, “from November to May” (7), to stand in their “saddest array” (8) so as to follow “the bier /Of the dead cold Year,” “like dim shadows watch by her sepulcher” (9-11), and “make her grave green with tear on tear” (22).

As can be seen, like Keats’s “Ode to Autumn,” in Shelley’s poem the mythical imagination of the speaker represents Autumn by employing the mythemes pointed out by Frazer and Frye. The season is mythologized in Frye and Frazer’s terms to represent death or the death of a god and a goddess, which are the sun and the goddess of corn in this context that disappear in winter and reborn in spring. The speaker’s mentioning of the spring in the beginning of the third stanza in Keats’s poem signals that spring is associated with the rebirth of the sun and thus with youth, whereas autumn with sunset and old age.

In Shelley’s short poem “The Waning Moon” (1824) this time the moon is directly associated with death:

> And like a dying lady, lean and pale,
> Who totters forth, wrapped in a gauzy veil,
> Out of her chamber, led by the insane
> And feeble wanderings of her fading brain,
> She arose up in the murky East,
> A white and shapeless mass-

(1-5)

In this poem, like the moon in *An Evening Walk* the moon is mythologized as a female figure. However, unlike that in Wordsworth's poem, it is not a lively figure, an eye whose light dominates the whole night. She is "a dying lady, lean and pale;" instead of welcoming the night with liveliness, she "totters forth…out of her chamber" and "arose up in the murky East." Representing the East, which is the symbol of beginnings, as "murky" indicates how the major Romantic poets differ from each other in the way they mythologize objects of phenomena.

3.3 Nature Beautified or Beauty Naturalized

3.3.1 Mythologization of Nature for Self-Transcendence

In *A Defence of Poetry* Shelley states, "Poetry lifts the veil from the hidden beauty of the world, and makes familiar objects be as if they were not familiar; it reproduces all that it represents," and creates impersonations "clothed in Elysian light" (328); "it transmutes all that it touches, and every form moving within the radiance of its presence is changed by wondrous sympathy to an incarnation of the spirit of which it breathes" (338). The act of defamiliarizing the familiar: this is what the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination does in Shelley's, Keats's and Wordsworth's poetry. However, it sometimes defamiliarizes for self-transcendence, by creating a transcendental and immortal being that can rescue the poet-speaker from the bounds of mortality and transience. In Shelley's "To A Skylark" (1820) a skylark is mythologized as a transcendental being that can cause self-transcendence in the poet with the immortal and artistic qualities of its song. Just like the other poems handled in this study, the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination of the speaker is at work in setting a resemblance between unresembling beings. In "To A Skylark" the poetic imagination of the speaker 'constructs' this time a skylark as a spiritual and transcendental being. Like "Mont Blanc," "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty," "Ode to Autumn" and "Ode to

the West Wind," "To a Skylark," too, opens with an address to a deified object of perception:

> Hail to thee, blithe Spirit!
> Bird thou never wert,
> That from Heaven, or near it,
> Pourest thy full heart
> In profuse strains of unpremeditated
> art.
> (1-5)

Like "Mont Blanc," "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty," "Ode to Autumn" and "Ode to the West Wind," the object of perception is addressed with such second person pronominal usages as 'thou,' 'thee' and so on. The act of mythologization and metaphorization continues in the following parts of the poem with the constant use of simile (from the second to the eleventh stanzas) that transfer the object of perception to the alien world of myth. The speaker says that the skylark "springest" from the earth "*like* a cloud of fire" (7-8)[17]; it floats and runs "*like* an unbodied joy whose race is /just begun" (14-5); "*Like* a star of Heaven, it is heard but unseen "in the broad daylight" (16-20); "All the earth and air" is "loud" with its voice, "*As*, when night is bare, /From one lonely cloud /The moon rains out her beams, and /Heaven is overflowed" (25-30); from "rainbow clouds" flow not "drops so bright to see" "*as* from [its] presence showers a rain of /melody"(32-5); it is "*like* a Poet hidden /In the light of thought /Singing hymns unbidden" (36-8), "*like* a high-born maiden /In a palace-tower, /Soothing her love-laden /Soul in secret hour /With music sweet as love, which overflows her bower" (41-5); it is "*like* a glow-worm golden /In a dell of dew, /Scattering unbeholden /Its aërial hue /Among the flowers and grass, which /Screen it from the view!"(46-50), "*like* a rose embowered /In its own green leaves, /By warm winds deflowered /Till the scent it gives /Makes faint with too much sweet those /heavy-wingéd thieves" (51-5).

[17] Italics are mine

Thus, the speaker mythologizes the skylark as a transcendental being veiled from sight but whose music dips all beings of nature with unlimited joy, "soothes" the love-laden soul of maidens and scatters its "aërial hue" among the beauties of nature. He imagines the bird as a poet "hidden /In the light of thought, /Singing hymn unbidden." The music of the bird surpasses "all that ever was joyous, and clear, and fresh" (58-60). The song of the bird, like the bird itself, is also divine. The speaker says that he has never heard before "a praise of love or wine /That panted forth a flood of rupture so divine" (63-5). The referent of the object of perception becomes dimmer when the sign-generating imagination of the speaker mythologizes the bird as an immortal being not affected by the suffering and pathos in the human world. With its "clear joyance /Languor cannot be" (76-7); "shadow of annoyance" (78) never come near it, and it loves without knowing "love's sad satiety" (80).

The speaker wants to learn from the bird the reason of its happiness, the objects that "are the fountain of [its] happy strain" (71-2). He says: "Teach us, Sprite or Bird, /What sweet thoughts are thine" (61-2); he wants to learn from it happiness, what is absent in the transient world. For the speaker, in the transient world "We look before and after /And pine for what is not;" even "our sincerest laughter" is fraught "with some pain" and "our sweetest songs are those that tell /of saddest thought" (86-90). Reminiscent of the educational aspect of nature in Wordsworth's *The Pedlar*, the bird, the speaker says, can teach the poet better than books because it is a "scorner of the ground" (100), not tainted with the trivialities of the mortal world. Only by getting united with the transphenomenal realm of the bird and achieving its joyous music can the speaker free himself of the suffering of the human world and, as a poet, make his own music be heard by mankind as he hears that of the bird. Thus, he ends the poem with the following request from the bird:

Teach me half the gladness
  That thy brain must know,
Such harmonious madness

From my lips would flow
The world should listen then – as I am listening now.
(101-5)

In *A Defence of Poetry* Shelley states, "A Poet is a nightingale, who sits in darkness and sings to cheer its own solitude with sweet sounds; his auditors are as men entranced by the melody of an unseen musician, who feel that they are moved and softened, yet know not whence or why" ("A Defence" 327). This is how the skylark and its 'auditor' are represented in "To A Skylark." However, this quotation seems to be more applicable to Keats's "Ode to a Nightingale" (1819), which is regarded as a twin poem to Shelley's "To A Skylark." In "Ode to a Nightingale" this time a nightingale is represented as the transcendental and immortalizing power of art in contrast to the transience of human life. What distinguishes Keats's poem from "To a Skylark" is that in "Ode to a Nightingale" stillness, stability, sleep and the sense of loss pervade the whole atmosphere of the poem.

"Ode to a Nightingale" opens in quite Keatsian manner:

My heart aches, and a drowsy numbness pains
My sense, as though of hemlock I had drunk,
Or emptied some dull opiate to the drains
One minutes past, and Lethe[18]-wards had sunk.
(1-4)

The speaker is intoxicated with the song of a nightingale, which he mythologizes in the first stanza as the "light-wingéd Dryad[19] of the trees, who "[in] some melodious plot /Of beechen green, and shadows numberless, /Singest of summer in full-throated ease" (7-10).

Mythologizing his 'drowsy numbness,' the speaker longs for the oblivion of alcohol, for "a draught of vintage"(11) "[t]asting of Flora[20]"(13), or "a beaker of

[18] The river of forgetfulness
[19] Wood nymph
[20] Roman goddess of fertility

the warm South, /Full of the true, the blushful Hippocrene[21],/ With beaded bubbles winking at the brim" (15-17). Similar to Wordsworth's *Home at Grasmere*, in this poem, too, the mythological river of forgetfulness is used to represent the speaker's desire for self-forgetfulness. However, unlike *Home at Grasmere*, the river is directly named as Lethe, the river of forgetfulness in Greek mythology. To elaborate further on Nietzsche's idea of self-forgetfulness that has been mentioned in the study of *Home at Grasmere*, the speaker's desire to forget with wine or the intoxicating power of the nightingale's song brings to mind Nietzsche's idea of Dionysian state, an idea that Nietzsche proposed about a century later than Keats' poem. In "The Birth of Tragedy" Nietzsche discriminates between two dualities in poetic imagination: the Apollonian and Dionysian, the former representing the art world of dreams and the latter the art world of intoxication. For Nietzsche, the Apollonian finds expression best in sculpture, whereas the Dionysian in music. Nietzsche states that the "joyous necessity of the dream experience has been embodied by the Greeks by their Apollo," who is "the god of all plastic energies" and "the soothsaying god;" he is also "ruler over the beautiful illusion of the inner world of fantasy." However, the most important aspect of the image of Apollo is that "delicate boundary which the dream image must not overstep lest it have a pathological effect." In this regard, Apollo represents "a measured restraint, that freedom from the wilder emotions, that calm of the sculptor god" (Nietzsche 15). In contrast, the Dionysian nature is proposed with the analogy of intoxication and represents "the blissful ecstasy that swells from the innermost depths of man" and takes place when the Apollonian nature collapses. Nietzsche argues,

> Both under the influence of the narcotic draught, of which the songs of all primitive men and peoples speak, or with the potent coming of spring that penetrates all nature with joy, these Dionysian emotions awake, and as they grow in intensity, everything subjective vanishes into complete self-forgetfulness (16).

[21] Fountain of the Muses on Mount Helicon

When handled in terms of Nietzsche's definition of the Dionysian nature, it can be seen that the music of the Nightingale draws the speaker to a Dionysian nature, to the ecstasy of intoxication (intoxicating music being another factor that represents in the poem a parallelism to Nietzsche's definition of the Dionysian nature), so that he delves 'Lethe-wards' into self-forgetfulness.

With the 'Dionysian' effect of the wine, he wishes to free himself from the bounds of human life, that is, mortality and transience, and get lost in the immortal world of the nightingale; he wants to fade away, dissolve, and forget what the nightingale has never known:

> The weariness, the fever, and the fret
> Here, where men sit and hear each other groan;
> Where palsy shakes a few, sad, last grey hairs,
> Where youth grows pale, and spectre-thin, and dies;
> (23-26)

The desire for self-transcendence, that is, 'fade away' and 'dissolve' to get 'lost' in the intransient and immortal world of the nightingale "is the basis of Keats's death-wish" (Dickstein 35). This desire for death and 'dissolution' becomes more apparent in the sixth stanza, where the ecstatic music of the nightingale encourages the speaker to embrace the idea of dying while enraptured by the nightingale's music. Death begins to be "the only road by which [the speaker] can make his last attempt to join the nightingale" (Dickstein 34). Listening in the dark to the nightingale, he says that he has often been "half in love" with "easeful Death" (52) and called Death soft names "in many a mused rhyme,/ To take into the air [his] quite breath" (53-4). He says that now "more than ever seems it rich to die,/To cease upon the midnight with no pain," while the nightingale pours its soul ecstatically.

In the otherworld of the nightingale "tender is the night" and "haply the Queen-Moon is on her throne,/Clustered around by all her starry Fays" (36-7), in which lines the phenomenal moon is mythologized as a queen sitting on her

throne. Because of the light of the Moon in the "embalmed darkness," one can sense

> …each sweet
> Wherewith the seasonable month endows
> The grass, the thicket, and the fruit-tree wild;
> White hawthorn, and the pastoral eglantine
> (44-6)

Unlike the night represented by the nightingale, "there is no light here [in the human world]" (38), and the speaker cannot see the flowers in the glade.

In the objective world, the speaker says, "Beauty cannot keep her lustrous eyes" (29). Thus, elaborating on the idea of beauty that is handled in "Ode on a Grecian Urn" and the Hyperion poems in more detail, the speaker substitutes art for wine for the 'Dionysian' effect and tells that he will fly to the nightingale, not through alcohol—"Not charioted by Bacchus and his pards" (32)—but with the "viewless wings of poesy" (33), that is, with a kind of beauty equivalent to that represented by the nightingale.

In *Imagination and Myth in John Keats's Poetry*, Brotemarkle claims that in "Ode to a Nightingale" Keats presents the relationship between Beauty and Imagination. The bird is "a natural symbol, but also a mythological figure: a 'light-winged Dryad of the trees.' As Psyche was both goddess and dove, the nightingale, too, adopts mythology and Nature in its identity. Keats's purpose was to represent beauty as 'the material sublime,' and consider it manifest in Nature-transformed-to-Art" (120). In the seventh stanza, the mythopoeic imagination of the speaker places the nightingale further and further out of the realm of ordinary life and mythologizes it as an "immortal Bird" (61), which can be achieved only through Beauty/art. As H. Fry states, "in the Nightingale Ode, the bird had become an art object when it was transformed into an 'immortal bird' (84). As Harold Bloom says, with its representation of the nightingale paradoxically both as the death-wish of the speaker and the immortality of art, "'Ode to a Nightingale' [becomes] the first poem to know and declare, wholeheartedly, that death is the mother of

beauty" (In Dickstein 38). Unlike the mortal and transient world of the speaker, "[no] hungry generations tread down" (62) on the transphenomenal world of the nightingale. Because it becomes an immortal and non-aging art object—like the Grecian Urn that will be handled in the following part of this study—this self-same song of the bird was also heard in ancient days by both emperor and clown; even, it "found a path/Through the sad heart of Ruth[22], when, sick for home, /She stood in tears amid the alien corn" (65-7).

In the last stanza, "it seems as if the speaker is involuntarily falling out of an enchanted space" (Parker 108). As the bird flies away, he is left 'forlorn' by it and, as if being awakened from an enchanted dream, he returns to his "sole self" (72). As Stillinger puts it, "'Forlorn' brings the speaker back to his 'sole self,' and back to earth, and visionary wings are traded for something more substantial" (141). L. Waldof argues that "Keats came to recognize the impossibility of a permanent union, or even of an imaginary one, with a symbol of permanence like the Urn [in "Ode on a Grecian Urn], and to accept final separations as an inherent part of human experience" (201). The same can be said for the nightingale, which represents permanence for the speaker and which the speaker inevitably parts from. When he returns to the real world, he laments that his imagination has failed him; he says: "Adieu! The fancy cannot cheat so well /As she famed to do, deceiving elf" (73-4). In the words of J. Beer, this indicates "a recognition that the sense of dual identity conjured by the nightingale's song [the desire for being both in the otherworld represented by the nightingale and the objective one] is extremely fragile" (67). When the "plaintive anthem" of the bird fades away, the intensity of the speaker's experience has left him shaken, as if awakened from a dream in which, speaking in terms of Freud and Nietzsche's ideas, the desire for death-wish and complete self-forgetfulness in his deep unconscious have taken over him. In the end, he is unable to remember whether he is awake or aslee However, yet "a note of nostalgia creeps in, a yearning after the fading nightingale's song" (Ibid):

[22] The young widow in the Biblical Book of Ruth; but, the footnote to the name in *Anthology of English Literature* says, Keats's vision has more in common with Wordsworth's "The Solitary Reaper."

Was it a vision, or a waking dream?
Fled is that music: — Do I wake or sleep?
(79-89)

3.3.2 Immobility as Alternative to Transience: The Immortalizing Function of Art

If the "Ode to a Nightingale" portrays its speaker's engagement with the fluid expressiveness of music, the “Ode on a Grecian Urn” (1819) portrays his attempt to engage with the static immobility of sculpture. As H. Fry states, “‘Grecian Urn takes up and continues the subject that was uncovered in ‘Nightingale’: the dialectical debate between death sublimated in art (immortality achieved through imaginative power) and living in the world with death (presence to Being achieved through the genius of camouflage)” (81). In “Ode on a Grecian Urn” the idea of immortality and permanence is represented this time, not with the mythologization of a living bird as in “Ode to a Nightingale,” but with the mythologization of an artifact, a Grecian urn. Being an artistic creation, the Grecian urn provides Keats with the opportunity to deal more directly with the ideas of Beauty, immortality, permanence and statuesque stability, which he also elaborates on in the Hyperion poems and, to a certain extent, in “Ode to a Nightingale.” In other words, “as symbol of artworks in general, and the classic style in particular, the art becomes an appropriate object for marking one quality that is common to almost all the arts: frozen time” (Brotemarkle 59).

In the first stanza, what attracts the speaker about the ancient Grecian urn is apparent from the very beginning of the poem:

Thou still unravished bride of quietness,
Thou foster-child of silence and slow time,
(1-2)

Although the speaker characterizes the urn as ‘still,’ ‘silent’ and ‘slow in time,’ its death is metaphorical, an oblivion. Since the urn’s “significance lies in its

embodiment of the imagination" (Brotemarkle 61), its oblivion makes it—paradoxically—an immortal, non-aging and frozen as well as a life and meaning-generating artifact. This paradoxical character of the urn can be seen in the following lines. As the speaker of "Ode to a Nightingale" describes the nightingale's song, the speaker of "Ode on a Grecian Urn" likens the urn to "[s]ylvan historian" who can tell the story of many events in history. Although the historical events depicted on the urn remained in the past, they continue to live in the statuesque beauty of the urn.

In the second stanza, the speaker looks at a picture on the urn, this time of a young man playing a pipe, lying with his lover beneath a glade of trees. The speaker says that the piper's "unheard" melodies are "more endeared" for the spirit than mortal melodies, which are "to the sensuous ear" (11-12). Besides, the young man can never leave his song, and "nor ever can those trees be bare" (16). He tells the youth that, though he can never kiss his lover because he is frozen in time, he should not grieve, because her beauty will never fade.

In the third stanza, the speaker looks at the trees surrounding the lovers and feels happy for their stability. And, unlike the transience and sense of loss represented with the autumn in "Ode to Autumn," the nature depicted in the artifact is not transient:

> Ah, happy, happy boughs! that cannot shed
> Your leaves, nor ever bid the Spring adieu!
> (21-2)

The "happy melodist," the lover depicted on the urn, "unwearied" will pipe "songs forever new" (23-4). Thus, the figures on the Grecian urn represent for the speaker an ever-continuing youth and non-diminishing beauty. And the love represented in the artifact will remain "[f]orever warm and still to be enjoyed, /Forever panting, and forever young" (26-7).

In the fourth stanza, the speaker examines another picture on the urn, one displaying this time a group of villagers leading a heifer to be sacrificed. He wonders where they are going: "To what green altar, O mysterious priest..." (32).

He imagines their little town, empty of all its citizens due to the sacrificial ceremony, and tells it that its streets will "for evermore" be silent, for those who have left it, frozen on the urn, will never return. He states,

> What little town by river or sea shore,
> Or mountain-built with peaceful citadel,
> Is emptied of this folk, this pious morn?
> And, little town, thy streets for evermore
> Will silent be; and not a soul to tell
> Why thou art desolate, can e'er return.
> (35-40)

In *Keats and Hellenism* M. Aske argues that "the text's rhetoric [tends] to violate the urn's silent alterity. Overburdened by the importunate discursiveness of language, the urn is in danger of being effaced…overrepresentation threatens fracture and fragmentation" (118). In other words, "the poet strives to redeem the urn according to the language of sensuous life: 'For ever warm and still to be enjoy'd,/ For ever panting, and for ever young.' But these overtly 'human' terms serve merely to divert us briefly away from the essential inhumanity of the urn's figure" (118-9). To re-express this point with the terminology of this study, the poetic imagination of the speaker endows the 'silent' and 'still' figures on the urn with flesh and blood by way of metaphorizing and mythologizing. However, the imagination's imposing life on the silent forms of the urn creates an intriguing paradox for these forms: They are free from time, but they are simultaneously frozen in time. They do not have to confront aging and death (their love is "for ever young"), but neither can they have experience (the youth can never kiss the maiden; the figures in the sacrificial ceremony can never return to their homes). Besides, speaking in terms of Riceour's idea of double-reference, they represent both a chronological (historical and temporal) and a configurational dimension (spatial, atemporal and timeless, which in Keats's terms, are aspects of Beauty). Taken on this ground, the mythologizing and metaphorizing act of the poetic imagination seems to be at work not only in the perception of the urn (which the

speaker of the poem does) but also in its creation (which the ancient artist did) because, applying Riceour's idea, both are metaphorical acts of the imagination and both 'construct' an image consisting of double-reference.

The double-reference of the figures depicted on the urn makes the speaker think about them as though they *were* experiencing human time; for instance, he imagines that the figures' procession in the fourth stanza has an origin (the "little town") and a destination (the "green altar"). However, all he can think is that the town will forever be deserted: If these people have left their origin, they will never return to it. In this sense, he confronts the limits of static art; it is impossible for the speaker to learn from the urn either the whos and wheres of the "real story" of the historical events in the first stanza, or the origin and the destination of the figures on the urn in the fourth.

However, in the final stanza the speaker addresses the urn not as a living entity but as artifact (as "Attic shape," "overwrought" with "brede" of "marble," "silent form," and "Cold Pastoral") and presents the enigmatic lesson of the urn as "Beauty is truth, truth beauty," –a motto which also exists and is elaborated on in the Hyperion poems, *Endymion* and "Ode to a Nightingale." With this shift, it becomes clear that the values of the urn "lie in its character as a work of art, not in its being a possible substitute for life in the actual world" (Stillinger 109). It is because of its character as a work of art or Beauty that the Grecian urn is "a figure of power that immortalizes the dead, like the abstracted nightingale" (Fry, "Voices" 84).

"In looking at objects of nature," says Coleridge in the Notebooks, "I seem rather to be seeking, as it were asking for, a symbolical language for something within me that already and forever exists" (Frye, "The Drunken Boat" 10-1). This is what happens in the poems studied above. When looking at objects of perception, the subjects of the poems—with their imagination's 'work of resemblance'—see a symbolical language in which these objects acquire spiritual, human and sometimes divine character. In other words, to use the terminology

employed in this study, they metaphorize and mythologize as they look at nature. Metaphorization and mythologization are presented as inherent aspects of perception and poetic imagination in the poems of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats that are analyzed above. They are aspects through which poetic imagination defamiliarizes what is actually familiar by transforming objects of perception into the alien world of myth.

However, although in all the poems studied above imagination or mind appears as a formative power that constructs and re-creates via myth and metaphor in the act of perception, it is seen that the way it constructs and re-creates and the mythemes employed in the act of mythologization differ from one poet to another or even from one poem to the other. In Wordsworth's *The Pedlar*, *The Two-Part Prelude*, *Home at Grasmere*, and "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" nature is most of the time mythologized as a mother figure that plays a critical role in the growth of poetic imagination. In these poems childhood or primitive life is glorified as the sole phase in human life in which man is completely united with nature and metaphorization and mythologization are the characterizing aspects of perception. The loss of childhood experience and primitive feelings with the emergence of civilized life, for some of these poems, does not only mean a separation or alienation from the mother-nature but also the loss of figuration. On the other hand, in Wordsworth's *An Evening Walk*, Keats' "To Autumn" and Shelley's "Autumn: A Dirge" and "The Waning Moon," in a way verifying Frye and Frazer's ideas, phases of the day and the year are made by the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination to symbolize phases of human life. In Shelley's "To a Skylark" and Keats' "Ode to a Nightingale" birds are mythologized as immortal and transcendental beings that can save the poet from the world of mortality and transience. Likewise, in Keats's "A Grecian Urn" an art object is mythologized to represent the immortalizing function of the stability in art. Thus, the idea represented in these poems is that metaphor and myth are indispensable aspects of perception and imagination.

Besides, from *Home at Grasmere* on, it is seen that through direct references to ancient Greek, Roman, Miltonic and Spenserian mythologies the referent—using Saussure's terminology—begins gradually to be lost in the signifying (myth-generating) process. To put it in Riceour's idea of double-reference, self-reference begins to replace the double reference of the first poems studied in this chapter. For instance, the mountain in "Mont Blanc," the west wind in "Ode to the West Wind," autumn in Keats' and Shelley's autumn poems, the nightingale in "Ode to a Nightingale," the skylark in "To a Skylark" and the sun and moon figures in most of the poems objects of nature are defamiliarized and transformed by the mythical imagination to the extent that the referent, that is, the real object is absorbed in the myth-making process.

The metaphorizing and mythologizing act of animating natural phenomena is realized in these poems to the extent that figures belonging to Greek and Roman mythology or allegorical figures existing in medieval literature are made immanent characteristics of objects of nature. This indicates, as implied in Keats' "I Stood Tip-toe Upon a Hill," that the origin of Greek and Roman mythology as well as all world mythologies should be sought in poetic imagination and its perception of nature, not elsewhere.

CHAPTER IV

ROMANTIC MYTHOGRAPHY IN THE POETRY OF SHELLEY AND KEATS

As seen in the previous chapter, mythopoeia is an indispensable aspect of the poems of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. Myth-making in these poems becomes the poetic imagination's act of animating and re-creating natural phenomena by attributing mythical, spiritual, ideational and human features to them; as can be observed in the previous chapter, in the myth-making process the poets under consideration are also seen to make references to figures or elements from ancient mythology to indicate that myth-making, from the ancient times until now, has always been an inherent feature of perception and taken place, to use Kant's words, when imagination confronts the sublime of nature. However, the Romantic poets' interest in mythology is not limited to the creating subject's reconstruction of phenomena in the process of perception. They also wrote poems whose main concern is ancient Greek and Roman, and Medieval and Spenserian mythologies. As Wiebe puts it in *Myth as Genre in British Romantic Poetry*, when we survey Romantic poetry, there are certain works that are difficult to analyze without using the term 'myth,' such works as Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, *Adonais*, and 'The Witch of Atlas,' and Keats's *Hyperion* poems—which Wieb calls 'mythopoems' to stress their mythopoeic character (5). Nevertheless, the Romantic poets under consideration do not handle the mythical figures or elements they chose without touching them, without reshaping and re-structuring their time-valued semantic contents. Following their ancestor mythographers' tradition of

mythopoeia, they create their own mythography by reconstructing these mythical figures and elements.

The way this mythography appears in Wordsworth's poetry is shown in the previous chapter. As will be remembered from the previous chapter, Wordsworth in a way creates his own mythography by handling ancient Greek, Spenserian and Miltonic mythologies in terms of Rousseau and Herder's idea of society and man of nature, and thus by presenting childhood as connotative with the primitive phase of humanity and adulthood with the destructive effects of modern society. In this frame, he mythologizes Nature as a mother figure that nourishes the poetic imagination of the poet, as a teacher that educates the poet about the many ways of the world of man, and sometimes as a mother who is offended with her child for he is grown apart from her. To avoid repetition, Wordsworth's mythography will not be studied in this chapter because its outlines have already been drawn in the previous chapter.

The distinctive aspect of Romantic mythography can especially be seen in the poetry of Shelley and Keats. These two poets, differently from Wordsworth, in some of their poems chose their subject matter directly from ancient Greek and Roman, and Miltonic mythologies and they create their own mythographies by reconstructing these mythologies and making them be seen in a different light. In some poems, these two poets reconstruct the traditional sacred and profane categorization in mythological thinking by recreating the she-monster mythology, such as that of Lamia in ancient Greek mythology and the Witch-figure in the Medieval and Renaissance mythologies, or the Daemon concept in the Christian mythology. For example, Keats in *Lamia*, and Shelley in *The Witch of Atlas*, *The Daemon of the World* and *Prometheus Unbound* recreate the she-monster, daemon and witch myths of ancient, Christian and medieval mythologies by making profane what has always been conceived as sacred and sacred as profane. They sometimes handle ancient mythology to present their ideas of art and society. For instance, in *Hyperion* and *Endymion* Keats uses mythology to represent his ideas of art, life and beauty. Similarly, Shelley modifies the Prometheus myth in

Prometheus Unbound and the Daemon myth in *The Daemon of the World* to represent his revolutionary ideas of society, social progress and freedom of the mind. In addition, *Endymion* continues the core discussion of the previous chapter by putting forward that nature is the originator of all beauty and myth, which are concretized with intervention of the sign-generating imagination of the perceiving subject. In each of these poems, the speaker creates his own mythography by re-shaping and manipulating the semantic content of ancient Greek and Roman, Christian and medieval mythologies.

As discussed in the previous chapters, metaphor is seen to be an indispensable aspect of myth-making and imagination. To remember the ideas of Kant, Ricoeur, Cassirer and others, in these ideas it is said that metaphor is an inherent aspect of the imagination and perception. Cassirer carries this idea one step further by showing that myth-making is also a metaphorizing act and that it is an innate character of perception. Thus, when using the term myth-making, this study moves from the assumption that myth-making is a metaphorical act and that metaphor and myth are two faces of the same coin. In this regard, the study does not use the word metaphor much here because it presupposes that the word myth-making already includes this function.

The poems analyzed in this chapter, as already said in the Methodology, are not handled in chronological terms but are grouped according to their themes and the way myths are made and re-made.

4.1 Reconstruction of the Daemonic

In the earlier parts of this study, it is presented that mythical imagination, as Northrop Frye argues in *The Anatomy of Criticism*, relies on certain archetypes or "typical or recurring images" in the myth-making process. The repetition of certain images in literature such as the sea or the forest, binary oppositions such as light/dark, demonic/angelic, and so on, or the evolution of such images in literature as well as in Christian mythology as 'sheep," 'shepherd,' 'lamb,' 'flock,' 'pasture,' and so on into pastoral poetry indicate a certain unity in the imitations of

nature poetry and in the communicating activity of the archetypes. As can be derived from Frye's idea, these archetypes almost always emerge in the form of binary opposition, which, according to Levi-Strauss, is the core principle of mythological thinking. Levi-Strauss thinks that "binary oppositions – for example, high/low, hot/cold, and left/right – are the fundamental mechanism of mytho-logic" (Meletinsky 61).

Binary logic is also the core characteristic of the work of mythical imagination in Cassirer's theory of myth. Cassirer argues that when mythologizing objects of perception, mythical imagination posits them according to the binary opposition of the sacred and profane. For instance, it pictures the profane in darkness/night/winter/a dark forest full of demonic forces, whereas it pictures the sacred in light/day/spring/idyllic-pastoral scene and so on. For Cassirer, the sacred and profane are sometimes represented in myth through the division of space into such directions and zones as east, west, north, south, upward, lower, right and left, which, for Cassirer, exist almost in every culture and entered into Christianity. For example, in religious mythology as well as in the literary works employing this mythology (such as Dante's *Divine Comedy* and John Milton's *Paradise Lost*), Hell is represented in the lower part and in darkness, whereas Heaven in the upper part and in light; in Homer's *Odyssey*, Virgil's *Aeneid* and religious mythology death is represented in the lower part and life in the upper part; according to some supernatural beliefs left is identified with the profane and right with the sacred and so on.

In the poetry of Shelley and Keats, the poets create their own mythography by re-constructing the binary opposition of the sacred and profane either by recreating the profane as sacred and the sacred as profane, or by demolishing this opposition. In the three poems studied below, the poets make sacred certain mythical figures that are commonly known as profane or make them pitiful to such an extent that the reader no longer categorizes them as profane.

4.1.1 Reconstruction of the She-Monster

4.1.1.1 The Witch Unwitched: The Divine Witch of Shelley's "The Witch of Atlas"

"The Witch of Atlas"[23] is a poem in which Shelley deconstructs the daemonic and profane in traditional mythological thinking by recreating the witch concept of post-Christian Europe and medieval thinking. Reading the title of the poem, one expects to read something about a witch and witchcraft in the traditional sense. Originally, witchcraft is a pagan, pre-Christian practice of sorcery or magic. In *The Anthropology of Religion, Magic and Witchcraft*, Rebecca L. Stein and Philip L. Stein state that when anthropologists speak of witchcraft, they generally refer to people who have an innate ability to do evil. Witchcraft, they say, "was found in peasant communities in Europe from medieval to early modern times" (224). Thus, witch is a person, usually a woman, "who achieves her evil ends by some mystical [and supernatural] power in her personality (Marwick 12); as it is defined in *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary*, a witch is "a person, especially a woman, who professes or is supposed to practice magic, especially black magic or the black art." The traditional conception of witch and witchcraft came with the advent of Christianity. The first Christian fathers, thinking that the old pagan practice of magic "posed an alternative to Christian prayers" and that "it was a competing system of practice, a rival to Christian ways of copying with adversity," labeled this practice as demonic (Kieckhefer 39). In his *City of God* Augustine, one of the first Christian fathers, wrote that "all magic is worked by demons. These evil spirits first instruct people how to perform magic rituals, and how to make use of magical stones, plants, animals, and incantations; when the magicians make use of these things, the demons come and carry out the desired deeds" (38-39). Magic is invented by

[23] Composed at the baths of San Giulano, near Pisa, August 14-6, 1820, and published in *Posthumous Poems*, ed. Mary Shelley, 1824.

the Devil, he argues, to lure humanity away from Christian truth. With the teachings of the Christian fathers, witches began to be conceived as persons who contracted a pact with the Devil. Kieckhefer states that "while there is no reason to think that women alone practiced magic, both pagan and Christian writers ascribed it primarily to them" (39). Since in the biblical mythology of *Genesis* Eve is told to have been tempted by the Devil and caused the fall of Man from the Garden of Eden, in the Christian belief women were seen more liable to be tempted by the Devil and be witches. The identification of witches with women can clearly be seen in the *Canon Episcopi*, which was written in 900 AD:

> It is also not to be omitted that some unconstrained women, perverted by Satan, seduced by illusions and phantasms of demons, believe and openly profess that, in the dead of night, they ride upon certain beasts with the pagan goddess Diana, with a countless horde of women, and in the silence of the dead of the night to fly over vast tracts of country, and to obey her commands as their mistress, and to be summoned to her service on other nights. But it were well if they alone perished in their infidelity and did not draw so many others into the pit of their faithlessness.[24]

This idea of the witch prevailed throughout the middle ages and culminated in the witchcraze of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which the twentieth century playwright Arthur Miller dealt with in *The Crucible* and which itself resembled to the anti-communist craze in the McCarthy Era of post-war America. Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, which was written in the witchcraze era, opens with the gathering of three witches in thunder and lighting, scheming ill-doings against mankind in general and Macbeth in particular. The first scene ends with the well-known exclamation of the witches:

> Fair is foul, and foul is fair:
> Hover through the fog and filthy air.
> (Act I, Scene I, 11-12)

[24] This excerpt is taken from Wikipedia Free Online Encyclopedia (http//en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_witchcraft#_note-canonEpiscopi)

In the third scene they appear again to tell Macbeth that in the future he will be thane of Cowder first and King of Scotland thereafter. Kindling Macbeth's ambition to be a king, they become the main cause of the bloodshed, tragedy and destruction of the order of the universe in the play. They are, as Macbeth calls them as he nears his downfall, "secret, black, and midnight hags" who play with the fate of mankind and destroy the order of God's universe. The presentation of the witches in Macbeth represents the general conception of witch in the medieval period and after.

When read against this socio-cultural background, one expects Shelley's "The Witch of Atlas" to be about an 'old hag' using her magical and supernatural powers to do evil against mankind. However, this expectation is frustrated as soon as one begins to read the poem and sees that what is presented is not an old hag, a witch in the traditional sense, but a very beautiful goddess. The speaker calls the female figure in the poem a "lady-witch" (55) and says that "her mother was one of the Atlantides" (57); the "all beholding Sun" has never seen in his voyage over continent and seas "so fair a creature, as she lay enfolden /In the warm shadow of her loveliness" (60-1). She is a lovely lady "garmented in light /From her own beauty" (81-2); she is so beautiful that "the dim brain whirls dizzy with delight, /Picturing her form" (85-6); with her beauty "the bright world" becomes dim and "everything beside /Seemed like the fleeting image of a shade" (138-9). Her voice and eyes are so enchanting that their "magic circle" draws "all living things towards this wonder new" (88) and "imparadise" all savage natures (104). "The spotted cameleopard" (89), "the wise and fearless elephant" (90), and "the sly serpent" (91), all savage beasts become tame with her gentle looks; "every beast of beating heart" (95) grows bold to behold such beauty and drink from her "sacred fount" (94). The speaker says:

> …all things that seem untameable,
> Not to be checked and not to be confined,
> Obey the spells of Wisdom's wizard skill;
> Time, earth, and fire –the ocean and the wind,
> And all their shapes –and man's mortal will;

And other scrolls whose writings did unbind
The inmost lore of Love…
(193-9)

"Every nymph of stream and spreading tree" (121), "every shepherdess of Ocean's flocks" (122), the Olympic god Ocean himself and Priapus in his company wonder how "the enwombed rocks /Could have brought forth so beautiful a birth" (126-8).

This lady, as can be concluded from her relation to gods and nymphs, is a supernatural being who has the ability of transforming into different forms. The speaker says:

'Tis said, she first [changed] into a vapour,
And then into a cloud, such clouds as flit,
Like splendour-wingéd moths about a taper,
Round the red west when the sun dies in it;
And then into a meteor, such as caper
On hill-tops when the moon is in a fit;
Then, into one of those mysterious stars
Which hide themselves between the Earth and Mars
(65-72)

"The Mother of the Months" took this star under her protection since "in that cave a dewy splendour hidden /Took shape and motion: with the living form /Of this embodied Power, the cave grew warm" (78-80). With a wingéd boat given to her by Apollo, she travels the world, sees the beauties of nature, witnesses the happiness and sufferings of people living in different parts of the world and, with her magic, solves their problems; she "ascend[s] the labyrinths of some many-winding vale" (386), "sail[s] forth under the light of shooting stars" (420-1), and hears all that happens between the earth and the moon; "now she [grows] pale as that moon, lost in the watery night / And now she [weeps], and now she [laughs] outright" (476-80).

It is clear from these statements that what Shelley had in mind when creating his witch was not a witch in the common conception but wizard-

goddesses or female figures in ancient Greek and Roman mythology as Circe[25], Hecate[26] and Medea,[27] which—as Judith Yarnall claims in *Transformations of Circe: The History of an Enchantress*—are the ancestors of the witch and *femme fatale* figures of the medieval period and after. In the quotation given above from *Canon Episcopi*, the fact that the ancient Roman goddess Diana[28] is presented as the mother of witches indicates that the Christian ideology sought the origin of witchcraft in what can be called the wizard-goddesses or *femme fatales* of ancient Greek and Roman mythology.

However, these mythological figures were not witches; they were goddesses or semi-goddess figures who, perhaps like the Witch of Atlas, had both positive and negative aspects, and who, in some way or the other, were related to the primal feminine life force of the universe. Talking about Circe's origin,

---

[25] Circe is a goddess in Greek mythology living on the island of Aeaea. Like the Witch of Atlas who in some way is related to the Sun-god, Circe is the daughter of the Sun, Helios, one of the Titans, and the owner of the land where Odysseus' men ate cattle. She is also known as a sorcerer, seductress and temptress goddess who can predict the future and transform her enemies into animals through the use of magical wand. In Homer's *Odyssey*, she transforms Odysseus' men into pigs with her magical wand. Odysseus protects himself against her by a magical herb called *moly* which has been revealed to him by the god, Hermes (Luck 110). When her magic failed, she was so astonished that she fell in love with him and agreed to return his men to human form. For one year Odysseus and Circe were lovers. She later assisted him in his quest to reach his home.

[26] Hecate is a pre-Olympic goddess who is considered as the main goddess of magic and sorcery. She even appears in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* as the leader of the witches weaving Macbeth's fate. Today she is often seen as a goddess of witchcraft and Wicca. Although she is known as the goddess of witchcraft, she is also renowned as a mighty helper and protector of mankind. It is also told that she is the daughter of Demeter and thus she is, like him, a goddess of the earth and fertility.

[27] In Greek mythology, Medea was the daughter of King Aeëtes, granddaughter of Helios -the Sun-god- niece of Circe, and later wife to Jason. In *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Deamons of Original Origin*, David R. West writes that the sorceress Medea is constantly associated with the goddess Hecate. In the *Argonautica* of Apollonius it is told that she is the priestess of Hecate in her temple, she bewitches with drugs at the suggestion of Hecate, she has both good and destructive drugs, and they protect Jason from the heat of the fire-breathing bulls (239-40). In "Witches and Sorcerers in Classical Literature," Georg Luck states that, falling in love with Jason, the leader of the Argonauts, Medea betrayed her own people and used her magic to help the Argonauts obtain her father's Golden Fleece in return for Jason's promise to marry her. Having been abandoned by Jason and sent to exile by her father, Medea is said to have taken refuge with Aegeus, the old king of Athens, having promised him that she would use her magic to enable him to have more children. She married Aegeus and bore him a son, Medus. But Aegeus had another son, Theseus. When Theseus returned to Athens, Medea tried to trick her husband into poisoning him. She was unsuccessful, and had to flee to Athens, taking Medus with her.

[28] In Roman mythology, Diana was the Huntress goddess, associated with wild animals and woodlands. She also later became a moon goddess, supplanting Luna, and was an emblem of chastity and virginity. Her association with witches may be established in *Canon Episcopi* due to her relationship with wild animals and the wilderness of dark forests.

Yarnall states, “Originally her attributes were all-encompassing. She was both nurturer and destroyer, controlling the mysteries of birth and death … Her sexuality was thought to be connected with the fertility of animals and plants, her ebb and flow reflected in the rhythms of all living things” (26). Yarnall goes on to say: “her character in Homer’s myth possesses an abundance of both negative and positive powers, suggesting her affinity with both faces of the original life-giving, death-wielding Goddess of Paleolithic and Neolithic times.” For Yarnall, Juno, Hecate, Proserpine, Cecroprian Artemis, the Paphian Aphrodite, and the Eleusinian Mother of Corn, all these deities “flow backward like rivers to the same spring” (27). As explained in the footnotes to the wizard-mythological female figures mentioned above, all these female figures are also known as helpers. For instance, without the guidance of Circe, Odysseus would not have been able to return home safely; Hecate is also known both as helper and protector of mankind and, like Demeter, as goddess of earth and fertility; and Medea helped Jason obtain her father’s Golden Fleece and later she helps Aegeus have a son. Among these figures, Hecate’s case is of particular importance for the purpose of the study of Shelley’s poem. Hecate is known as the goddess of magic and sorcery, and after the advent of Christianity, as the mother of witches and witchcraft. However, in ancient mythology she is said to have used her power of magic most of the time for helping people. In Hesiod’s *Hymn to Hecate* in *Theogony*, which is the most important sourcebook on Hecate, one of the outstanding features of Hecate is described as helping people: “whenever any one of men on earth offers good sacrifices and prays for favour according to custom, he calls upon Hecate” (West 189). Thus, Hecate is a benevolent goddess who, as described in Hesiod’s work, sits by venerable kings in judgment, gives victory or glory when she wills, stays by horsemen and is helpful to athletes competing in games. In Homer’s *Hymn to Demeter*, it is said that when Demeter’s daughter was abducted by Pluto, it was Hecate who rescued the girl (West 191). She is also known as a mediator goddess quenching feuds among people and gods. For this reason, she is sometimes called a goddess of the crossroads.

In mythology, such female mythological figures as Circe and Medea –who are said to have had some tragic love relationship with certain male figures are, most of the time, not victimizers but victimized[29]. They seem to have used magic and sorcery to take revenge against their victimizers, who are men or, speaking in more socio-historical terms, the emerging patriarchies of the time. For Circe's transforming Odysseus' men into pigs, Luck states, "It is not clear why she wants to change Odysseus and his companions into swine; perhaps, because she has a very low opinion of men" (110). Yarnall goes one step further and claims that the male and female hostility with which the Circe myth begins represents "the social tension that prevailed when the power of women began to be repressed by emerging patriarchies" (51). With the advent of Christianity, it can be argued, this power struggle ended and the reign of patriarchy was complete. The first work of Christianity, as has already been suggested at the beginning of this part, was to fight against the feminine-biased culture of the ancient pagan world and to make man's dominion over this culture stronger by labeling ancient wizard-goddesses as mothers of witches and witchcraft and by totally overshadowing their positive aspects. This act of labeling is clearly seen in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, where Hecate appears in Act IV, Scene I, not with her positive aspects but as the leader of the witches who weave Macbeth's ill-fate.

In "The Witch of Atlas" the mythopoeic imagination of the speaker seems to reconstruct the witch myth that prevailed in Europe after the advent of Christianity and that culminated in the witchcraze of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by re-situating his witch in her time-valued position among the wizard-goddesses of the ancient Greek and Roman mythology. Since these goddesses were not called witches in the ancient world and the word witch was attributed to such female figures after the introduction of Christianity, Shelley's use of this word to name his wizard-goddess, whether intentional or not, points to the primal

[29] Hecate is left out here because any tragic encounter with or hostility against men has not been discovered in her recorded myth.

feminine life force of the ancient world as the origin of the witch concept of Christian Europe.

A mythological figure with the name "Witch of Atlas" or whose story could associate her with such a name exists neither in ancient Greek nor in Roman mythology. Thus, it is a creation of the mythopoeic imagination of the poet. As Leigh Hunt argues, "'The Witch of Atlas' …is but a personification of the imaginative faculty" (qtd. in O'Neil 134). However, it is not a mere fanciful creation; as Northrop Frye argues in *Anatomy of Criticism*, literature is a storehouse of archetypes and myths that continue to exist in transformed forms in the history of literature. Shelley seems to have chosen certain figures from this storehouse and based his witch figure on them. As has already been claimed, these figures seem to be the wizard-goddesses or female figures of the ancient world. The constant reference to ancient Greek mythological figures in the poem as the Sun-God, Ocean, Pan, nymphs, Atlas, Apollo, and so on, proves the fact that Shelley situates his witch in the ancient Greek mythological context, among the wizard-goddesses of this context.

The similarity to Hecate should be emphasized here because, like Hecate, Shelley's witch is both a sorceress and a benevolent goddess who uses her power of magic not for the destruction but for the preservation of mankind. Unlike the witch of Christian Europe, she looks at people not with hatred but with compassion. As she travels along the globe with the flying boat given to her by Apollo, she beholds all the human beings on her way "as living spirits" (570); as she looks at those people, she sees that

> The naked beauty of the soul lay bare,
> And often through a rude and worn disguise
> She [sees] the inner form most bright and fair –
> And then she [has] a charm of strange device,
> Which, murmured on mute lips with tender tone,
> [Can] make that spirit mingle with her own.
> (571-6)

Her dwelling, in accordance with the witch concept outlined at the beginning of this study, is stored with instruments for magic: sounds of air, visions swift, various dizzying odours, liquors, "scrolls of strange device" (185), and "wondrous works of substances unknown" (201). However, she mostly uses these instruments for the well-being of mankind. When "loosed and missioned, making wings of wind," she uses her power to stir "sweet thoughts or sad, in destined minds" (175-6). With her liquors, she cures "the sick soul to happy sleep, /And change eternal death into a night /Of glorious dreams" (178-80).

Like Hecate, she is a mediator goddess who quenches with her magic "the Earth-consuming rage" and makes men "live and move /Harmonious as the sacred stars above" (190-2). The speaker relates that:

> Friends who, by practice of some envious skill,
> Were torn apart – a wide wound, mind from mind!-
> She did unite again with visions clear
> Of deep affection and of truth sincere.
> (661-4)

All the things that seem untameable obey her spells; "The Ocean-nymphs and Hamadryades, /Oreads and Naiads" (217-8) offer to do her bidding on the seas and "live forever in the light /Of her sweet presence" (223-4). She is also a beneficent goddess who helps lovers. When a maiden and a boy meet one another and fall in love, the speaker says, she let their innocent love "take no ill" because of the thousand schemes lovers find against each other, and she makes them take "their fill of happiness in marriage warm and kind" (159-60).

Similar to Hecate, the Witch of Atlas is alone; she does not have a lover; neither does she experience a tragic love relationship with a male figure. However, she does not feel alone because, like an artist, "her spirit is free from human need" (O'Neil 140) and "like a sexless bee /Tasting all blossoms, and confined to none," she wanders among the mortal forms of nature with "an eye serene and heart unladen" (589-92). Her loneliness is likened to the loneliness of an artist in the act of creation. Reminiscent of the word "Witch Poesy" in "Mont Blanc," it is said:

All day the wizard lady sate aloof,
  Spelling out scrolls of dread antiquity,
Under the cavern's fountain-lighted roof;
  Or broidering the pictured poesy
Of some high tale upon her growing woof,
  Which the sweet splendour of her smiles could dye
In hues outshining heaven –and ever she
Added some grace to the wrought poesy.
(249-56)

Thus, her aloofness is presented as the aloofness of an artist creating a work of art and satisfied with the pleasure s/he takes from all the beauties of the world as s/he creates. Her special relationship with Apollo, whose one attribute is the god of art, reinforces the Witch's image as an artist.

As a conclusion, it can be said that "The Witch of Atlas" is a celebration of the imagination's power of myth-making. The witch figure in the poem is "both myth herself, and the sophisticated modern poet's meditation upon myth" (O'Neil 140). The result of this meditation is the reconstruction of the witch concept of Christian Europe. By presenting his 'witch' in the form of a Hecate-like goddess, Shelley re-enthrones the feminine other—that Christianity labeled 'witch' or 'old hag'—into her original magnificent position.

4.1.1.2 The Sympathetic and Beautiful Serpent of Keats' *Lamia*

Keats' *Lamia* (1819) can be considered as a good example of how the Romantic poet creates his own mythography by re-constructing the binary logic of the sacred and profane in ancient mythology. In ancient Greek mythology, as Robert Graves says in *The Greek Myths* (Vol. I), Lamia was the beautiful daughter of Belus and the queen of Libya. She was so beautiful that Zeus fell in love with her. She bore Zeus several children, but all of them except Scylla were killed by Hera in a fit of jealousy. Lamia took her revenge by destroying the children of others, and she behaved so cruelly that her face turned into a nightmarish mask (205). Later, she is said to have lied with young men and sucked their blood. Lamia was transformed by Hera into a monster whose head and torso were of a

woman but whose lower half was serpentine. She was also known as an enchantress, a liar and a calculating expert in love. She was usually taken to belong to the same line with such she-monsters or enchantresses in ancient Greek mythology and demonology as Medusa[30] and Circe, and after Christianity she came to be known as a witch who used her magical powers to prey on human beings and devour children. Her closeness to the Medusa figure, who is one of the main subjects of attraction for feminist theories in the 20th century, is especially noteworthy.

In the introduction to the poem in the *Norton Anthology*, it is said that Keats took as the source of his plot a story in Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). In this story,

> One Menippus Lycius, a young man twenty-five years of age, that going betwixt Cenchreas and Corinth, met such a phantasm in the habit of a fair gentlewoman, which, taking him by the hand, carried him home to her house, in the suburbs of Corinth…The young man, a philosopher, otherwise staid and discreet, able to moderate his passions, though not this of love, tarried with her a while to his great content, and at last married her, to whose wedding, amongst other guests, came Apollonius; who, by some probable conjectures, found her out to be serpent, a lamia; and that all her furniture was, like Tantalus' gold, described by Homer, no substance but mere illusions. When she saw herself descried, she wept, and desired Apollonius to be silent, but he would not be moved, and thereupon she, plate, house, and all that was in it, vanished in an instant. (826-7).

In fact, a similar story was earlier told by Flavious Philostratus in *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Philostratus relates that:

> One of the pupils of Apollonius was a twenty-five year old Lycian called Menippus, who resembled an athlete in his beauty. Most people thought that Menippus was loved by a foreign woman, who seemed to be

[30] In Greek mythology, it is told that Medusa was originally a very beautiful woman whose crowning glory was her magnificent long hair. She was desired and courted by many suitors. Yet before she betrothed to a husband, Poseidon found her worshipping in the temple of Athena (Minerva) and ravished her. Athena was outraged at her sacred temple being violated , and punished Medusa by turning her beautiful tresses into snakes and giving her the destructive power to turn anyone who looked directly at her into stone.

> beautiful, dainty and rich. She only appeared to be so. In fact, when walking along the road to Kenchreae Menippus had met an apparition in the shape of a woman. She took his hand and told him that she had long been in love with him. She said that she was a Phoenican woman living in a suburb of Corinth. She invited Menippus to her home, enticing him with the offer of her singing and wine, and assuring him that he would have no rival in love…Menippus came in the evening and came often in the future, not realizing that she was an apparition…Apollonius told Menippus that his love was a serpent and that he could not marry her…for she was accustomed to feeding upon beautiful and young bodies, since their blood is pure. (qtd. in West 295-6).

Apollonius is said in Philostratus's work to reveal in his pupil's wedding feast that such beings as Lamia "fall in love, and they are devoted to the delights of Aphrodite, but especially to the flesh of human beings, they decoy with such delights those whom they mean to devour in their feasts" (qtd. in Gordon 216). As can be observed, although Philostratus's and Burton's stories handle the Lamia myth in a different light by adding a literary dimension to it, in essence, they do not re-construct the myth because in both these stories and in Greek mythology Lamia is represented as a serpentine figure that does evil against mankind.

The story of Keats's Lamia bears close resemblance to both Burton's and Philostratus's stories. However, Keats' poem takes into consideration the fact that in ancient Greek mythology Lamia was a very beautiful woman before she was victimized by Hera and transformed into a monster, and that her evil doings were in a way a reaction to her victimization.

In the poem it is said that a serpentine female figure called Lamia is transformed by Hermes—the wing-footed messenger at the summons of Jove—into her original beautiful woman form and she makes a Corinthian young man called Lycius fall in love with her. Spellbound with Lamia's beauty, Lycius begins to visit her in her home, which she makes up with her magical power on the slope of a hill near Corinth to keep away from the public gaze of the inquisitive and gossiping Corinthians. They continue to live in their dream-like world until Apollonius, Lycius's tutor, reveals in their wedding feast that Lamia is a serpent and that she has enthralled his pupil in her world of deception and illusion. After

this revelation, Lamia, her house, furniture, and everything she has created dissolve.

Although its story bears close resemblance to the above-mentioned predecessor-texts, Keats's Lamia, nonetheless, is "reflective of Keats's intense visual imagination and reveals the technique he had learned of describing scenes in a highly detailed and concrete way" (Brotemarkle 81). With his iconic imagination, as characteristic of most Keats's poetry, the poet changes the earlier stories by creating a world of romance both lively with love and gods chasing beautiful nymphs in sweet natural settings, and tinted with melancholy and sadness. Lamia appears at the beginning as a serpent having a feminine attractiveness. His iconic imagination at work, the speaker describes her as a "palpitating snake" (45), "a gordian shape of dazzling hue, /Vermilion-spotted, golden, green, and blue; / Striped like a zebra, freckled like a pard, /Eyed like a peacock, and all crimson barr'd" (47-50). She is "full of silver moons" (51) and "rainbow-sided" (54), and upon her crest she wears "a wannish fire /Sprinkled with stars, like Ariadne's tiar" (57-8). She is "some pinanced lady elf" who has a serpent's head but a woman's mouth "with all its pearls complete" (60). Her throat is serpent, but "the words she [speaks] /[Come], as though bubbling honey, for Love's sake" (64-5). After she is transformed by Hermes into her former beautiful woman's shape, she makes Lycius spellbound with her beauty. He looks at her in such an enthralled way that "soon his eyes [drinks] her beauty up, /Leaving no drop in the bewildering cup, /And still the cup [is] full" (251-3); "every word she [speaks] entic'd him on / To unperplex'd delight and pleasure known" (326-7). Similar to the *femme fatale* figure of Burton's and Phlistratus's stories, she is so beautiful that she seems nymph-like to Lycius and, looking at her—if we express it using the terminology of biblical mythology—he becomes as if he was tasting the forbidden apple of the Garden of Eden. When she tells him such "finer spirits" as her cannot "breathe below in human climes, and live" (280-1), Lycius, "sick to lose /The amorous promise of her lone complain, /Swoon'd, murmuring of love, and pale with pain" (287-9). She brings him to life, as the fairy lady of "La Belle Dame Sans Merci,"

by putting "her new lips to his" (294). He wakens from one trance to another as she sings "happy in beauty, life, and love" (298).

Much more importantly than the work of visual imagination, the poem is reflective of Keats's ability to handle certain myths in a new light and reconstruct their semantic content. In the poem although Keats bases his plot on Burton's and Phlostratus's stories, he seems to construct his Lamia figure by relying on the beautiful woman in Greek mythology victimized by Hera and the male-biased order of ancient Greek mythology, and by making her represent his ideas of sadness, melancholy and beauty/art, which are the common characteristics of Keatsian mythography. Thus, Keats reconstructs the original myth in two regards: first, by making his Lamia figure not a victimizer preying on children and human blood but one unfairly victimized both by some male-biased grand power and human society; and, second, by making her represent his aesthetic ideas, the relation between art and philosophy, and his ideas of sadness and melancholy.

When one begins reading the poem, instead of a monstrous figure in the name Lamia, one confronts a victimized and suffering female figure with whom one can sympathize. As Brotemarkle argues, "while in the folklore tradition of the West, a lamia is clearly evil, connected to witchcraft and dark magic, Keats radically alters her nature. She is, without doubt, a sympathetic character, not a femme fatale but rather a sacrificial lamb in the service of humanitarian Beauty. Keats represents her as ladylike and passive…She is a feigner and a manipulator of appearances but not a liar" (99-100). As he describes her before her transformation, although the speaker says that Lamia seems "some demon's mistress, or the demon's self" (56), in fact, his focus is on her miserable situation. She is "touch'd with miseries" (54), her head is "bitter-sweet" (59) and she has fair eyes that constantly weep, "as still Proserpine weeps for Sicilian air" (63). As Hermes flies amorously from vale to vale, from wood to wood, from river to river to find "the secret bed" of the sweet nymph flying and hiding from his passionate love, he hears the "mournful" and "lone" voice of Lamia complaining about her present self and her imprisonment in the serpent's body; she exclaims:

"When from this wreathed tomb shall I awake!
When move in a sweet body fit for life,
And love, and pleasure, and the ruddy strife
Of hearts and lips! Ah, miserable me"
(38-41)

As she sees Hermes, Lamia, "the brilliance feminine" (92), offers him help to find his fair nymph and, in return, she asks him to transform her into her former self, into a beautiful woman. She says: "I was a woman, let me have once more /A woman's shape, and charming as before. /I love a youth from Corinth –O the bliss! /Give me my woman's form, and place me where he is" (117-20).

Thus, the speaker presents Lamia as a humane figure who feels sad and melancholic due to her present state. She is represented as a beautiful female figure victimized by some grand power and desiring to get rid of the prison-house of her snake form and to experience the feeling of love for a human being. Hence, she is not represented as an evil figure one can detest, but as a figure one can feel sorry for because of her urgent and suppressed desire for human passion and love.

The reader continues to sympathize with her also after Hermes transforms her into her former woman's shape because her suffering and exclusion from human passion last even after her transformation and introduction into the human world of Corinth. She continues to be an alien after her transformation because she can be from the human society neither in her lifestyle and appearance, nor with her strange behavior. First of all, her gorgeous palace on the slope near Corinth is a mystery for the Corinthians; all Corinth, "men, women, rich and poor, in the cool hours," "mutter'd, like tempest in the distance brew'd, /To the wide-spread night above her [strangely-shaped] towers" and "shuffled their sandals o'er the pavement white" (353-6). The Corinthians become interested in the origin of so fair and fairy a lady having so strange and gorgeous palaces. However, for Lamia, her origin is a secret and something she is terribly afraid of being revealed. Besides, she has neither kin nor friends. When, in the second part of the poem, Lycius insists on a wedding feast, its very idea makes Lamia terrorized due to her

fear of the public gaze and because she has neither relatives nor friends to join in the ceremony. As they decide on the feast, as is the custom "to bring away, /The bride from home at blushing shut of day, veil'd in a chariot" by relatives and friends, Lycius asks her whether she has "some sweet name," "any mortal name, /Fit appellation for [her] dazzling frame," or "friends or kinsfolk on the citied earth" to share their "marriage feast and nuptial mirth" (85-91). To this question, Lamia's answer is:

> "I have no friends," said Lamia, "no, not one;
> My presence in wide Corinth hardly known:
> My parents' bones are in their dusty urns
> Sepulchered, where no kindled incense burns,
> Seeing all their luckless race are dead, save me,
> And I neglect the holy rite for thee…"
> (92-7)

In the wedding, her waiting for the guests at home, without, as is the custom, being brought by relatives and friends, becomes another subject of mystery about Lamia's origin for the public.

Hence, with her alien situation and strange behavior, she becomes an object of attraction for the public gaze of Corinth. However, nothing makes her more uneasy than Apollonius's gaze, which she first encounters as she timorously walks with Lycius in the street:

> Muffling his face, of greeting friends in fear,
> Her fingers he press'd hard, as one came near
> With curl'd gray beard, sharp eyes, and smooth bald crown,
> Slow-stepp'd, and robed in philosophic gown:
> (362-5)

As seen in these lines, not only Lamia but also Lycius gets uneasy with Apollonius's 'sharp eyes' and the Corinthians' inquisitive gaze. As she sees Apollonius's sharp philosophic eyes fixed on her, Lamia becomes so terrorized that she shrinks closer to Lycius's mantle, and "adding wings to haste," she trembles. Realizing her agitated state, Lycius asks:

"Why do you shudder, love, so ruefully"
Why does your tender palm dissolve in dew?" –
"I'm wearied," said fair Lamia: "tell me who
Is that old man? I cannot bring to mind
His features: -Lycius! Wherefore did you blind
Yourself from his quick eyes?" Lycius replied,
" 'Tis Apollonius sage, my trusty guide
And good instructor; but to-night he seems
The ghost of folly haunting my sweet dreams."
(369-77)

Georg Luck argues that "Apollonius was a sorcerer as well as a philosopher" because he had "foreknowledge of certain events, and this is due to 'supernatural prompting'" (130-1). Luck presents his unmasking of Lamia, "which is the most celebrated stories about him," as a proof of his being a sorcerer (130-1). Having sensed his magical power and his foreseeing eyes, Lamia tries to take precautions against him in the second part of the poem by insisting on his not being invited to the wedding feast: "if, as now it seems, your vision rests /With any pleasure on me, do not bid /Old Apollonius –from him keep me hid" (99-101). However, Apollonius attends the feast without being invited and, as the other guests look "maz'd, curious and keen" (156) at the illusory and artificial appearance of the furniture in Lamia's home, he looks around "with eye severe" and walks around austere "with calm-planted steps…as though some knotty problem, that [has] daft /His patient thought, [has] now began to thaw, /And solve and melt" (II, 158-62).

As the wedding ceremony goes on, Apollonius fixes his ominous eyes on Lamia, "without a twinkle or stir /Full on the alarmed beauty of the bride, /Brow-beating her fair form, and troubling her sweet pride" (246-8). With Apollonius's magical eyes fixed on her, Lamia at first grows pale and icy, and then suddenly she grows unnaturally hot. "No azure vein" (272) remains on her face, "no passion to illume /The deep-recessed vision: - all [is] blight" (274-5); Lamia, "no longer fair, there [sits] a deadly white" (276). At Lycius's blaming his tutor's magical eyes in his bride's worsening state, as in Burton's and Philostratus's stories,

Apollonius reveals that Lamia is a serpent and that he is trying to preserve him from being a serpent's prey. With these words of Apollonius, her victimization process in Corinth being complete, Lamia "[breathes] death breath; the sophist's eye, /Like a sharp spear, [goes] through her utterly, /Keen, cruel, perchant[31], stinging" (299-301). As can be concluded from these statements, the mythopoeic imagination of the speaker presents Lamia not as a victimizer, as Apollonius asserts, but as a victimized. Apollonius appears as the victimizer here because what Lamia wants is only to experience some human feelings, which she could experience before Hera, just out of jealousy and whim, transformed her into a monster. Apollonius victimizes not only Lamia but also his pupil, whom he claims he preserves from the evil of the serpent. As he hears his tutor's revelation,

> Lycius's arms [are] empty of delight,
> As [are] his limbs of life, from that same night.
> On the high coach he lay –his friends [come round] –
> Supported him –no pulse, or breath they found,
> And, in its marriage robe, the heavy body wound.
> (307-11)

Thus, ironically, Apollonius causes his pupil's death as he tries to preserve him from the serpent's prey, or, to put it more rightly, from losing himself in the delights of pleasure and love.

At the beginning of this part, it is said that the Lamia myth is also reconstructed by the mythopoeic imagination of the poet to represent his idea of art and its relationship with philosophy. Renovating the ancient struggle between art and philosophy, which found its most famous expression in Plato's aesthetic ideas, Keats presents the opposition between Lamia and Apollonius as a struggle between art/beauty and philosophy, or to put it more rightly, Sophistry. As Brotemarkle states, critics usually find the significance of the poem "in the conflict between the two characters, Lamia and Apollonius, between poetry-imagination versus philosophy-reason" (86). Taking into consideration Lamia's beauty and

[31] Piercing

dream-like world, this interpretation comes to mean that "Apollonius's survival marks the victory of philosophy over poetry" (Brotemarkle 86). This conflict finds its best expression in the following statements of the speaker, which he utters in the second part of the poem as Lamia nervously and with a fear of the 'sophist's gaze' awaits the wedding guests:

> … Do not all charms fly
> At the mere touch of cold philosophy?
> There was an awful rainbow once in heaven:
> We know her woof, her texture; she is given
> In the dull catalogue of common things.
> Philosophy will clip an Angel's wings,
> Conquer all mysteries by rule and line,
> Empty the haunted air, and gnomed mine –
> Unweave a rainbow, as it erewhile made
> The tender-person'd Lamia melt into a shade.
> (229-38)

Keeping in mind that the speaker presents Lamia towards the beginning of the poem, before her transformation, as "a gordian shape of dazzling hue, /Vermilion-spotted, golden, green, and blue; / Striped like a zebra, freckled like a pard, /Eyed like a peacock, all crimson barr'd" (47-50), "full of silver moons" (51) and "rainbow-sided" (54), it can be seen that what is metaphorically meant with the rainbow is Lamia herself, and as the rainbow image is ostensibly meant to represent art, Lamia seems to be handled by the poet as a metaphorical representation of art. Besides, in the quotation above, the speaker openly seems to take side with Lamia. Taking into consideration the fact that such Enlightenment philosophers as Locke and Hobbes (in line with Plato's ideas of art) criticized art and metaphor (that is, the key principle of artistic expression) as deceptive and deviating people from truth, Apollonius's victimization of Lamia for deceiving Lycius and deviating him from truth may be interpreted as a criticism against the Enlightenment approach to art.

As seen, in Keats's myth-making imagination, the Lamia myth is stripped of its original semantic content, and Lamia is made into a sacrificial lamb

victimized by Hera and the collective gaze of Apollonius. She is also made a metaphorical representation of the poet's ideas of art that provides the poet with the opportunity to discuss art's relation to (Enlightenment) philosophy and the threat the logical reasoning of philosophy poses for art. Besides, re-creating the Lamia myth, Keats also presents sadness and melancholy as the characterizing features of not only Lamia's story but also, as is common to most of his poetry, of art and beauty.

4.1.2 The Sublime Daemon of Shelley's "The Daemon of the World"

Shelley's "The Daemon of the World" (1816) is another example for how the Romantic mythopoeia represented in Keats' and Shelley's poetry reconstructs mythological figures by re-creating the profane as sacred in the binary opposition of ancient classical and Christian mythologies and by demolishing this opposition. In ancient Greek and Roman mythologies as well as in Christian and medieval mythologies, the term 'daemon' is almost always classified in the category of the profane. Although the ancient world had its own concept of the daemon, the way it was conceived in medieval Europe and after, as (in "Essay on the Devil and Devils") Shelley puts it, was "the outwork of the Christian faith" (268). The Daemon or, as it came to be known in Christian thinking, the 'Devil,' 'Satan,' or Lucifer was a fallen angel who rebelled against God and was identified by Christians with the serpent in the Garden of Eden whose lies led to the original sin and the need for Jesus Christ's redemption. He is also identified as the Accuser of Job, the tempter of the Gospels, and the dragon in the Book of Revelation. Traditionally, Christians have understood the Devil to be the author of lies and promoter of evil. The epitome of this understanding of Satan, to use the most common word in biblical mythology, was found in medieval Europe and it finds its best expression in its representation in Dante's *Inferno*. As Shelley argues, Dante presents a very gross idea of the Devil in *Inferno*. As is common in all representations of the profane, Satan is represented in the bottom of the earth, in the last of the nine circles of Hell, which is the darkest pit of earth. He is at the

center of the circle, has three faces, one red, one black, and one a pale yellow, each having a mouth that chews on a prominent traitor. Satan is represented as a giant, a terrifying beast, weeping tears from his six eyes, which mix with the traitors' blood sickeningly. He is imprisoned in ice, and beats his six wings as if trying to escape, but the icy wind that emanates only further ensures his imprisonment (as well as that of the others in the ring).

In "The Daemon of the World" Shelley seems to have chosen Milton as his predecessor mythographer, who, in *Paradise Lost* re-creates the Satan figure in Christian thinking and its conception in the medieval Europe by representing it as "very different from the popular personification of evil, malignity" ("Essay on the Devil" 267). Shelley argues that in Milton's work Satan is represented as a true hero who struggles to overcome his own doubts and weaknesses, and accomplishes his goal of corrupting mankind. In Shelley's famous words, "nothing can exceed the grandeur and the energy of the character of the Devil as expressed in *Paradise Lost*;" he is a moral being "as far superior to his God as one who perseveres in some purpose which he has conceived to be excellent, in spite of adversity and torture, is to one who in the cold security of undoubted triumph inflicts the most horrible revenge upon his enemy –not from any mistaken notion of bringing him to repent of a perseverance in enmity but with the open and alleged design of exasperating him to deserve new torments" ("Essay on the Devil" 267). Relying on Shelley's interpretation, it can be said that Milton re-created the Devil and put into question his categorization as profane in the binary logic of Christian mythology and medieval thinking.

Shelley follows Milton's line in "The Daemon of the World" by re-creating the Daemon figure in Christian understanding, and goes one step further by representing him not as an avenger of God but someone as necessary for the universe as God. Thus, the poem is usually regarded as representing Shelley's ideas of religion that are called by most critics as heretic and anti-Christian.

The poem is formed of Ianthe's dream vision: a beautiful and virtuous woman named Ianthe sees in her "baby Sleep" the Daemon and travels with him to

his temple, sees both the Heaven and Hell together there and from him learns about the real cause of evil in the world and the main characteristics of an ideal world. The poem begins with Ianthe's sleep and with the speaker's philosophizing on the brotherhood between Sleep and Death. As if she is dead, she seems to wait to be taken to the otherworld in her sleep. Listening to the sound of the genii of nature in her sleep, Ianthe hears the "rushing sound" of the chariot of the Daemon of the world "floating on waves of music and of light" towards her (56). The Daemon is seen by the speaker to have an ethereal appearance; he is "slight as some cloud/ That catches but the palest tinge of day" and bright "as that fibrous woof when stars indue /Its transitory robe" (59-63). Four bright and beautiful shadows draw "that strange car of glory" (65). In sharp contrast to the Satan in Dante's *Inferno*, the Daemon of Shelley's poem has all the attractiveness and glory of an epic hero; the speaker describes his aerial beauty as:

> Human eye hath never beheld
> A shape so wild, so bright, so beautiful,
> As that which o'er the maiden's charmed sleep
> Waving a starry wand,
> Hung like a mist of light,
> Such sounds as breathed like odorous winds
> Of wakening spring arose,
> Filling the chamber and the moonlight sky.
> (70-7)

Shelley's Daemon is not only a beautiful and mighty being but also an intellectual. In a quite Keatsian and Nietzchean manner, he says to Ianthe, whom he calls "the world's supremest spirit" (78), that by sleeping she "entranced [entered] in some diviner mood /Of self-oblivious solitude," and so doing she has freed her heart from the hate and awe bestowed on earth by "Custom, and Faith and Power" (88-91). In this statement, it is seen that Shelley mythologizes the Daemon as his mouthpiece for criticism of the established church and degenerated social and political life. Continuing this criticism he asks the "majestic spirit" (98) of Ianthe to arise from her prison-house, leave "earth's unsubstantial mimicry" (107) and follow him. Upon this, "from the mute and moveless frame /A radiant spirit arose,

/All beautiful in naked purity" (108-10). "Robed in its human hues," Ianthe's spirit ascends, "departing as it went the silver clouds," moves towards the chariot and takes its seat beside the Daemon (111-4).

In "The Daemon of the World" Shelley also deconstructs the traditional concepts of space concerning the binary opposition of the sacred and profane. In Dante's *Inferno* as well as in Christian mythology, Satan and Hell, which is Satan's dwelling place is said—in accordance with Strauss's, Frye's and Cassirer's positioning of the profane—to be situated in the lowest and darkest part of the earth, whereas God and Heaven are in the light upper part. In sharp contrast to this conception, Shelley's Daemon and Hell are positioned in the sun, in the upper and lightest part of the universe. Shelley states,

> Some have supposed that the Devils live in the sun, and that glorious luminary is the actual Hell…If the sun is Hell, the Devil has a magnificent abode, being elevated as it were on the imperial throne of the visible world ("Essay on the Devil" 272).

Later in the article he argues: "The idea of the sun being Hell is an attempt at an improvement on the old established idea of its occupying the center" (Shelley "Essay on the Devil" 274). This is evinced, for Shelley, with the fact that "the Devil and his angels are called powers of the air, and the Devil himself Lucifer," which in Latin means –Shelley states in a footnote – "the bearer of light; the dawn or morning light, and thus the dispenser of knowledge" ("Essay on the Devil" 274).

Relying on this conception, Shelley situates the Daemon and his dwelling place in the sun, which indicates that according to Shelley the Daemon and his abode are as sublime as God. This means of course re-writing of Christian mythology and demolishing the traditional binary opposition of the sacred and profane.

As the chariot arrives at the Daemon's dwelling in the sun, the speaker describes it as if what he is describing is not Hell but Heaven. He says that the abode of "the mightiest Daemon" (208) is in the highest point of the sun where

different colors of the burning sun create "a sight of wonder" (166). Nothing on earth can be equal to the beauty of the Daemon's "gorgeous dome" (214);

> Not the golden islands
> That gleam amid yon flood of light,
> Nor the feathery curtains
> That canopy the sun's resplendent couch,
> Nor the burnished ocean waves
> …
> So fair, so wonderful a sight
> As the eternal temple could afford.
> (209-16)

It is so beautiful that not "the elements of all human thought" can frame such "a lovely and sublime" scenery, nor "earth may image forth its majesty" (17-20).

As they pass the gates of the overhanging battlements of the Daemon's temple, Ianthe's spirit pauses in ecstasy but soon she sees "shadows and skeletons, and fiendly shapes, /Thronging round human graves" (257-8). What she sees in the temple, the speaker says, is like a memory that records ages; she sees "the likeness of a thronéd king" (who is more like the Devil of Christian understanding and Dante's *Inferno*) approaching them (270); "his countenance [is] calm, /His eye severe and cold;" he bears in his right hand a bloody coin, and conceals beneath his robe a human heart that he "gnaw[s] /By fits, with secret smiles" (274-5).

These utterances may give the sense that the Daemon's temple is Hell in the traditional sense. However, Shelley does not present his Daemon as the main cause of evil and the torture of the shadows and skeletons crowded in his temple. Re-constructing the traditional conception, he shows "Custom, and Faith and Power" (90), that is, the established Church, custom and the state as the main cause of the torture of these shadows. First and foremost, the church's creating a division of heaven and hell in the conceptual worlds of the people, for the speaker of the poem, "burst in ruin o'er the world" and built "vast trophies, instruments /Of murder, human bones, barbaric gold, /Skins torn from living men, towers of skulls /with sightless holes…/Mitres, and crowns, and brazen chariots stained /With blood, and

scrolls of mystic wickedness, /The sanguine codes of venerable crime" (262-9). Differently from the common conception, Shelley does not make such a division in his poem; instead, he presents Heaven and Hell side by side, as two equally necessary aspects of being. His Daemon is also as necessary for this world as God. This concept of Heaven and Hell, and Devil and God coincides with Blake's presentation of these two levels of being in *Marriage of Heaven and Hell* and "The Lamb" and "The Tiger" (which allegorically mean Jesus Christ and Satan) as two contrastive aspects that are indivisible and equally necessary for being.

The Daemon is presented, as already suggested above, as an agent of Heaven rather than of Hell. Explaining his idea of the togetherness, or to put it more rightly, the oneness of Heaven and Hell, Shelley states,

> If we assign to the Devil the greatest and most glorious habitation within the scope of our senses, where shall we conceive his mightier adversary to reside? Shall we suppose that the Devil occupies the center and God the circumference of existence, and that one urges inwards with the centripetal, while the other is perpetually struggling outwards from the narrow focus with the centrifugal force, and that from their perpetual conflict results that mixture of good and evil, harmony and discord, beauty and deformity, production and decay? ("Essay on the Devil" 273).

Coinciding with the explanation above, Shelley centralizes his Daemon in "The Daemon of the World." He is presented as much more than a subsidiary spirit in Heaven; he is even presented as a Creator who creates harmony out of the chaos of ages represented with the tortured and struggling shadows in his temple. He is so mighty that he says: "To me is given /The wonders of the human world to keep – /Space, matter, time and mind" (339-41). As Wasserman claims, he is represented as the One Mind, the omnipresent Power or universal mind similar to that in "Mont Blanc" that is an all-encompassing unity in which all individual minds and 'space,' 'matter,' and 'time' are subsumed (146-7). In the harmony he creates (which is Heaven and is observed to be represented with the part of his dwelling seen before Ianthe enters the overhanging battlements), "the proud Power of Evil" will no longer be able to "shake pestilence and war" on "this fairest

world" because man is no longer a slave to it. His representing "Custom, Faith and Power" as "the proud Power of Evil" indicates how Shelley reconstructs in the poem the traditional binary concept of the sacred and profane.

As can be concluded from the study of the poem so far, Shelley bestows his Daemon with a role similar to that of Virgil in Dante's *Divine Comedy*. In accordance with the Latin meaning of Lucifer as the "bearer of light" and "dispenser of knowledge," the Daemon in the poem plays the role of a mentor showing Ianthe's spirit the real cause of evil in the world, which are the established institutions, and instructs her about the characteristics of an ideal world. Fulfilling this role, he tells Ianthe that his world of harmony is free from the evil of custom and faith and so it gives end to the fear and "failing hope" this evil has created in mankind. In this heavenly world, foregrounding Shelley's ideal world, the Daemon says:

> All things are re-created, and the flame
> Of consentaneous love inspires all life:
> The fertile bosom of the earth gives suck
> To myriads, who still grow beneath her care,
> Rewarding her with their pure perfectness;
> The balmy breathings of the wind inhale
> Her virtues, and diffuse them all abroad:
> Health floats amid the gentle atmosphere,
> Glows in the fruits, and mantles on the stream;
> (343-51)

The Daemon is presented not only as the possessor of Hell but also as the creator and protector of Heaven. Eliminating evil from the world of man, "the habitable earth" becomes "full of bliss" (360). In this world, he states,

> No storms deform the beaming brow of heaven,
> Nor scatter in the freshness of its pride
> The foliage of the undecaying trees;
> But fruits are ever ripe, flowers ever fair,
> And Autumn proudly bears her matron grace,
> Kindling a flush on the fair cheek of Spring,
> Whose virgin bloom beneath the ruddy fruit

Reflects its tint and blushes into love.
(352-9)

Man, whose mind is enslaved and whose creativity is blunted by the established institutions, perceives this "gradual renovation" and defines each "moment of its progress on his mind" (404-5). He comes to see that he was "a nobler being" before "slavery / Had crushed him to his country's blood-stained dust" (417-8). He was in the past "the train bearer of slaves, /The mimic of surrounding misery, /The jackal of ambition's lion-rage, /The bloodhound of religion's hungry zeal" (426-9). But, in the new world, he has got rid of all the things that put limitations on his mind and demolished all oppositions that were prescribed to him by the established church. The mind and the body, and passion and reason, which have been set in opposition by the established church, no longer combat in his life. He begins to adorn earth "with taintless body and mind" (431). He no longer "slays the beast that sports around his dwelling" (444). "Hatred, despair and fear and vain belief, / The germs of misery, death, decease, and crime" are no longer "the wingéd habitants" of his life (450-2). His mind "unfattered o'er the earth extends /Its all-subduing energies, and wields /The sceptre of a vast dominion" (465-7). Thus, "human things are perfected" in this world and "earth, /Even as a child beneath its mother's love, /Is strengthened in all excellence" (517-9).

All divisions leading to hatred amongst mankind being demolished, human life becomes unified. In this respect, death is no longer an end but a new beginning that leads "to azure isles and beaming skies /And happy regions of eternal hope" (548-9). In this statement, what Shelley means is not a life after death, but a new life born of the death of the old. As the Daemon says, worms destroy their prey in silence and darkness. However, their ruins "leave not a wreck behind" because "their elements, wide-scattered o'er the globe,/ To happier shapes are moulded, and become /Ministrant to all blissful impulses" (512-6).

Towards the end of the poem, after his long speech on the real cause of evil in the world and the main characteristics of the heavenly world, he tells Ianthe's

"surpassing spirit" to return to the world and continue her "eternal war to wage /With tyranny and falsehood, and uproot /The germs of misery from the human heart" (573-6). He says to her: "Go, happy one, and give that bosom joy /Whose sleepless spirit waits to catch /Light, life and rapture from thy smile" (593-5). Ianthe is so happy with this journey and with the mentorship of the Daemon that, as she mounts the chariot to return to the world, "speechless with bliss," she bends "her beamy eyes in thankfulness" on him. When she awakes from her sleep with a "gentle start" (615), as a result of the Daemon's mentorship in her dream, she realizes in her "the Body and the Soul united" (616). She has become a different person, one who ends her enslavement and gains freedom of mind by demolishing oppositions and conceiving the oneness of life.

As it is seen, the Daemon is not presented as the bearer of darkness and evil, as he is traditionally expected to do and as coincides with his classification in the category of the profane. Instead, he is represented as 'the bearer of light' and 'dispenser of knowledge.' Fulfilling this role, he guides Iantha's spirit to see the real cause of evil in the world and instructs her about the ideal world. Not only the concept of the Daemon but also the concepts of Heaven and Hell are also re-constructed in the poem. Heaven and Hell, just as God and the Daemon, are presented as one, two seemingly contrastive aspects of the one life. Rejecting the binary logic that has set oppositions between what in essence should be one, Shelley, using the Daemon as his mouthpiece, prophesizes a world in which life is total and man is no longer a slave to authority and prescribed concepts; he has freedom of mind and conceives the parts not as opposed to each other but as components of an all-encompassing whole.

4.2 Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*: Prometheus, Re-Enacting the Biblical Story of *Genesis*, and the Unbounded Fighter for Freedom

In *Prometheus Unbound* (1820) Shelley's revolutionary hero is this time Prometheus, a figure from ancient Greek mythology. Prometheus is encoded in our semantic encyclopedia as a Titan in Greek mythology who gives humankind the

gift of fire and, with metaphorical meanings, as someone who is a defiant rebel or who endures much suffering for a cause. In Greek mythology, Prometheus appears as the most celebrated descendent of the Titans – a gigantic race who inhabited earth before the creation of man and was overthrown from Olympus by Zeus and the other Olympian gods. In *Age of Fable*, Bulfinch relates the Prometheus myth stating that in Greek mythology Prometheus was said to be the creator god; before earth and sea and heaven were created, all things wore one aspect, which is usually called Chaos –a confused and shapeless mass, nothing but dead weight. Earth, sea and air were all mixed up together; so the earth was not solid, the sea was not fluid and the air was not transparent. Some god –it is not known which –arranged and disposed the earth. He appointed rivers and bays to their places, raised mountains, scooped out valleys, distributed woods, fountains, fertile fields and stony plains. The air being cleared, the stars began to appear, fishes took possession of the sea, birds of the air, and four-footed beasts of the land. But a nobler animal was wanted, and man was made. Prometheus took some of the earth, and kneading it up with water, made man in the image of the gods (Bulfinch 12). Prometheus and his brother Epimetheus were given the office of providing man and all other animals with the faculties necessary for their preservation. Epimetheus undertook to do this, and Prometheus was to overlook his work. Epimetheus bestowed upon different animals the various gifts of courage, strength, swiftness and sagacity; wings to one, claws to another, a shelly covering to a third and so on. When it came to providing man, Prometheus, with the aid of Minerva, went up to heaven, lighted his torch at the chariot of the sun, and brought down fire to man, that is, the gift of thinking and creating (13).

The world being thus furnished with inhabitants, the first age was an age of innocence and happiness, called the Golden Age. In that age, truth and right prevailed, the forests had not yet been robbed of its trees to furnish timbers for vessels, there were no such things as swords, spears or helmets, the earth brought forth everything necessary for man, without his labour and sowing, perpetual spring reigned, flowers sprang up without seed, the rivers flowed with milk and

wine, and yellow honey distilled from the oaks (Bulfinch 14). Wasserman calls this age the Saturnian age, named after Saturn, the father god of the Titans whose fall from power is handled in Keats's *Hyperion* that will be studied in the following part of this chapter. Wasserman states that the Saturnian Age "ended when Saturn was vanquished, the goddess of Justice fled, and the world came under the sway of Jupiter. Then, Ovid tells us, under the reign of Jupiter spring became but one of the four seasons, and the earth began to endure the extremes of burning heat and ice" (Wasserman 263). Houses became necessary and crops no longer grew without planting in that age.

In Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, in parallel with the Greek myth, Prometheus is represented as the originator of being and as the god of the Golden Age of perpetual spring, and Jupiter as his successor and main enemy, the oppressor of mankind and the destroyer of the heavenly world of the Golden Age. While Shelley's poem relies on the myth in one respect, in another respect it relies on Aeschylus's play *Prometheus Bound*, which handles Prometheus's imprisonment after he is overthrown. In Aeschylus's play, Zeus (Shelley's Jupiter) is a tyrant who tortures Prometheus, but Prometheus is proud and resists Zeus's oppressions. The surviving fragments of Aeschylus's play, *Prometheus Unbound*, indicate that Prometheus gives up resisting Zeus's oppressions and is reconciled with him.

In his poem, Shelley reconstructs the Prometheus myth by making Prometheus a political icon to represent his revolutionary ideas of social progress, freedom of mind and fight against oppression and its deteriorating effects on mankind. In this regard, unlike Aeschylus's work, he rejects any kind of reconciliation between Zeus and Prometheus, which would metaphorically mean reconciliation between the oppressor of mankind and the oppressed. In his "Preface" to the poem, Shelley states, "in truth, I was averse from a catastrophe as that of reconciling the Champion with the Oppressor of mankind. The moral interest of the fable, which is so powerfully sustained by the sufferings and endurance, would be annihilated if we could conceive of him as unsaying his high

language and quailing before his successful and perfidious adversary." Shelley's Prometheus never yields to Jupiter (the Zeus of Aeschylus's play); as Jupiter has made Earth "multitudinous with [his] slaves," whom he enslaved with "knee-worship, prayer, and praise, /And toil, and hecatombs of broken hearts, /With fear and self-contempt and barren hope" (6-8), Prometheus stands erect against the oppressor of mankind. To make him surrendered to authority, Jupiter has imprisoned him in a dark cave on the precipice of an "eagle-baffling mountain" and nailed him to the wall of the cave.

The poem opens with Prometheus in this situation and his exclamation of woe, pain, torture and solitude. He states that nobody hears his cry there, neither the "all-beholding Sun" traveling in Heaven nor the Sun's "ever-changing Shadow" on Earth (26-7). "The crawling glaciers" on the wall of the cave pierce him "with the spears /Of their moon-freezing crystals," and "the bright chains" hanging him on the wall "eat with their burning cold into [his] bones" (31-3). With the effect of pain and solitude, he hallucinates that "shapeless sights come wandering by" and mock him (36-38); the "Earthquake fiends are charged /To wrench the rivets from [his] quivering wounds /When the rocks split and close again behind: /While from their loud abysses howling throng /The genii of the storm, urging the rage /Of whirlwind and afflict [him] with hail" (38-43). Had he "deigned to share the ill tyranny of the God," he would not have been tortured, hung to the wall of his cave and been exposed to these pangs of woe, solitude and despair (18-20). However, in spite of all this torture, he does not surrender himself to the oppressor of mankind reigning in heaven. To Jupiter's messenger, Mercury, he says:

> Submission, thou dost know I cannot try:
> For what submission but that fatal word,
> The death-seal of mankind's captivity
> (Act I, 395-7)

Although Prometheus hated Jupiter at the beginning, later he ceases to hate him; and only then does his voice begin to be heard and the process that leads Jupiter to destruction starts. Prometheus says: "I speak in grief, /Not exultation, for

I hate no more, /As ere misery made me wise…I am changed so that aught evil wish /Is dead within" (56-8, 70-1). With the fear of Jupiter, the previously swift whirlwinds hung mute and moveless; the Springs vibrating before shudder with fear; and the mountains hide the beams of the sun and the fire of the thunder from him with their mists of cataracts. However, as soon as he ceases to hate Jupiter, they begin to speak with him. The beings of nature –the Spirits of the Air, the Springs, the Mountains and the Whirlwinds – and Mother Earth begin to hear his exclamations, and only then begins the process of the destruction of Jupiter and the victory of Prometheus.

Shelley's mythopoeic imagination comes to the fore especially as he handles the Prometheus figure in terms of Miltonic mythology and makes this figure the 'cause' of a new world. In his "Preface" to the work Shelley states that the only imaginary being resembling his Prometheus in literature is Milton's Satan; but, for him, "Prometheus is a more poetical character than Satan, because, in addition to courage, and majesty, and firm and patient opposition to omnipotent force, he is susceptible of being described as exempt from the taints of ambition, envy, revenge, and a desire for personal aggrandizement, which, in the hero of *Paradise Lost*, interfere with the interest." Drawing a resemblance between Prometheus and Milton's Satan brings a new dimension to the understanding of the Prometheus myth of ancient Greek mythology and makes the poem in some respects close to "The Daemon of the World." In the poem Prometheus, just like Satan in Milton's work, is represented as an angel fallen from Heaven to Hell as a result of some power struggle in Heaven.

The poem's opening with Prometheus's imprisonment and torture in a dark cave, which may be taken as Hell and his calling his oppressor with such names as "Mighty God," "Almighty Tyrant" and the ill-tyrant reigning in Heaven indicates the close similarity between Milton's Satan and Shelley's Prometheus. Thus, Prometheus appears as the fallen angel of Milton's work fighting against the tyranny of God, who is Jupiter in this context, and, taken from this stand, the poem can be interpreted as an allegory of the story of *Genesis* in biblical mythology.

However, Shelley's reconstruction of the Greek myth and Christian mythology is not limited to that in the poem. He makes Heaven and its ruler seem profane and Hell sacred. Moving from the stance that "all things exist as they are perceived –at least in relation to the percipient" and that "the mind is its own place, and of itself can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven,"[32] Shelley recreates Heaven as Hell and its ruler like Dante's Satan. For instance, hounds and fiends appear in Christian mythology as well as in Dante's *Inferno* as beings of Hell but in *Prometheus Unbound* they appear as beings of Heaven; as he expresses his cry of pain, Prometheus says: "Heaven's wingéd hound, polluting from thy [Jupiter's] lips /His beak in poison not his own, tears up /My heart" (34-5). The paradoxical co-presence of "Heaven" and such words as "hound," "polluting" and "poison" in this statement pose a sharp contrast to the common conception of Heaven. Likewise, as he speaks with Mother Earth, Prometheus likens himself to one who checks "a fiend-drawn charioteer, /The falsehood and force of him who reigns /Supreme" (126-8). As he "who reigns supreme" is most probably God, the co-existence of God and the fiends drawing his chariot conflicts with Christian thinking and mythology because fiends, like hounds, have always been regarded as beings of Hell rather than of Heaven and as side by side not with God but with Satan.

If the Prometheus figure is handled on the same plane as Milton's Satan as a fallen angel, it can be said that in the representation of Prometheus, too, the profane is made sacred and the sacred profane. Shelley recreates Prometheus by "assimilating into his character a modification of Milton's Satan and a strictly Shelleyean interpretation of Christ" (Wasserman 293). Prometheus is called in the poem with such words as God and "sacred Titan" (Act II, Scene I, 40), and to express his being nailed to the wall, the word "crucifixed" is used, which clearly refers to Jesus Christ, his torture and eventual redemption. With the use of such words, Prometheus, who—when taken on the same plane as Milton's Satan—should be seen as profane, is made sacred and the real God. As Wasserman states,

[32] In *Defence of Poetry*

> Prometheus absorbs Christ, as he does Satan, because they are manifestations of the same pattern of truth…Shelley's hero is the identity of both these preeminent types of superhuman and self-sacrificing resistance to evil, although it is part of the bitter irony of the inverted Christianity throughout the play that Shelley means Jupiter who has crucified Prometheus to represent the God of whom the New Testament Christ is the incarnate son. (296)

As the Earth tells him, Prometheus is "more than God" (Act I, 144). When the two Oceanides, Asia (Prometheus's ex-lover) and Panthea, ask for help from Demogorgon to free Prometheus from imprisonment, they ask him "Who made the living world?," to which Demogorgon answers: "God." They ask him: "Who made all /That it contains? thought, passion, reason, will, /Imagination." He answers: "God: Almighty God" (Act II, Scene IV, 8-12). And when they ask who created the life and happiness on Earth, he answers: "Merciful God" (II, IV, 18). In *The Oxford Anthology of English Literature* in the footnote to the word 'God' in Demogorgon's answers, it is said that with this word Demogorgon means not Jupiter, but a figure closer to Prometheus (431). In accordance with the original Greek myth and similar to the representation of the Daemon as God and creator in "The Daemon of the World," Asia presents Prometheus as the main cause of life; she says:

> …Prometheus
> Gave wisdom, which is strength, to Jupiter,
> And with this law alone, 'Let man be free,'
> Clothed him with the dominion of wide Heaven.
> (II, IV, 43-6)

Prometheus "gave man speech," she says, "and speech created thought / Which is the measure of the universe" (II, IV, 72-3). He also gave rise to science because he gave man the attribute of thinking and scrutinizing, and with this, he prophesized a new world:

> Science struck the thrones of earth and heaven;
> Which shook, but fell not; and the harmonious mind

Poured itself forth in all-prophetic song;
And music lifted up the listening spirit
Until it walked, exempt from mortal care.
(II, IV, 74-78)

Like the Daemon in "The Daemon of the World" and the Power in "Mont Blanc," he represents the One Mind that is the main cause of life and that encompasses 'matter,' 'space,' 'time,' and all individual minds. This representation of Prometheus indicates that the binary logic of the sacred and profane that is underlined by Levi-Strauss, Frye and Cassirer as one of the core principles of all mythical thinkings does not exist in Shelley's mythopoeic imagination.

Although there are some similarities between Prometheus and Satan, there is another figure in *Prometheus Unbound* that is much closer to Milton's Satan than Prometheus. This figure is Demogorgon and he dwells in the abyss of the dark forest, which has always been regarded in religious texts as a symbol of Hell. The co-presence of the words Demo—which may be interpreted as Demon—and gorgon—which is a name generally given to the monsters and daemons of the ancient Greco-Roman mythologies—in his name and his dwelling in a Hell-like dark forest imply that what Shelley had in mind when creating this figure was Satan. However, just like Milton's Satan and the Daemon in "The Daemon of the World," Demogorgon is presented as starkly different from the Satan figure in Christian mythology and Dante's *Inferno*, and slightly different from Milton's Satan. Similar to the Daemon of "The Daemon of the World" he is presented as a magnificent Power that works for the well-being of the earth and, like the Power in "Mont Blanc," that causes the cycle of being in the universe. In the introduction to the poem in *The Oxford Anthology of English Literature*, the suggested meaning 'daemonic' in Demogorgon being accepted, it is said:

> Unlike the Demogorgon of Spenser, Milton, and Coleridge (see his fragment, "Limbo"), Shelley's daemon is not the pagan god of the abyss, but rather the god of skepticism, of our appalled but honest question: "What can we know?" He is a dialectical entity, who governs the turning over of historical cycles, resembling in this the Marxist dialectic of history

> […] He is also a parody of the descent of the Holy Spirit in some Christian accounts of fallen history. (421)

Thus, as Wasserman puts it, he is "the unembodied eternal cause, the primal power infinitely remote from all that is embodied" (289). The function of Demogorgon as personification of a dialectic process overshadows the meaning 'daemonic' suggested by his name. In accordance with the definition above, Demogorgon seems to represent in the poem a dialectic process or the cycle of being that leads to the destruction of the oppressor of mankind and the birth of a new world. As he says to Asia, all things are subject to "Fate, Occasion, Chance, and Change" (II, IV, 119). However, for the dialectic process represented by Demogorgon to take action in the overthrow of Jupiter, the conditions should be ripe. First of all, Jupiter's evil doings and tyranny should become obvious. As she speaks with Demogorgon, Asia states,

> …But who rains down
> Evil, the immedicable plague, which, while
> Man looks on his creation like a God
> And sees that it is glorious, drives him on,
> The wreck of his own will, the scorn of earth,
> The outcast, the abandoned, the alone?
> …while yet his frown shook Heaven, ay, when
> His adversary from adamantine chains
> Cursed him, he trembled like a slave.
> (Act II, Scene IV, 100-8)

Demogorgon answers her saying that "all spirits are enslaved which serve things evil: /Thou knowest if Jupiter be such or no" (II, IV, 111).

The decisive role in ripening the conditions for the overthrow of Jupiter is played by Prometheus. His unbending resistance and ceasing to hate Jupiter have weakened Jupiter's authority:

> And [Prometheus] tamed fire which, like some beast of prey,
> Most terrible, but lovely, played beneath
> The frown of man; and tortured to his will
> Iron and gold, the slaves and signs of power,

And gems and poisons, and all subtlest forms
Hidden beneath the mountains and the waves.
(II, IV, 67-71)

With this resistance, he has "waked the legioned hopes / Which sleep within folded Elysian flowers" and sent love "to bind /The disunited tendrils of that vine / Which bears the wine of life, the human heart" (II, IV, 59-65).

Demogorgon is the only power that can dethrone Jupiter from Heaven and give an end to the tyranny of Heaven over earth. In this regard, Act III presents a turning point in the play in which Jupiter's fall begins and a new world is born. This act opens with the following statements of Jupiter:

Ye congregated powers of heaven, who share
The glory and the strength of him ye serve,
Rejoice! Henceforth I am omnipotent.
All else had been subdued to me;
(Act III, Scene I, 1-4)

However, sensing that the dialectical process is bringing his domination to an end, he says:

The soul of man, like unextinguished fire,
Yet burns towards heaven with fierce reproach, and doubt,
And lamentation and, and reluctant prayer,
Hurling up insurrection, which might make
Our antique empire insecure, though built
On eldest faith, and hell's coeval, fear
(III, I, 5-10)

After a while, the Car of the Hour, which may represent the cycle of time, arrives and announces Demogorgon's coming to take Jupiter with him down to the abyss, his dwelling place. Demogorgon tells Jupiter:

Eternity. Demand no direr name.
Descend, and follow me down the abyss.
I am thy child, as thou wert Saturn's child;

Mightier than thee: and we must dwell together
Henceforth in darkness. Lift thy lightnings not.
The tyranny of Heaven none may retain.
(III, I, 52-57)

When Demogorgon is taken as the embodiment of the Satan figure, his statement that "I am thy child" becomes meaningful in this context and suggests the father and child relationship between Satan and his creator God in the biblical mythology of *Genesis*. On this ground, Shelley can be said to reconstruct the biblical mythology concerning Satan by making Satan, who is God's child and is categorized as profane in the Christian conception, as sacred and a victor over his father, and by making God, who should be sacred in the Christian conception, as the father of evil. Demogorgon is also presented as the protector of mankind and provider of justice.

With these statements, a strife that "[shakes] the solid stars" breaks between the two divinities and subsequently they begin to fall from Heaven into the abyss of the earth. The whole universe is shaken with the sound of the fall; as the Spirit of Earth says, the sound is so loud that it shakes "the towers amid the moonlights" (III, III, 54-55) and "all the inhabitants [leaps] suddenly /Out of their rest, and [gather] into the streets, /Looking in wonder up to Heaven" (III, III, 58-60). As he falls from Heaven, Jupiter, becoming pitiful, cries for help: "Mercy! Mercy! /No pity, no release, no respite" (III, I, 62-3). Knowing that his real destroyer is not Demogorgon but Prometheus, he exclaims: "thou wouldst make mine enemy my judge, /Even where he hangs, seared by my long revenge, /…he would not doom me thus" (III, I, 64-6). He states, "like a cloud, mine enemy above /Darkens my fall with victory" (III, II, 82-3). As he sinks "dizzily down, ever, forever, down," his authority gets lost and "the elements" previously under his control begin to obey him not (III, I, 80-1).

The punishment of Prometheus, according to the *rationale* of the poem, brought about the end of the Golden Saturnian Age and the division of the universe into Heaven, Hell and Earth. As she speaks with Demogorgon,

reminiscent of Vico, Rousseau, Herder, Wordsworth and Shelley's views of primitive life, Asia says: "There was the Heaven and the Earth at first," which suggests that in the Golden Saturnian Age of the Titans and before Prometheus's captivity, Earth and Heaven were one. However, after Jupiter separated Heaven from Earth, she continues,

> … on the race of man
> First famine, and then toil, and then decease,
> Strife, wounds, and ghastly death unseen before,
> Fell, and the unseasonable seasons drove
> With alternating shafts of frost and fire,
> Their shelterless, pale tribes to mountain caves:
> (II, IV, 49-54)

The change that is said here to have occurred on Earth after Jupiter came to power is in accordance with the Greek myth, for which the Golden Age ended with Jupiter's reign. Similarly, towards the beginning of the play, the Earth Mother tells Prometheus that before all the beings inhabiting her were silenced by God (Jupiter), she was heavenly. However, reminiscent of Vico's view of the Deluge and its consequences on Earth, and of Rousseau, Herder, Wordsworth's ideas of civilized life, she states that when the Tyrant's thunder chained him (Prometheus) in his prison-house and separated Heaven from Earth

> …The sea
> Was lifted by strange tempest, and new fire
> From earthquake-rifted mountains of bright snow
> Shook its portentous hair beneath Heaven's frown;
> Lightning and Inundation vexed the plains;
> Blue thistles bloomed in cities; foodless toads
> Within voluptuous chambers panting crawled:
> When Plague had fallen on man, and beast, and worm,
> And Famine; black blight on herb and tree;
> And in the corn, and vines, and meadow grass,
> Teemed ineradicable poisonous weeds
> Draining their growth, for my wan breast was dry
> With grief; and the thin air, my breath was stained
> With the contagion of a mother's hate
> Breathed on her child's destroyer;…

(166-79)

The nature in which Prometheus and Asia, "that lovely twain" (Act II, Scene II, 1), experienced their joyous and unspoiled love under the bright eye of heaven before has become now a dark forest intermingled with Rocks and Caverns so that it is "curtained from Heaven's wide blue; /Nor sun, nor moon, nor wind, nor rain /Can pierce its interwoven bowers" (II, II, 4-6).

As soon as the tyranny of Heaven over earth is given an end by Demogorgon and Prometheus is at last restored to his original place, there begin rebirth and renovation on earth; "the renovation of Earth is represented in terms of a return to an eternal spring [of the Golden Age of both Greek myth and biblical mythology]" (Wasserman 264). Through the Earth's "withered, old, and icy frame /The warmth of an immortal youth shoots down /Circling," and "in mild variety the seasons mild" clothe the entire world with "ever-living leaves, and fruits, and flowers" (III, III, 88-90, 115, 123). Everything that oppressed man before and put limitations on his freedom is destroyed. "Thrones [become] kingless" (III, III, 131) and such means of tyranny and oppression as "thrones, altars, judgment-seats, and prisons" and such things created by "wretched men" as swords, scepters, tiaras, chains, and "tomes of reasoned wrong" have become ghosts of "no-more-remembered fame" (III, III, 164-9). As "thrones [become] kingless," the distinctions created by authority among men that made men hate each other and live without human love and freedom no longer exist:

> …men walked
> One with the other even as spirits do,
> None fawned, none trampled; hate, disdain, or fear,
> Self-love or self-contempt, on human brows
> No more inscribed …
> …
> None frowned, none trembled, none with eager fear
> Gazed on another's eye of cold command.
> (III, III, 131-8)

With Jupiter's fall, the "loathsome mask" that made men fall apart "has fallen" and man has become "scepterless, free, uncircumscribed…Equal, unclassed, tribeless, and nationless, /Exempt from awe, worship, degree, the king /Over himself" (III, III, 193-7). This change is crowned with the re-establishment of the old unity of Heaven and earth that was spoiled with the tyranny of Jupiter and punishment of Prometheus, which may symbolically suggest the fall of man, Satan's exile from Heaven and the division of the universe into heaven, earth, and hell. With Jupiter's fall from Heaven, heaven and earth become one; earth becomes heavenly and heaven earthly. As Panthea says, the veil that hid earth from the light of Heaven is removed with the fall of Jupiter and all earth gets overwhelmed with a dazzling light. The sun rays, like "swords of azure fire, or golden spears…overtwined," and "vast beams like spokes of some invisible wheel /which whirls as the orb whirls" fill "the abyss with sun-like lightnings" (Act IV, I, 271-6). This fall of light on earth, Panthea says, makes "heaven and earth united" (IV, I, 273).

It can be concluded from the statements above that there is an underlying criticism of institutionalized Christian thinking and its conception of life in the poem. As can also be seen in "The Daemon of the World," for Shelley, it is the established Church and its state apparatuses that divided Earth from Heaven and caused the wars, strife, famine and destruction in the world of man. When handled from this angle, Jupiter and his reign in Heaven can be interpreted as the allegory of "Custom, and Faith, and Power" that oppresses and draughts the life of man.

Thus, following the line of his predecessor mythographers, Shelley reconstructs the Prometheus myth in *Prometheus Unbound* by making Prometheus not only a fighter against tyranny but also a metaphor through which he presents his idea of religion and authority. In this respect, he re-writes the story of *Genesis* in Christian mythology by reconstructing the traditional sacred-profane categorization in this mythology. He also re-creates the myth by making Prometheus, just like the Daemon in "The Daemon of the World," the founder of a new world where the division of mind from the body and heaven from earth no

longer exist and in which the famine, draught and extremes of hot and cold of the old world are replaced with eternal spring and fecundity.

4.3 Immobility, Beauty, Truth and History in Keats' *Hyperion: A Fragment*

In Keats' first *Hyperion: A Fragment* (1818-9), the object of mythopoeia is this time another Titan, Hyperion, and the subject matter is again the Titans' war with the Olympians and their eventual fall. In *Hyperion: A Fragment*, Keats chose his subject from Greek mythology and based it on Hesiod's *Theogony*, the events of the cosmogony in which the Olympians overthrow their parental generation, the race of the Titans. According to Brotemarkle, in addition to Hesiod, Keats also borrows from Baldwin's *Pantheon*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Davies' *Celtic Researches* and Leyden's *Auctores Mythographi Latini* (27). Very little is told on Hyperion either in Greek mythology or in related texts. He is the Titan Sun-god, the son of Gaia (Earth) and Uranus (Sky), and, as a result of his marriage with his sister Theia, he is the father of Helios (Sun), Selene (Moon) and Eos (Dawn). In Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the sun god is called *Helios Hyperion*, 'Sun High-one.' But in the *Odyssey*, Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* the Sun is once in each work called *Hyperonides* 'son of Hyperion' and Hesiod certainly imagines Hyperion as a separate being in other places. In later Greek literature *Hyperion* is always distinguished from *Helios*. Hyperion plays virtually no role in Greek cult and little role in mythology, save in lists of the twelve Titans. Keats's poem is based on the *Titanomachia*, an epic in Greek mythology relating the War of the Titans, which tells of the despair of the Titans after the victory of the Olympians. What concerns this study is that Keats re-creates the myth by inserting in it Miltonic and Shakespearean elements and making it a wholly Keatsian one dealing with the importance of Beauty and art in social progress and with transience, sadness, suffering and melancholy as basic elements of life in nature. He also recreates the myth by highlighting the Hyperion figure among the Titans and making him the central character of the poem.

In Book I of *Hyperion: A Fragment* the poet introduces two principal Titans, Saturn and Hyperion, and describes Saturn's malaise caused by his dethronement by the Olympians and Hyperion's sadness and melancholy caused with the fear of confronting a similar fate. The poem opens with the aged and still Saturn sitting in silent depression in a secluded vale:

> Deep in the shady sadness of a vale
> Far sunken from the healthy breath of morn,
> Far from the fiery noon, and eve's one star,
> Sat gray-hair'd Saturn, quite as a stone,
> Still as the silence round about his lair;
> Forest on forest hung about his head
> Like cloud on cloud. No stir of air was there,
> Not so much life as on a summer's day
> Robs not one light seed from the feather'd grass,
> But where the dead leaf fell, there did it rest.
> (I, 1-10)

Thea, the wife of the sun-God Hyperion, comes to comfort him, but herself weeps, placing her hand on "that aching spot /Where beats the human heart" (42-3). "As when, upon a tranced summer-night, /Those two senators of mighty woods/…/Dream, and so dream all night without a stir" (72-5). And "still these two were postured motionless, /Like natural sculpture in cathedral cavern; /The frozen God still couchant on the earth, /And the sad Goddess weeping at his feet" (85-8).

As can be observed in the lines cited above, the Keatsian elements exist from the very beginning of the poem. To begin with, a sense of sadness and melancholy pervades the whole opening scene. Another important Keatsian element is that the whole of nature is in a trance and seems to be frozen. As Aske puts it, at the heart of Keats's myth-reconstruction in the poem lies "a desire to load every rift of the epic subject with the sculptured plenitude of a monumental style (96). In a statuesque and sculptural manner, Saturn is presented as 'grey hair'd' and like a stone; silence and immobility dominates the whole place, and the two divinities sit as still as statues. When this is taken together with the sculptural

aspects presented in the following parts of the poem, the poem can be said, like "Ode to a Grecian Urn," to be about art and instead of concerning itself with the myth, it uses myth to draw attention in a self-reflexive way to its own nature as art. There is also a Miltonic analogy in the scene because, just like Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the poem opens with a fallen divinity in a dark setting. However, instead of the rebellious and active Satan devising strategies for revolt, there is in Keats' poem 'a frozen God' who has no hope of getting out of his fallen situation.

Among the Titans, only Hyperion has not yet fallen: "His sov'reignty, and rule, and majesty;-/Blazing Hyperion on his orbed fire/Still sat, still snuffed the incense" (I, 165-7). When he completes the day and disappears in the west to have his "rest divine upon exalted couch and slumber in the arms of melody/…/His winged minions in close clusters stood, / Amazed and full of fear" (192-7). However, even though he is great and still powerful, he is overpowered by feelings of sadness and melancholy because he feels "unsecure" (168). Thus,

> …when he would taste the spicy wreaths
> Of incense, breath'd aloft from sacred hills,
> Instead of sweets, his ample palate took
> Savour of poisonous brass and metal sick:
> (I, 186-9)

What is noteworthy in Hyperion's case is that although with his movement from the east to the west he makes time pass, he feels subjected to the destructive character of time and to the transience of existence in nature. He is so glorious that when he gave a roar, "as if of earthly fire," he "scar'd away the meek ethereal Hours[33]" (215-6). He, "the planet orb of fire," rode each day from the east to the west, "spun round in sable curtaining of clouds" (270-1). The speaker says:

> [He] Glow'd through, and wrought upon the muffling dark
> Sweet-shaped lightnings from the nadir deep
> Up to the zenith,-hieroglyphics old,
> Which sages and keen-eyed astrologers
> Then living on the earth, with labouring thought

[33] Female divinities in Greek mythology who presided over the changes of the seasons.

Won from the gaze of many centuries:
Now lost, save what we find on remnants huge
Of stone, or marble swart; their import gone,
Their wisdom long since fled…
(I, 274-83)

Although Hyperion is the cause of time and change, he cannot stop them:

…the dazzling globe maintain'd eclipse,
Awaiting for Hyperion's command.
Fain would he have commanded, fain took throne
And bid the day begin, if but for change.
He might not:- No, though a primeval God:
The sacred seasons might not be disturb'd.
(I, 288-93)

His inability to exert authority on time and change and his being, like Saturn, subject to them increase his senses of woe and suffering:

… the bright Titan, phrenzied with new woes,
Unus'd to bend, by hard compulsion bent
His spirit to the sorrow of the time;
And all along a dismal rack of clouds,
Upon the boundaries of day and night,
He stretched himself in grief and radiance faint.
(I, 299-304)

As can be observed in the lines above, Hyperion, about whom Greek mythology only relates that he is the Titan Sun-god and has participated in the war with the Olympians, becomes here a wholly Keatsian character that suffers from feelings of sadness, melancholy, and the destructive effects of time and change. Also, although it is not mentioned in Greek mythology and related texts that he stayed in power though other Titans fell, Keats preserves Hyperion's authority in the first book in contrast to the fallen Titans. However, like the other Titans, he, too, is subject to dethronement. And what is worse, he and the other Titans can not get rid of their sufferings by dying since they are immortal; when they fall, they are fated, as Hyperion's father Coelus explains, to exist only as voice, to live "the

life of winds and tides," and thus to have an "ethereal presence" (I, 340-1). As in "Fairy Lands Forlorn" Patricia Parker states, although the poem is planned to be in Miltonic epic form, the fact that even the greatest gods become impotent in time and that even the God still in power suffers from feelings of sadness and melancholy make the poem more Shakespearean than Miltonic (Parker 109).

Book II of *Hyperion: A Fragment* opens with the arrival of Saturn and Thea at the dark place where the deposed Titans are mourning their loss, surrounded by waterfalls and huge cliffs. Just like the presentation of Saturn and Thea in the beginning of the poem, also the other fallen Titans are presented as stone-like, numbed, and overpowered by feelings of woe and melancholy. They and the objects of nature in their dwelling seem to slumber. Analogous to the place where Satan and his comrades meet in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the place they inhabit is "a den where no insulting light/ Could glimmer on their tears" (II, 5-6). Around them are "crag jutting forth to crag, and rocks that [seem]/ Ever as if just rising from sleep" (10-1). Instead of thrones, they sit upon "hard flint." They are "scarce images of life, one here, one there,/ Lay vast and edgeways; like a dismal cirque/ Of Druid stones, upon a forlorn moor" (33-5). With the column pieces, statues, figures and stones around them, they seem to be surrounded with ruins of their own empire. As Aske puts it, "Hyperion endeavors to monumentalize the gigantic strength of the ancient fictions, but Keats's view of antiquity becomes increasingly clouded by the fictions themselves, which emerge as ruins and fragments of a landscape on the verge of perishing and dissolving into an abyss" (97). Through the blanket of darkness that veils them in this abyss, no light of heaven could peep; "the Heaven itself, is blinded throughout night./ Each one kept shroud, nor to his neighbour gave/ Or word, or look, or action of despair" (38-40). Creüs is "sank and pined;" in Iäpetus' grasp, there is "a serpent's plashy neck; its barbed tongue/ Squeezed from the gorge, and all its uncurl'd length/ Dead; and because the creature could not spit/ Its poison in the eyes conquering Jove" (44-8); and Asia's face is "dusky" (56). Apart from these, there are also "in the fallen tribe" Atlas, Phorcus, Enceladus, Oceanus, Clymene, Tethys and others.

The representation of the fallen Titans as stony figures exemplifies, like the opening scene, the statuesque and sculptural aspects of the poem. According to Richard Woodhouse, the poem "is that in poetry which the Elgin and Egyptian Marbles are in sculpture;" likewise, De Quincey imagined the poem representing "the majesty, the austere beauty, and the simplicity of a Grecian temple enriched with Grecian sculpture" (qtd. in Aske 84). For Parker,

> [*Hyperion*'s] opening picture of Saturn sitting "quiet as stone" is joined by the description of Thea and the aged king "postured motionless,/ Like natural sculpture in cathedral cavern" and, later, of the council of fallen Titans as "dismal cirque/ Of Druid stones upon a forlorn moor." This sculptural positioning is part of what Geoffrey Hartman has called Keats' 'picture envy,' his fascination with 'shaped and palpable gods.' (114)

In this regard, the poem can be said to draw attention to its own artfulness or literariness because with the representation of the Titans, Keats presents his idea of art and beauty. However, this beauty, as the sculptural aspects also symbolize, is fixed and represents the spiritual fixity of the Titans. For Wetson, "Saturn, the disposed man of power, flounders when progress overtakes him, and becomes a victim of suffering" (107). While Saturn discusses strategy with "the fallen divinities,"[34] this situation of the Titans is defined by Oceanus, who "puts forward a stoically optimistic reading of history" (O'Neil 157). He argues, "we fall by course of Nature's law, not force /Of thunder, or of Jove" (181-2). The pain of truth is, he says, that life involves change, which no one can resist: "So on our heels a fresh perfection treads, / A power more strong in beauty, born of us/ And fated to excel us" (212-14). Making beauty the sole truth of life, he continues as:

> "…Shall the tree be envious of the dove
> "Because it cooeth, and hath snowy wings
> "To wander wherewithal and find its joys?
> "We are such forest-trees, and our boughs

[34] The fact that Satan and his friends are also fallen divinities and that Satan discusses strategy with his comrades in Milton's poem indicate the parallelism between *Paradise Lost* and *Hyperion*. In a letter he writes to a friend, Keats states that he abandoned *Hyperion* because there were many Miltonic inversions in it.

"Have bred forth, not pale solitary doves,
"But eagles golden feather'd, who do tower
"Above us in their beauty, and must reign
"In right thereof; for 'it's the eternal law
"That first in beauty should be first in might:
(221-9)

Keats thought that "what the imagination seizes as Beauty must be truth—whether it existed before or not" (qtd. in Waldoff 183). In a letter to Benjamin Robert Haydon in 1818, he wrote "the sense of Beauty…obliterates all consideration" (185). Oceanus ends his speech with what can be seen as the motto of not only this poem but also of "Ode on a Grecian Urn": "Beauty is truth, truth beauty." Thus, Oceanus' idea that "that first in beauty should be first in might" not only represents Keats' idea of art and life but also presents his view of history because he explains the fall of the Titans, which can be taken as symbolizing the fall from power of any group or nation in history, with their being less beautiful and thus less mighty than the Olympians. According to this view, the only way to be mighty and stay in history is to be beautiful, and if a group of people or nation in power loses their beauty in time, they will inevitable be displaced by more beautiful ones. Centering beauty in historical evolution, keeping in mind Ricoeur's idea of history that has been presented in the theoretical framework of this study, suggests how history is a 'construct' of the predicative imagination of its writer or teller. As Herder claims, "what might properly be called history" is precisely the *writing* of history (qtd. in Aske 82). Thus, it can be said that by reconstructing the Greek mythology concerning Hyperion and the fall of the Titans Keats elaborates on this idea of beauty and, intentional or not, presents it as the key principle of all historical evolution and social progress.

This idea of beauty, truth, and historical evolution that seems to be the central theme of the poem is further defended by Oceanus' daughter Clymene. Reminiscent of *Endymion*'s core idea (which will be studied in the following part of this chapter) that "a thing of beauty is a joy forever" and that where there is no beauty there is also no joy, Clymene says that "joy is gone, /And this thing woe

crept in among our hearts" because beauty resides with the new generation of gods (254-5). She then speaks of her feelings on hearing an enchanting melody, which made her "sick/ Of joy and grief at once," and which was sung by the new god of song (and poetry) Apollo. She states that she tried to sing a melody similar to that of Apollo but she could not. As she tries to sing, a new blissful melody comes from Apollo:

> "A living death was in each gush of sounds,
> "Each family of rapturous hurried notes,
> "That fell, one after one, yet all at once,
> "Like pearl beads dropping sudden from their strings:
> (II, 281-4)

Clymene suggests that it is because he is first in beauty that Apollo is first in might. However, the "living death" in "each gush of sounds" in Apollo's song indicates that even such new generation divinities as Apollo are not free of feelings of woe, sadness and melancholy in Keats' poetic imagination.

Enceladus, on the other hand, criticizing Oceanus and Clymene's cowardice and discouraging speeches, proposes that they should fight against the Olympians and exclaims that Hyperion is there to help them. All of a sudden Hyperion appears and sheds a gleam of light on each face:

> … a splendour, like the morn,
> Pervaded all the beetling gloomy steps,
> All the sad spaces of oblivion,
> And every gulf, and every chasm old,
> And every height, and every sullen depth,
> Voiceless, or hoarse with loud tormented streams:
> …
> Now saw the light and made it terrible.
> It was Hyperion-
> (II, 357-67)

However, Hyperion, too, is melancholic. In "midst of his own brightness," he "sighs, too, as mournful as Mamnon's harp/ He utter'd, while his hands contemplative/ He pressed together, and in silence stood" (373-78). At sight of

"the dejected King of Day," "[despondence] seiz'd again the fallen Gods/ And many hid their faces from the light" (379-81). For enflaming a passion for revolt among the Titans, Enceladus, Iäptus, Creüs and Phorcus "shouted forth old Saturn's name" (386). And Hyperion "from the peak loud answered, 'Saturn'" (391). However, as Heraclitus says: "By cosmic rule, as day yields night, so winter summer, war peace, plenty famine. All things change;" and so it is impossible to step in the same river twice. Seeming to be aware of the fact that it is impossible to return to the old days, Saturn, "in whose face was no joy," continues to sit as still as a stone (390), without heeding others' efforts of reviving his passion for revolt.

Book III of *Hyperion* seems to be the climactic part of the poem because it elaborates on and illustrates the central theme of the poem, "that first in beauty is first in might." This unfinished book changes the scene to a Greek island where Apollo and only beauty reside. Among the three books of the poem, only this book opens with an invocation to the Muse:

> Thus in alternate uproar and sad peace,
> Amazed were those Titans utterly.
> Leave them, O Muse! O leave them to their woes;
> For thou art weak to sing such tumults dire:
> A solitary sorrow best befits
> Thy lips, and antheming a lonely grief.
> Leave them, O Muse! For thou anon wilt find
> Many a fallen old Divinity
> Wandering in vain about bewildered shores.
> Meanwhile touch piously the Delphic harp,
> And not a wind of heaven but will breathe
> In aid soft warble from the Dorian flute;
> For lo! 'its for the Father of all verse.
> (III, 1-13)

Representing the ideal poet in Keats' understanding, Apollo is solitary and sings his song of grief in loneliness. In contrast to the inferno-like setting the Titans reside in, the setting of Apollo is analogous to the Garden of Eden. Leaving his mother and his twin-sister sleeping in their bower, Apollo

> …in the morning twilight wandered forth

Beside the osiers of a rivulet,
Full ankle-deep in lilies of the vale.
The nightingale had ceas'd and a few stars
Were lingering in the heavens, while the thrush
Began calm-throated. Throughout all the isle
There was no covert, no retired cave
Unhaunted by the murmurous noise of waves.
(III, 33-40)

Listening to the beautiful sound of nature, Apollo "wept, and his bright tears/ Went trickling down the golden bow he held" (42-3). He is approached by Mnemosyne, the goddess of memory and mother of the muses. He tells the goddess that "dark, dark/ And painful oblivion seals [his] eyes." He strives to see why he is so sad until "a melancholy numbs [his] limbs" (86-9). Being the goddess of memory, looking at her face brings him to the sudden realization that "knowledge enormous makes a God of [him]" (113). He realizes that "names, deeds, gray legends, dire events, rebellions, /Majesties, sovran voices, agonies,/ Creations and destroyings, all at once" pour into his mind and deify him (114-8). With this self-realization, he convulsively "die[s] into life" (130), and the true poet is born.

In his letter to Beiley in 1817, Keats wrote: "The imagination may be compared to Adam's dream—he awoke and found it truth" (qtd. in Parker 109). Apollo's self-realization can be likened to his awakening from a dream. With his awakening, he realizes that he suffers from grief and feels melancholic because he has 'enormous knowledge' on the sufferings of all other living beings and suffers with them. He realizes that as a god (or creative poet) his imagination is like a memory or a 'word-hoard' of such woeful things as 'gray legends,' 'dire events,' 'rebellions,' 'Sovran voices,' 'agonies,' and 'destroyings.' Thus, he represents the ideal creative poet in Keats' understanding because he feels the burden of existence, suffers with other living beings—he dies into life—and he is a solitary being, a child of nature creating his poetry among the beauties of nature.

His sadness is not like that of the Titans. As the speaker suggests in his invocation to the Muse, the world of the Titans is one that is full of 'tumults dire.'

The Titans suffer because of their loss of authority, whereas Apollo suffers because other beings suffer. The Muse does not concern herself with the Titans who represent the lower aspects of life but with such sublime and beauteous things as the Delphic harp and the Dorian flute that represent the Father of all verse. Thus, it is because he is first in beauty that Apollo is first in might.

As can be observed in the poem, Keats uses the Hyperion myth to present his idea of art, life and history. With his idea of the primary position of beauty (which is artistic form in modern critical theory) in art and life, Keats presents an early version of formalist theory. Besides, with his idea that "that first in beauty should be first in might" he presents a view of historical evolution based on beauty.

4.4 *Endymion*: "Where Do Beauty and Joy Reside?"

In *Endymion* (1818), Keats elaborates further on the idea of beauty he handles in *Hyperion* and presents it this time, just like "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" and "Ode to a Nightingale," as an aspect of nature concretized with the mediation of poetic imagination. To return to the core discussion of the previous chapter, it has already been said that Keats, Shelley and Wordsworth follow the Greek mythological tradition of animating nature, of seeing spirits in non-animate objects. In *The Pantheon: or Ancient History of the Gods of Greece and Rome* William Godwin states that Greek religion "gave animation and life to all existence: it has its Naiads, Gods of the rivers, its Tritons and Nereids, Gods of the seas, its Satyrs, Fauns and Dryads, Gods of the woods and trees, and its Boreas, Euros, Auster and Zephyr, Gods of the winds" (qtd. in Barnard 51). To express it with Kant's idea of beauty, these poets saw beauty as a consequence of the mind's confrontation with the sublime of nature, and myth-making is the best expression of beauty through which the imagination transforms the object of perception into an alien territory. In *Endymion* Keats re-handles in a much wider context the questions he poses in "Ode to a Nightingale" and "I Stood Tip-Toe Upon a Hill" concerning the origin of beauty and myth, and their interrelation with the mortal and immortal levels of being. However, this time these issues are taken in their

homeland, in the Greek mythological context, and the mythological figure chosen for this aim is Endymion, who is an ideal figure that can represent Keats' ideas of beauty and life and who, with his mythopoeic imagination, presents Keats with the opportunity to recreate this figure not only as a product of Greek mythological thinking but also as a Romantic myth-maker himself.

In Greek mythology, it is said that Endymion was a beautiful youth who fed his flock on Mount Latmos. In *The Classic Myths* C. M. Gayley relates the Endymion myth as follows: One calm, clear night, Diana, the Moon goddess, looked down and saw Endymion sleeping. The cold heart of the virgin goddess was warmed by his surpassing beauty, and she came down to him, kissed him, and watched over him while he slept. When her love was finally discovered by the deities of Olympus, Jupiter gave Endymion a choice between death in any manner that was preferable, or perpetual youth united with perpetual sleep. Endymion chose the latter. He still sleeps in his Carian cave, and still the mistress of the moon slips from her nocturnal course to visit him. She takes care that his fortunes should not suffer by his inactive life; she yields his flock increase, and guarded his sheep and lambs from the wild beasts (124-5). According to Bulfinch, "the story of Endymion has a peculiar charm from the human meaning which it so thinly veils. We see in Endymion the young poet, his fancy and his heart seeking in vain for that which can satisfy them, finding his favorite hour in the quiet moonlight, and nursing there beneath the beams of the bright and silent witness the melancholy and the ardor which consumes him. The story suggests aspiring and poetic love, a life spent more in dreams than in reality, and an early and welcome death (204).

The Endymion figure in Greek mythology presents Keats with the opportunity to develop his ideas of sleep, sadness, melancholy, beauty and love, and to deal with the question of the interrelationship of beauty and love with sleep and with the mortal and immortal levels of being. Although Keats' poem, too, concerns itself with sleep, dream and beauty, Keats reconstructs the Endymion myth by carrying a step further the questions he poses in "I Stood Tip-toe Upon a Hill" and later handles in "Ode to a Nightingale" concerning the origin of beauty

and its relationship with the mortal and immortal realms of being. To remember, in "Ode to a Nightingale" the speaker seeks the origin of beauty in the immortal realm of the nightingale and expresses his wish to get united with the dream world of the bird and get rid of the prison-house of mortality. However, in the end he awakens from his dream and comes to realize that all his imaginings about the nightingale have only been a dream. What drove him to mythologize in this way is only the surpassing beauty of the bird's song. Likewise, in "I Stood Tip-toe Upon a Hill" the speaker more openly presents that the origin of beauty is nature. Nature becomes beauty, or to put more rightly, mythology with the intervention of poetic imagination. Sleep, according to the rationale of the two poems, is a means of escape for the imaginative individual who seeks beauty in the netherworld of dream. *Endymion* can be seen as a poem in which Keats handles the issues he previously elaborated on "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" and later in "Ode to a Nightingale" proposing that beauty lies in the material world and that it is concretized with the participation of another interlocutor, that is, imagination.

Endymion is divided into four books, each approximately 1,000 lines long. In *Book I* Endymion is set apart from his Latmian people by the "cankering venom" (I, 396) caused by his dream of a heavenly goddess, that is, the moon goddess Diana who has left him dissatisfied with reality. To attain his dream of ideal love, Endymion is first initiated into the mysteries of the heavens (Book I), then into those of the earth (Book II) and those of the sea (Book III). And in the final book he is returned to earth, where he meets a mortal Indian Maid, instantly falls in love with her and has to choose between actual earthly love and his dreams.

In the poem, Keats recreates the Endymion myth by making Endymion a sad and melancholic Romantic poet (like Keats) who concerns himself with actual love and beauty, and who thinks at first that beauty and real love lie in the immortal realm of dream and can save him from the prison-house of mortality but later comes to realize that they should be sought on earth because nature is the originator of all beauties. In this respect, as J. Barnars claims, "*Endymion*'s mythological figures and inset stories are vehicles for Keats's exploration of

beauty and truth, and an attempt to recreate…the 'beautiful mythology' the Greeks had drawn from nature" (51). As he draws beauties from nature, Endymion, like the speakers of "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" and "Ode to a Nightingale," gets intoxicated and sleepy with those beauties and creates myths in his dream world out of them. The poem opens with what can be seen as the motto of the rationale of the poem: "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever." In the following statements, the speaker details his meaning and prevents the reader from falling into the false impression that such beauty should be sought not on earth but elsewhere by suggesting that beauty is in nature, though civilized society and its deteriorative effects are great threats for it; it is through the beauty of nature that a human being becomes joyful and forgets about the negative effects of civilized life and mortality. A "flowery band" in nature can "bind us to the earth" in spite of "despondence, of the inhuman dearth /Of noble natures, of the gloomy days, /Of all the unhealthy and o'er-darken'd ways" (I, 7-10). Some "shape of beauty," the speaker says, such as "the sun, the moon /Trees old and young, sprouting a shady boon /For simple sheep," can move away "the pall /From our dark spirits" (I, 12-15). Such beauty is also the source of myth, the origin of "the grandour of the dooms /We have imagined for the mighty dead" (I, 20-1); it is "an endless fountain of immortal drink, /Pouring unto us from the heaven's brink;" it is through which humanity created "all lovely tales that we have heard and read" (I, 22-4). These images and tales stay with us; they "haunt us till they become a cheering light / Unto our souls" (30, 31). Thus, we are bound to earth, for the speaker, despite its evils and shortcomings, by the human imagination's searching of the natural world. Throughout *Endymion*, Keats sees the role of the poet in the same terms as he had in "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill." The truths contained in the natural world remain immanent until an individual human imagination makes them apprehensible through poetry. Poetry is an inherent aspect of nature for the poem; a story is told

> …by a cavern wind unto a forest old;
> And then the forest told it in a dream
> To a sleeping lake, whose cool and level gleam

A poet caught as he was journeying
To Phoebus' shrine; and in it he did fling
His weary limbs, bathing an hour's space,
And after, straight in that inspired place
He sang the story up into the air,
Giving it universal freedom.
(II, 831-9)

However, Endymion, at this stage of the poem, seeks beauty not in nature but elsewhere, in the immortal heavenly realm he has created with his iconic imagination in his dream world. The poem begins with a gathering of the shepherds and shepherdesses around the altar of Pan, the ancient Greek god of shepherds and flocks, to pray to him. Everybody is joyful and takes the pleasure of the beauty of the spring time. As the youths sing and dance "to weariness" (I, 321), the elder men, who are "ripe for high contemplating" (355), sit and talk about how life would be like in the shades of Elysium. However, Endymion, the lord of shepherds, like the speaker of "Ode to a Nightingale," is in a trancelike state, his "eyelids curtain'd up their jewels dim" and striving "to hide the cankering venom, that [has] riven /His fainting recollections" (I, 394-7). His senses having "swoon'd off" (I, 398), he keeps "in the self-same fixéd trance," like one "who on the earth had never stept, /Ay, even as dead-still as a marble man, /Frozen in that old tale Arabian" (I, 403-6).

Myth-making, sleeping and dreaming are simultaneous in the poem because Endymion's myth-making imagination is always at work, either sleeping or awake. The word 'sleeping' should not be taken literally here because Endymion sleeps even when he seems to be awake and dreams or day-dreams throughout the poem. Besides, the act of dreaming is always coincided with myth-making. In *Anatomy of Criticism* Northrop Frye underlines the interconnection between myth and dream stating that myth is a form of dream in verbal communication; the myth "accounts for, and makes communicable, … the dream" (106). For Frye, this interconnection between myth and dream arises from the fact that wish-fulfilment and displacement (two Freudian and Jungian terms) are the core principles of both myth and dream. Dream, like myth, is a form of wish-

fulfilment, “a system of cryptic allusions to the dreamer’s own life, not fully understood by him” (107). Displacement is an important factor both in dream and myth because the object of desire, which is the object of perception in Endymion’s case, is transformed into the alien territory of dream and myth by way of displacement. Thus, in *Endymion*, myth and dream should be taken as faces of the same coin since in both forms the myth-making imagination of the dreaming subject is at work.

Validating Frye’s argument, Endymion’s dreaming life is also a constant act of mythologization which he actualizes by way of displacing objects of perception with the spiritual and alien figures of myth and through which he fulfils his desire of achieving immortal love and escaping from the burdens of mortal life. Thinking that beauty lies in the otherworld of dream, Endymion remains slumberous and in a trance throughout the poem, and creates with his sign-generating imagination visions of wish-fulfillment and escape. The speaker says:

> O magic sleep! O comfortable bird,
> That broodest o’er the troubled sea of the mind
> Till it is hush’d and smooth! O confined
> Restraint! Imprison’d liberty! Great key
> To golden palaces, strange minstrelsy,
> Fountains grotesque, new trees, bespangled caves,
> Echoing grottoes, full of tumbling waves
> And moonlight; ay, to all the mazy world
> Of silvery enchantment –who unfurl’d
> Beneath thy drowsy wing a triple hour,
> But renovates and lives?
>
> (I, 453-63)

The interconnection between dreaming and myth-making can be illustrated with the scene which depicts Endymion’s first encounter with the moon goddess in the first book of the poem. He relates to his sister, Peone, the reason of his malaise stating that when he was wandering once among the beautiful trees, brooks and singing birds of nature in late afternoon, as “the sun unwilling leaves /So dear a picture of his sovereign power/…/When he tightens up the golden rains, / And paces leisurely down amber plains” (I, 447-51), he, feeling that his head got dizzy

and distraught, came to the same tumultuous river his sister has brought him and fell asleep there. He tells his sister:

> …Ah, can I tell
> The enchantment that afterwards befell?
> Yet it was but a dream: yet such a dream
> That never tongue, although it overteem
> With mellow utterance, like a cavern spring,
> Could figure out and to conception bring
> All I beheld and felt.
>
> (I, 572-8)

As he lays and watches the zenith "where the milky way /Among the stars in virgin splendour pours" (I, 579-80) and travels his eye on the sky in the evening fall, he says he saw "the loveliest moon emerge" (I, 592), "with her argent spheres" (I, 593) rolling through the heaven "clear and cloudy" (I, 596). It was so "passionately bright" (I, 594) that it dazzled his soul and enthralled him with her beauty. When he raised his sight upward to "commune" with her orbs, his sight was "quite dazed /By a bright something, sailing down apace" (I, 601-2), making him veil his eyes and face. As the speaker of "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" mythologizes the moon as a goddess wandering in nature at night, here too Endymion mythologizes the moon as a goddess in his dream world because when he opens his eyes, he says, he sees in front of himself a "completed form of all completeness," a "high perfection of all sweetness"(I, 606-7), a woman of surpassing beauty with "golden hair" (609), "locks bright enough to make [him] mad" (613) and with "a paradise of lips and eyes" (618). Then, with feet hovering and her scarf being outblown with the wind, she approaches him "blushing, waning, willing, and afraid /And pressed [him] by the hand" (635-6). As she touches him, he feels he is "upmounted" to the heavens and flew "in that region /Where falling stars dart their artillery forth, /And eagles struggle with the buffeting north" (641-3). He is "lapp'd and lull'd along the dangerous sky" (646). When they leave "journeying nigh," they begin to swoop "into frightful eddies" (647-8). Like the speaker of "Ode to a Nightingale," Endymion gets intoxicated with the excessive beauty of the goddess and with the immortal realm represented

with the goddess to the extent that he kisses "the wooing arms" holding him and thinks that he can give her his "eyes at once to death" and live taking in "draughts of life from the gold fount /Of kind passionate looks" (654-7).

However, in fact, the moon goddess is a product of Endymion's myth-making imagination and his dream world. As he first sees the goddess, someone, probably his sister, says: Endymion, how strange! /Dream within dream" (632-3). And when he finishes telling his sister his experience with the moon goddess, Endymion exclaims: "Why did I dream that sleep o'erpower'd me /In midst of all this heaven…My sweet dream /Fell into nothing –into stupid sleep" (672-3, 677-8). After he is abandoned by his goddess, he says to his sister, "all the pleasant hues of heaven and earth had faded: deepest shades /Were deepest dungeons; heaths and sunny glades /Were full of pestilent light" (691-4). When he sees an "innocent bird /Before [his] heedless steps stirr'd," he beholds in it "a disguised demon, missionéd to knit /[His] soul with under darkness; to entice /[His] stumbling down some monstrous precipice" (I, 698-703). Being an absent referent, as Martin Aske puts it, that "only appears in the text as a faint silver lining on the horizon of consciousness, an elusive promise of 'argent luxuries'" (Aske 62), the moon goddess begins to represent for Endymion the fulfillment of a pleasure that is "oft a visitant" (I, 906). From then on, thinking that he can get united with the moon goddess and achieve true beauty and love only in dream, in other words, supposing that he can fulfill his desires of true love and beauty only in the 'displaced' world of dream, Endymion sleeps and dreams all the time. Like the speaker of "Ode to a Nightingale," the mortal life on earth begins to seem unbearable to him, and he starts to believe that actual beauty, love and happiness can only be found in the immortal realm of dream, in the alien territory of myth. He begins to think that real love, beauty and joy lies in the "clear religion of heaven" (I, 781), in that "which becks /Our ready minds to fellowship divine; till we shine, /Full alchemized, and free of space" (I, 777-80). "An orbéd drop of light" from heaven is real love (I, 805-6). The influence of such a light, he says,

…genders a novel sense
At which we start and fret; till in the end,
Melting into its radiance, we blend,
Mingle, and so become part of it, -
Nor with aught else can our souls interknit
So wingedly: when we combine therewith,
Life's self is nourish'd by its proper pith,
And we are nurtured like a pelican brood.
(I, 808-15)

Thus, his is a love that "shine /Of heaven ambrosial" and "overwing all bounds" (II, 809, 814).

In the second book his dreaming and myth-making mounts to the creation of a fictional world in which he searches for his love in the abyss of the earth, re-actualizing a kind of voyage similar to that of Dante in the *inferno* and those of Odysseus and Aeneas in the underworld. Towards the beginning of this part, Endymion, melancholic and sad for his inability to achieve immortal love and happiness, comes to "a splashing fountain's side," near the mouth of a cavern, and finding himself a covert bed of flowers he flings himself on the grass. Most probably asleep and dreaming, he sees a nymph "uprisen to the breast /In the fountain's pebbly margin, and she [stands] / 'Mong lilies, like the youngest of the brood" (II, 98-100). Then, she vanishes from Endymion's gaze, who "brooded o'er the water in amaze" (II, 132). In search of the nymph (who is Diana that appears to Endymion in the form of a nymph), Endymion dreams that he begins to descend into the abyss of the deep cavern near the fountain. In a way that confirms Frye's idea of myth and dream as wish-fulfillment and that indicates Endymion's wish to die, Endymion descends into the cavern and fulfills "his appetite /To dive into the deepest" (II, 220-1). In the first book, Endymion tells his sister that only his immortal love to Diana preserves him "from the drear abyss /Of death" (I, 904-5). Keeping in mind this statement, the vanishing of the nymph in the scene above seems to have created in Endymion a Nietzchean wish to die, to get lost in the deep abyss of the cavern and forget everything about the existential burden of mortal life. He is even about to die as he attempts to step forth in a wide,

fathomless and dark outlet inside the cavern, when he all of a sudden pulls his paces back, "warming and glowing strong in the belief /Of help from Dian" (II, 299-300).

As he travels in the darkest pit of the earth, Endyimion sees Adonis asleep in a region of the cavern. Adonis's situation mirrors that of Endymion and thus in the Adonis episode Endymion has the opportunity to look upon himself and see his own state. Like Endymion himself, Adonis is fatally ill due to pangs of love and Venus, the love-sick queen weeps over him; a "tremulous shower /heal'd up the wound, and, with a balmy power," his death, just like Endymion, is medicined to a lengthened drowsiness, which Venus has filled with visions and dressed up with luxuries of the imagination (II, 482-5). Then, Endymion sees how Adonis comes to life as soon as he leaves dreaming and begins to embrace the life on earth. Seeing Endymion looking at Adonis, Venus tells him Adonis's story. She tells him that Adonis loved some fair immortal, and that "his embrace /had zoned her through the night" (II, 568-9). She says to Endymion: "one day thou wilt be blest: /So still obey the guiding hand that fends /Thee safely through these wonders for sweet ends" (II, 573-5). When Venus and the other deities leave, Endymion awakes from sleep and sees that "all those visions were o'ergone, and past" (II, 589). However, with Venus's words, he feels "assured /Of happy times, when all he had endured /Would seem a feather to the mighty prize" (II, 590-2).

Towards the end of Book II Endymion's myth-making culminates in his imagining the story of Alpheus, the river god, and the nymph Arethusa upon his hearing the sound of two gushing springs. As in "*Endymion*: 'Petty Paganism' and 'Purgatory Blind'" J. Barnard puts it: "the story of Alpheus, the river god, and the nymph Arethusa, is meant to demonstrate that by the end of Book II Endymion has taken on the powers of the original poets who invented Greco-Roman myths. The episode is a copy-book example of natural beauty providing the ancient poets with the source of 'lovely tales'" (57-8). After he has dreamed of Diana again and thus "swoon'd drunken from pleasure's nipple" (II, 869), Endymion wakes up from his sleep and began to think silently on his immortal love and desolate state. Then,

suddenly, he realizes the "humming tones" of two springs, dashing together swiftly, madly and fantastically round the rocks. At last, they shoot down "from the ceilings height, pouring a noise /As of breathless racers whose hopes poise /Upon the last few steps, and with spent force /Along the ground they [take] a winding course" (II, 923-6). Most probably falling asleep and dreaming again, he mythologizes the gushing springs as Alpheus and Arethusa in Greek mythology, discoursing their love as they flow. Alpheus follows Arethusa, who flies away from him apparently due to Diana's[35] demand of her to keep away from men, and entreats her to "be pitiful to [his] great woe," see how painfully he flows and get united with him. However, Arethusa does not wait and continues to flow, answering him thus:

> Ever since I heedlessly did lave
> In thy deceitful stream, a panting glow
> Grew strong within me; wherefore serve me so,
> And call it love? Alas! 'twas cruelty.
> (II, 969-72)

"Sweet Arethusa," Alpheus replies, "Dian's self must feel /Sometime these very pangs. Dear maiden, steal /Blushing into my soul, and let us fly /These dreary caverns for the open sky" (984-7). Arethusa says:

> What can I do, Alpheus? Dian stands
> Severe before me: persecuting fate!
> Unhappy Arethusa! Thou wast late
> A huntress free in.
> (1005-8)

At this, the two sad streams suddenly fall "adown a fearful dell" (1009). Endymion hears no more the sounds of the discoursing deities, save "echo, faint repeating o'er and o'er /The name of Arethusa" (1011-2). This episode shows how the intervention of human imagination transforms objects of sensual experience into the defamiliarized world of myth and dream.

[35] Diana is told in Grek mythology to be also the goddess of virginity and a huntress goddess.

In the third book, his sign-generating imagination at work, Endymion mythologizes this time in his dream world the sea. Meeting an old fisherman having had a love experience similar to his, Endymion sets out for a voyage on the sea with the old man to save with a magic rod the old man's dear nymph Scylla and the other lovers enshrined in the ocean. Touching the rod on the crystal waves that swallowed up Scylla, Endymion enlivens the nymph and leaves her with the old man to enjoy their re-unification; then he touches the wand all along his way on the sea and thus all who drowned up there are animated, and there arise "a noise of harmony, pulses and throes /Of gladness in the air" (III, 791-2). Those who died there "in mutual arms devout and true /[Spring] to each other madly" (793-4). Having been of use to the lovers enshrined in the ocean, Endymion and the old fisherman

> …tasted a pure wine
> Of happiness, from fairy press oozed out.
> Speechless they eyed each other, and about
> The fair assembly wander'd to and fro,
> Distracted with the richest overflow
> Of joy that ever pour'd from heaven.
> (III, 801-6)

Feeling a new born god of the sea, Endymion goes this time to the undersea with the fisherman and those he animated to pay their piety to the "Neptunus supreme,' the Roman god of the ocean. As they approach Neptune's palace in the undersea, first they see the "diamond gleams and golden glows" around the palace and then its "opal domes…on high /By jasper pillars, letting through their shafts /A blush of coral" (III, 841-3). When they pass through the golden gate of the palace, the thousands led by Endymion veil their eyes from the dazzling sunshine that flashes upon them as soon as they enter. Being swooned from the "hue-golden blaze" of Neptune's gorgeous hall, they unveil their eyes and discern Neptune sitting on his throne of "emerald deep" and at his right hand stands "winged Love, and on /His left [sits] smiling Beauty's paragon" (III, 861, 864-6). Around Neptune's throne flash everywhere "noiseless, sub-marine

cloudlets, glittering /Death to a human eye: for they [do] spring /From natural west, and east, and south, and north, /As light of four sunsets, blazing forth /A gold-green zenith 'bove the Sea-God's head" (III, 874-8). Endymion and others with him stand in dream till Triton, the messenger god of the deep and Neptune's son, blows his horn, upon which the Nereids, who are sea-nymphs, begin to dance and the Syrens to sing. Then, Love "takes wing, and from his pinions shed /On all the multitude a nectarous dew" (III, 891-2). Endymion also sees Venus there, who says to him:

> …Now this is cruel. Since the hour
> I met thee in earth's bosom, all my power
> Have I put forth to serve thee. What, not yet
> Escaped from dull mortality's harsh net?
> (III, 904-7)

When it is accepted that this entire episode takes place in Endymion's dream world, the emphasis in this statement on his mortal state and on his inability to escape "mortality's harsh net" indicates how Endymion's mythical dream world functions as wish-fulfillment. Nevertheless, Endymion sees that he is "far strayed from mortality" there as the palace whirls and makes him giddy (III, 1080). However, showing that the whole episode was his dream, he wakes up and returns to his mortal self and, instead of a paradise-like ocean, "a placid lake /[Comes] to his eyes" (1027-9). When he arises from sleep, it is seen that he begins to take pleasure from the beauty of the sensual world. He realizes that the green forest in front of him is cooler than all the wonder he has seen in the undersea world and it "[Lulls] with its simple song his fluttering breast" (1030-1). He thinks how happy it is to return to his "grassy nest" from the dazzling and giddying dream of the undersea world.

Although the sub-title of the poem is "A Poetic Romance," J. Stillinger claims, "the repudiation of romance and of the reality of visionary experience is the central theme of Keats's poetic development" (In Kern 68). Verifying Stillinger's view, the action takes an unexpected turn in the fourth book and

Endymion begins to see beauty on earth instead of the mythical world of dream. As he thinks of his immortal love and is "offering a hecatomb of vows" to "heaven's airy dome" (IV, 38-9), he hears an Indian Maid's exclamation of woe and loneliness, pleading for a sweet saying from a living soul to "set [her] dull and sadden'd spirit playing" (46), for a hand to toy with hers, for lips to worship and eyelids to twinkle on her bosom because she is "sad and lost" (51). "In swimming search /After some warm delight" (63-4), she sees Endymion and asks him whether he has "a kindred pain" (62) and can bear "a woman's sigh alone and in distress" (55). His attention being drawn from dream to earthly love and beauty by the Indian Maid, Endymion instantly falls in love with her and realizes that earthly love and the beauty in nature can "confound the heavens and the earth in one" and mingle every breath "with the meadow air" (IV, 80-1, 83). Groaning "as one by beauty slain" (98), he says to her:

> O pardon me, for I am full of grief –
> Grief born of thee, young angel! Fairest thief!
> Who stolen hast away the wings wherewith
> I was to top the heavens. Dear maid, sith
> Thou art my executioner…
> …
> Do smile upon the evening of my days;
> And, for my tortured brain begins to craze,
> Be thou my nurse…
> (IV, 108-17)

In the fragmentary and non-sequential structure of the poem, the moon "arises crescented" and Endymion all of a sudden begins to dream that the moon goddess comes to him and sleeps with him. As he kisses and adore her in slumber, "the shadow" of the goddess weeps, and melting away, says to him: "let us no more breathe /This murky phantasm" (465-6). He sees the immateriality of the goddess he has been so long in love with when

> He saw her body fading gaunt and spare
> In the cold moonshine. Straight he seized her wrist;
> It melted from his grasp; her hand he kiss'd,

And, horror! Kiss'd his own
(IV, 507-10)

All of a sudden, he sees that who lies with him is the Indian Maid, not the goddess, and is happy to feel the grass and the solid ground. At this point of the poem, Keats brings Endymion to a full realization that beauty and love are in the material/mortal world and that nature is the originator of all beauties. He tells the maid that "to him /Who lives beyond earth's boundary, grief is dim, /Sorrow is but a shadow" (IV, 619-21). He recognizes that until now what he has experienced is just a dream and is vain; he says: "I have clung /To nothing, loved a nothing, nothing seen /Or felt but a dream" (IV, 636-8). Since he has been living in a dream, he has despised all earthly elements: love, the sky, the tie of mortals to each other, the bloom of flowers, rush of rivers and the tombs of heroes gone. "There never lived a mortal," he says, "who bent /His appetite beyond his natural sphere, /But starved and died" (IV, 646-7). His "sweetest Indian" there, there "I will kneel," he says (648, 49). Thus, farewell to "cloudy phantasms," "caverns lone," "air of visions," "the monstrous swell /Of visionary seas" and to the "daintiest Dream" (651-53, 656). Though his love for the moon is still vast, on earth, he says,

…I may not love thee, and therefore
Doves will I offer up, and sweetest store
All through the teeming year: so thou wilt shine
On me, and on this damsel fair of mine,
And bless our simple lives. My Indian bliss!
(IV, 659-63)

From now on, he will experience his love not in dream, but under "the brow /Of some steep mossy hill," where "dark yew-trees…drop their scarlet-berry cups of dew" (670-1, 673-4). "Honey from out the gnarl'd hive I'II bring," he says, "and apples, wan with sweetness, gather thee" (682-3).

Thus, in *Endymion* Keats presents a certain answer to the origin of beauty and myth by bringing Endymion in the end of the poem to the realization that beauty should not be sought in the netherworld of dream or in an immortal level of

being that is created by the imagination. Beauty, according to the *rationale* of the poem, lies in nature and can only be realized with the intervention of the imagination. Myth, in a sense, can be said to be the result of this realization because, in line with the ancient Greek tradition of animating nature, the myth-making imagination of the perceiver incarnates objects of nature by creating out of them spiritual beings, gods, nymphs, and so on. Keats handles myth and dream until the end of the poem as simultaneous because Endymion completely loses touch with the material world and gets lost in a world of dream as he makes myths. Recovering Endymion's touch with nature in the end, Keats seems to come to the conclusion that myth-making and dream are acceptable as far as one does not lose contact with nature and the mortal level of being.

In *Shelley: A Critical Reading*, as he talks on Shelley's mythopoeia, Wasserman states, "Shelley conceives of the poet not only as assimilator of beautiful mythic forms: inasmuch as he is creative, he is a mythopoeist, not by inventing myths, but by reconstituting the imperfect ones that already exist. His creations are 'beautiful and new, not because the potions of which they are composed had no previous existence in the mind of man or in nature,' but because of 'the whole produced by their combination'" (275). The same is also valid for Keats' idea of myth. In Shelley's and Keats' understanding, Virgil was a great mythographer not in the sense that he created new myths but in the sense that he reconstituted Homer's mythology, handling it in a different light. For instance, Virgil's *Aeneid* is a re-writing of Homer's *Odyssey*. The same is also valid for Miltonic mythology, which can be regarded as a re-writing of Dante's *Divine Comedy*. In this regard, mythology almost always emerges as a re-writing of predecessor mythologies. Taking this fact into consideration, Shelley and Keats are mythopoeists, who, keeping in line with their predecessor mythograhers, create their own mythograghies not by creating new myths but by reconstituting already existing ones. They handle already known myths but reconstruct them to the extent that these myths begin to seen in a completely different light.

In the poems studied in this chapter, Shelley and Keats handle such already known myths as the Daemon in Christian mythology; Lamia, Prometheus, Hyperion and Endymion myths in ancient Greek mythology; and the witch myth in medieval and Reneissance mythical thinkings. However, in each poem studied above, they recreate the myth so that it becomes a totally Shelleyean or Keatsian one. In *Lamia* and "Witch of Atlas," for instance, they recreate the she-monster or *femme fatale* figures prevailing western mythological thinking by making, in sharp contrast to the previous texts having handled the same myths, Lamia a victimized, beautiful and pitiable figure with whom the reader can sympathize and the witch a Hecate-like goddess whose positive features are highlighted. Similarly, in "The Daemon of the World" Shelley recreates the Daemon by reconstructing the Satan figure in Christian and medieval mythologies and in Dante's *Divine Comedy*. In sharp contrast to the Satan figure in previous predecessor mythologies, except for that in Miltonic mythology, Shelley's daemon is presented as a godly figure, in Wasserman's words, as the One Mind encompassing all beings, who is the God of Heaven, Hell and earth and is the founder of a new world. In *Prometheus Unbound* Shelley's founder of the new world is this time Prometheus, who becomes in the poem a political icon, a fighter against oppression and for freedom. Shelley also reconstructs the myth by drawing an analogy between Milton's Satan and Prometheus and thus, like "The Daemon of the World," "The Witch of Atlas," and Lamia, deconstructing the binary logic in traditional mythological thinking that has classified these figures in the category of the profane. In *Hyperion*, on the other hand, Keats uses the Hyperion myth and the war and fall of the Titans in Greek mythology to present his idea of life, beauty and history. What makes Keats' myth-making distinctive in this poem is his presenting a theory of beauty and history, centralizing beauty in historical evolution. In *Endymion* Keats elaborates further on the idea beauty he handles in *Hyperion* but this time developing the core idea of "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill" and coming to the conclusion that beauty should be sought in nature, not in dream, and that myth is a natural result of the imagination's realization of the beauty in nature.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This study has tried so far to indicate that metaphor and myth are indispensable aspects of the poetry of William Wordsworth, Percy Bysshe Shelley and John Keats. In this poetry, metaphor and myth are seen to be different faces of the same coin and are presented as key principles of perception, imagination and artistic creation. It is through its metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination that the subject imbues objects of perception with attributes that are foreign to them and thus defamiliarize them. Relying on Kantian, Romantic and modern Neo-Kantian ideas, the study proposes that metaphor and myth are inherent aspects of the human mind and function in the process of perception as means through which the human imagination gives form to natural phenomena. It can be said that metaphorization, which is shown in this study to be the core principle of myth-making, is an act of seeing similitude in dissimilitude, in Ricoeur's words, to *see* something *as* something else. In the act of metaphorization and mythologization, that is, in the act of drawing similarities between dissimilar elements, the imagination of the subject assimilates, absorbs and re-creates the object of perception to the extent that the object 'diminishes' or is defamiliarized. In other words, the metaphorizing and mythologizing subject, as Cassirer puts it, makes the 'name,' that is, symbolic language (Aristotle defined metaphor as 'name'), "the essence of its object;" Cassirer claims that "the potency of the real thing is contained in its name – that is one of the fundamental assumptions of the mythmaking consciousness itself" (*The Philosophy: Language* p.3). This means that the associative imagination of the perceiving subject removes the subject-

object and metaphorical literal distinctions by dissolving the object in the subject and the literal in the metaphorical in the process of metaphorization and mythologization.

When the use of metaphor and myth in the poems of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keas is studied in the light of the proposition above, it is seen that these poems can be classified into two categories: first, those in which the imagination of the perceiving subject constructs and defamiliarizes objects of perception by endowing them with human, spiritual and ideational characteristics; second, to show how myth is something that is re-created time and again by poetic imagination, those in which the mythopoeic imagination of the poets under consideration handle figures from ancient Greek, Roman, Miltonic or Christian mythologies and re-create them by deconstructing their time-valued semantic contents. In both categories, poetic imagination appears as a formative power that constructs, defamiliarizes and re-creates via mythologization and metaphorization.

When the poems of the first category are analyzed, metaphorization and mythologization are observed to be natural results of the human mind's interaction with nature in the process of perception. As such, in these poems the act of perception becomes for the imagination an act in which natural phenomena are incarnated and imbued with spiritual and sometimes divine features. In these poems, perception and human imagination are, as Keats shows in "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill," the core principles of all mythology, from ancient times up to the present. It is when confronted with the beauties and sublime of nature that "the old sage" created such mythological figures as Psyche, Narcissus, Pan, Diana, and so on.

However, the interaction between poetic imagination and nature appears in different forms in these poems. In some poems, especially in those of Wordsworth, poetic imagination sees 'genii', that are spirits, in objects of nature and mythologizes nature as a feminine figure 'mothering' the poetic imagination of 'her' child/the poet and educating him about the ways of the world. In these poems childhood or primitive life is glorified as the sole phase in human life in which

man is completely united with nature and metaphorization and mythologization are the characterizing aspects of perception. The loss of childhood experience and primitive feelings with the emergence of civilized life, for some of these poems, does not only mean a separation or alienation from the mother-nature but also the loss of the ability of figuration. In Wordsworth's *The Pedlar* it is seen that the pedlar's interaction with nature or his being mothered by her when he was a child developed in him a metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination and taught him the ways of the world. A distinguishing feature in the handling of this issue in *The Pedlar* is that, in it, the early phase of human life in which the mind is mothered by nature is represented as the starting point in the history of imagination, and what the mind acquires from nature during this phase continues to guide it throughout this history. In this regard, *The Pedlar* handles the growth of poetic imagination in philosophical terms indicating the educational implications of the interaction with nature. *The Two-Part Prelude*, too, tells of the growth of poetic imagination with the 'mothering' of nature and represents how poetic imagination develops the act of mythologization and metaphorization in the prime of life. Although in some places the speaker approaches the pastness of childhood with senses of sadness and longing for a lost Eden, he, as in *The Pedlar*, builds his perception of things on childhood experience and thus explains how what he learned in childhood has guided him in his later life. In this regard, a certain continuity is presupposed in the history of imagination because the 'spots of time' of early experience continue their guidance in later life.

In "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" and *Home at Grasmere*, too, Wordsworth animates nature by seeing 'tutelary spirits' in it and by transforming it into a mothering figure nurturing her child and developing in him a faculty of metaphorization and mythologization. However, in these poems a breach is observed to be opened in the history of imagination and of the speaker's living experience due to the entrance of civilization into human life and man's destruction of nature. In these poems childhood experience, which is also associated with primitive life in this context, is recalled with a sense of loss. Being

grown up, according to these poems, represents the loss of primeval feelings, spontaneity and non-charted look at nature. Such sense of loss is the prevalent theme of "Ode: Intimations of Immortality." In this poem, as Paul H. Fry puts it, the poet locates "primitive society or early selfhood in a region that he still calls sacred" (60). This sacred world, according to the speaker, is lost due to the introduction of civilized society and logical thinking into his life. Thus, unlike *The Pedlar* and *The Two-Part Prelude*, in this poem being grown up represents not continuity but discontinuity in experience and the history of imagination.

In *Home at Grasmere*, too, a kind of discontinuity is represented in man's relationship with nature and civilization plays the sinister role of detaching man from his 'mother.' In the poem there is a constant effort on the part of the speaker to get re-united with nature and recover his long-lost contact with her. In terms of the act of mythologization and metaphorization, like the other three poems, in *Home at Grasmere* the speaker is seen to endow objects of nature with tutelary spirits in the act of perception. However, this poem differs from the other poems in that especially towards the end of the poem the act of mythologization becomes much more sophisticated due to references to Miltonic and Spenserian mythologies and, instead of representing the interaction between mind and nature, it moves to the almost atemporal and ahistorical realm of myth.

On the other hand, in Shelley's "Mont Blanc," "Ode to the West Wind" and "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" the poetic imagination of the speakers constructs a transphenomenal presence out of phenomenal beings. In the sign-generating imagination of the speakers objects of perception are made a transcendental and omnipresent 'Power,' or an all-encompassing One Mind through which "the everlasting universe of things /Flows" ("Mont Blanc" 1-2). In "Mont Blanc" the Power residing on the peak of the Mount 'floats' everywhere and is represented as the fountainhead of the flow of life on earth, as both destroyer and regenerator that causes the life cycle on earth. In "Ode to the West Wind" Shelley represents his idea of Power this time with a west wind. The speaker mythologizes the West Wind, like Mont Blanc, as an omnipotent power

that both destroys and regenerates. In "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" this time the "unseen Power" becomes the object of focus and is deified by the poetic imagination so that it becomes, just like Plato's Actual Form, an omni-present being that is both immanent to all beings in nature and transcendental. It floats "among us" and visits "[t]his various world" and "Each human heart and countenance" (2-3, 7).

Mortality and the transience of human life are seen to be two of the most common themes of the poetry of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. The sign-generating imagination of the speaking subject handles these themes, as all others, in mythological and metaphorical terms, by seeing similitude between the phases of human life and the phases of a day or seasons of a year. In accordance with the mythemes theorized by Northrop Frye and James Frazer concerning the mythological meaning of day and seasonal cycles, in some poems morning and spring are connoted with childhood and young age; summer and noon with middle age; autumn and evening with old age; and winter and night with death. In Wordsworth's *An Evening Walk*, Keats' "To Autumn" and Shelley's "Autumn: A Dirge," in a way verifying Frye and Frazer's ideas, phases of the day and the year are made by the metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination to symbolize phases of human life, and mortality, transience and sense of loss are made the characterizing features of this life. In *An Evening Walk*, too, the speaker animates nature by mythologizing it as a mother figure nurturing the poetic imagination of her child and by *seeing* its objects *as* 'tutelary sprits.' The main focus of this poem, too, like *Home at Grasmere* and "Ode: Intimations of Immortality," is mortality, transience, man's alienation from nature, and the sense of loss felt for the lost eden of childhood. However, differently from these poems, in *An Evening Walk* the sense of loss felt for the lost Eden of life (childhood, primitivity, being one with nature) and old age are connoted in the sign-generating imagination of the speaker with evening. In Keats's "To Autumn," the evening of human life is this time represented by poetic imagination with autumn. However, unlike *An Evening Walk* in "To Autumn" nature is mythologized as a goddess, most probably Ceres (the

Roman goddess of corn), lying among her corns and ripe fruits. Autumn, ripeness of nature, the approaching storm of winter are all made in the poem symbols of old age and transience of human life. In Shelley's "Autumn: A Dirge," which can be regarded as a twin poem to Keats's "Ode to Autumn," autumn, as the title suggests, is this time associated with death. The speaker represents autumn as the death of the year and throughout the poem he uses words that strongly connote death.

In Shelley's "To a Skylark" and Keats' "Ode to a Nightingale," on the other hand, the poetic imagination of the speaking subject mythologizes objects of perception for self-transcendence, by re-creating the object as a transcendental and immortal being that can rescue the poet-speaker from the bounds of mortality and transience. In Shelley's "To A Skylark" a skylark is mythologized as a transcendental being that can cause self-transcendence in the poet with the immortal and artistic qualities of its song. Likewise, in Keats' "Ode to a Nightingale" this time a nightingale is represented as the transcendental and immortalizing power of art in contrast to the transience of human life. What distinguishes Keats's poem from "To a Skylark" is that in "Ode to a Nightingale" stillness, stability, sleep and the sense of loss pervade the whole atmosphere of the poem.

In Keats' "Ode on a Grecian Urn" the idea of immortality and permanence is represented this time with the mythologization of an artifact, a Grecian urn. Being an artistic creation, the Grecian urn provides Keats with the opportunity to deal more directly with the ideas of Beauty, immortality, permanence and statuesque stability, which he also elaborates on in the Hyperion poems, *Endymion* and, to a certain extent, in "Ode to a Nightingale." With the statement "Beauty is truth, truth beauty," which can be regarded as the motto of the poem, Keats presents his idea of beauty and makes beauty the core principle of human life.

However, the Romantic poets' interest in mythology is not limited to the creating subject's reconstruction of phenomena in the process of perception. In what can be considered as poems of the second category, they handle figures or mythical elements belonging to ancient Greek, Roman, Miltonic, Christian and

medieval mythologies and, following their ancestor mythographers' tradition of mythopoeia, they create their own mythography by reconstructing these mythical figures and elements. Especially Shelley and Keats, differently from Wordsworth, in some of their poems chose their subject matter directly from ancient Greek and Roman, Spenserian and Miltonic mythologies and they create their own mythographies by changing their time-valued semantic contents. They re-constitute these mythologies by reconstructing the traditional profane and sacred categorization in mythological thinking and/or by making these myths represent their ideas of art, life and history.

Shelley in *The Witch of Atlas* and Keats in *Lamia* recreate the she-daemon and witch myths of ancient mythology and post-Christian Europe by reconstructing their traditional categorization as profane. In *The Witch of Atlas* Shelley reconstructs this binary categorization by recreating the witch concept of Christian mythology and medieval thinking and by situating his witch not in the category of the profane, as is usual, but in the category of the sacred. In sharp contrast to Christian and medieval understanding, the mythopoeic imagination of the poet presents under the title 'witch' a Hecate-like goddess whose positive aspects are highlighted. Thus, with his witch figure Shelley re-enthrones the feminine othe—that was labeled as 'witch' or 'old hag' after Christianity—into her original magnificent position in ancient times.

In Keats' *Lamia* the mythopoeic imagination of the poet recreates the well-known she-daemon of ancient mythology by re-constructing the binary logic of the sacred and profane in Greco-Roman mythologies. In Keats's myth-making imagination, the Lamia myth is stripped of its original semantic content, and she is made a very beautiful, humane and pitiful figure with which the reader can sympathize. In contrast to her representation in ancient Greek mythology and related texts, Lamia appears in Keats'poem not as a victimizer of children and human beings but as a sacrificial lamb victimized both by some grand power and by the collective gaze of Apollonius. She is also made a metaphorical representation of the poet's ideas of art that provides the poet with the opportunity

to discuss art's relation to (enlightenment) philosophy and the threat the logical reasoning of philosophy poses for art.

In *The Daemon of the World* Shelley reconstructs this time the Satan figure of Christian mythology. The Daemon in Shelley's poem is not presented as the bearer of darkness and evil, as he is traditionally expected to do and as coincides with his classification in the category of the profane. Instead, he is represented as 'the bearer of light' and 'dispenser of knowledge,' as the One Mind encompassing all the universe, and as a creator of both Hell and Heaven. Fulfilling his role as the bearer of light and functioning as Shelley's prophesier of a new world, he guides Iantha's spirit to see the real cause of evil in the world and instructs her that the division of the universe into Hell and Heaven, which were one in the Golden Age, by "Power, and Custom, and Faith" is the real cause of evil in the world. Not only the concept of the Daemon but also the concepts of Heaven and Hell are also re-constructed in the poem. Heaven and Hell are presented as one, two contrastive aspects of the one life. Rejecting the binary logic that has set oppositions between what in essence should be one, Shelley, using the Daemon as his mouthpiece, prophesizes a world in which life is unified and man is no longer a slave to authority and prescribed concepts.

In *Prometheus Unbound* Shelley reconstructs the Prometheus myth by recreating Prometheus as a political icon against tyranny and oppression and as a founder of a new world. By drawing an analogy between Prometheus and Satan and Jupiter and God, he also re-writes the story of *Genesis* in the Christian mythology by making God the oppressor of mankind and the cause of evil on earth and Satan the savior of mankind and the agent that will save earth from imprisonment. According to the *rationale* of the poem, with Jupiter's coming to power the Golden Saturnian Age ended and heaven was separated from earth. Afterwards, similar to Vico's definition of the post-Deluge situation of the earth, famine, draught, starvation, and strife among men began to exist on earth and the permanent spring of the Golden Age was replaced with extremes of hot in summer and cold in winter. In the end of the poem the Golden Age is restored and heaven

and earth are once again united with Jupiter's fall from heaven. When taken as a re-writing of the story of *Genesis*, this comes to mean that in Shelley's understanding the Edenic world of the Golden Age can be restored only when people give end to such divisions as Heaven and Hell and God and Satan in their conceptual worlds created by "custom, faith and power" and begin to conceive the world in its totality, without dividing it into conflicting parts. In this regard, *Prometheus Unbound* bears close resemblance to *The Daemon of the World*.

Keats, on the other hand, reconstitutes the Hyperion myth in *Hyperion: A Fragment* to present his ideas of life, art, beauty and historical evolution. Inserting in the poem Miltonic and Shakespearean elements, Keats makes the Hyperion myth a wholly Keatsian one dealing with the importance of Beauty and art in social progress and with transience, sadness, suffering and melancholy as basic elements of human life. Oceanus's statements that "Beauty is truth, truth beauty" and "that first in beauty should be first in might" represent not only Keats' idea of art and life but also present his view of history. Thus, it can be said that Keats recreates the Greek mythology concerning Hyperion and the fall of the Titans by elaborating on this idea of beauty and presenting it, intentional or not, as the key principle of all historical evolution and social progress.

In *Endymion* Keats elaborates further on the idea of beauty he handles in *Hyperion* and presents it this time, just like "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill," as an aspect of nature that can only be realized with the intervention of poetic imagination. Developing the core idea of "I Stood Tip-Toe upon a Hill," Keats brings Endymion to the conclusion that beauty should be sought in nature, not in dream, and that myth is the result of imagination's realization of this beauty because, in line with the ancient Greek tradition of animating nature, the myth-making imagination of the perceiver incarnates objects of nature by creating out of them spiritual beings, gods, nymphs, and so on.

As seen, the mythopoeic imagination of the creating subject appears in all of these poems as a formative power that constructs, modifies and recreates both objects of perception and ancient myths. In the poems of the first category, the

metaphorizing and mythologizing imagination, verifying the Kantian, Romantic and modern Neo-Kantian theories handled in the theoretical framework of this study, gives form to natural phenomena by seeing resemblance in what actually are dissimilar, by *seeing* objects of perception *as* animate, spiritual and divine beings. It also mythologizes in the process of perception by working on already existing mythemes that connote spring and morning with childhood and youth, summer and noon with adult age, autumn and evening with old age and night and winter with death. Although the ways followed and the mythemes employed in the acts of mythologization and metaphorization vary from poem to poem, the perceiving subject emerges as a modifying power in all these poems that subsumes the object to the act of manipulation and dissolves the literal in the imaginative and metaphorical processing of phenomena.

In the poems of the second category, instead of objects of nature, this time predecessor myths are modified and re-created by the mythopoeic imagination of the subject. Myths that have always been conceived in the category of the profane are reconstructed in these poems so that the main figures of these myths become sacred, sublime and beautiful. The poets under consideration reconstitute these myths also to present their ideas of life, art, social progress and history. In sum, it can be said that in all of the poems studied in this thesis, the subject and its imagination emerge as the determiner of meaning and the shaper of objects of perception. Myth and metaphor are inborn aspects of this process. Metaphorization and mythologization are seen to be the main modes of expression for the subject in its act of modification. Such metaphorization, of course, takes place on the discourse level because, due to the working of the imagination in connotative and associative way in this process, all language becomes metaphorical.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, M.H.. *The Correspondent Breeze: Essays on English Romanticism*. New York and London: W.W. Norton&Company, 1984.

---. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

---. "Wordsworth's Long Journey Home." *William Wordsworth's The Prelude*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986

Aske, M. *Keats and Hellenism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Austin, F. *The Language of Wordsworth and Coleridge*. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Barnard, J. "*Endymion*: 'Pretty Paganism' and 'Purgatory Blind.'" *Critical Essays on John Keats*. Ed. Hermione de Almeida. Boston and Massachusetts: G. K. Hall &Co., 1989. 47-67.

Barth, Robert J, S.J. "Coleridge's Scriptural Imagination." *Coleridge, Keats and Imagination*. Eds. R. Barth and J. L.Mahoney. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1990. 135-42.

Beardsley, M. C. "The Metaphorical Twist." *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor.* 1962. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 105- 122.

Black, M. "Metaphor." *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor.* 1954-1955. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 63-82.

Bloom, Harold. "Introduction." *William Wordsworth's The Prelude*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986.

Booth, W. C. "Metaphor as Rhetoric: the Problem of Evaluation." *On Metaphor*. Ed. S. Sacks. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 47-70.

Bowra, M. *The Romantic Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Brook, A. *Kant and the Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Brotemarkle, D. *Imagination and Myths in John Keats's Poetry*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1993

Bulfinch, T. *The Age of Fable or Stories of Gods and Heroes*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company Publishers, 1913.

Cassirer, E. *Rousseau, Kant and Goethe*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963.

---. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms: Language* Vol. I. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1953.

--- *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms: Mythical Thought* Vol. II. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Caygill, H. *A Kant Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

Cohen, T. "Figurative Speech and Figurative Acts." *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. 1975. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 182-199.

---. "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy". *Metaphor.* Ed. S. Sacks. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 1-10.

Coleridge, S.T. *Biographia Literaria*. Ed. George Watson. London and Melbourne: Everyman's Library, 1975

---. *Aids to Reflection / S. T. Coleridge: Collected Works*. Ed. John Beer. London: Routledge-Princeton University Press, 1993.

---. "*From* The Statesman's Manuel." The *Norton Anthology of English Literature* (Fifth Edition), Vol. II. M. H. Abrams (General Editor). New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986. 409-12.

Coupe, L. *Myth*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Crawford, D.W. *Kant's Aesthetic Theory*. London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1974.

Creaser, J. "Saying and Meaning in 'To Autumn'". *Critical Essays on Keats.* Eds. L. Cookson and B. Loughrey. New York: Longman, 1988. 113-123.

Cronin, R. *Shelley's Poetic Thoughts*. London: Macmillan, 1981.

De Man, P. “The Epistemology of Metaphor.” *On Metaphor*. Ed. S. Sacks. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 11-28.

---. “Time and History in Wordsworth.” *Romanticism*. Ed. Cynthia Chase. London and New York: Longman, 1993. 55-77.

---. *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Deleuze, G. *Kant’s Critical Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1984.

Dickstein, M. “The Fierce Dispute: The “Ode to a Nightingale.”” *The Odes of Keats*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 29-40.

Ende, S. A. “Identification and Identity: The “Ode to a Nightingale”.” *The Odes of Keats*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 65-73

Ferber, M. *The Poetry of Sheley*. London: Penguin Books, 1993.

Ferguson, F. “Shelley’s Mont Blanc: What the Mountain Said.” *Shelley*. Ed. M. O’Neil. New York: Longman, 1993. 43-55.

Frye, N. *Anatomy of Criticism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.

---. “The Drunken Boat: The Revolutionary Element in Romanticism” *Romanticism Reconsidered*. Ed. Northrop Frye. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1963. 1-25.

Fry, H. “Wordsworth’s Severe Intimations”. Ed. George H. Gilpin. *Critical Essays on William Wordsworth*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990.

---. “Voices in the Leaves: The “Ode on a Grecian Urn.”” *The Odes of Keats*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 83-92

Fulford, T. *Coleridge’s Figurative Language*. London: Macmillan, 1991.

Gayley, C. M. *The Classic Myths*. New York: John Wiley &Sons, 1911.

Goodson, A. C. *Verbal Imagination: Coleridge and the Language of Modern Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Gordon, R. “Imagining Greek and Roman Magic.” *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe* Eds. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark.. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999. 159-266.

Gould, E. *Mythical Intentions in Modern Literature*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Graves, R. *The Greek Myths*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1955.

Grimsley, R. *The Philosophy of Rousseau*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Grube, G.M.A. *Plato's Thought*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 1980.

Harding, A. J. *The Reception of Myth in English Romanticism*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1995.

Harries, K. "Metaphor and Transcendence." *On Metaphor*. Ed. S. Sacks. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 71-88.

Hartman, G. H. "Poem and Ideology: A Study of Keats' "To Autumn."" *The Odes of Keats*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publisher.1987. 45-63.

Hawkes, T. *Metaphor*. London: Methuen&Co Ltd., 1972.

Henle, P. (1981). "Metaphor". *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. 1958. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 83-103.

Herder, J.G. *Essay on the Origin of Language*. Trans. J. H. Moran and A. Gode. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Hogle, Jerrold E. *Shelley's Process: Radical Transference and the Development of His Major Works*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Jasper, D. *The Sacred and Secular Canon in Romanticism*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Kant, I. *Critique of Judgement*. Trans. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987.

Kaufmann, F. "Cassirer, Neo-Kantianism, and Phenomenology." *The Philosophy Of Ernst Cassirer.* Ed. A. Shlipp. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1958. 799-854.

Kearney, R. "Narrative Imagination: Between Ethics and Poetics." *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action*. Ed. R. Kearney. London: Sage Publications, 1998. 173-190.

Keats, J. *Complete Poems and Selected Letters of John Keats.* New York: The Modern Library, 2001.

Kern, R. "Keats and the Problem of Romance." *Critical Essays on John Keats*. Ed. Hermione de Almeida Boston and Massachusetts: G. K. Hall &Co.,1990. 68-87.

Kroeber, K. "'Home at Grasmere': Ecological Holiness." *Critical Essays on William Wordsworth*. Ed. George H. Gilpin.Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990. 179-96.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago and London : U. of Chicago Press, 1980.

Langer, S. K. 'On Cassirer's Theory of Language and Myth.' *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*. Ed. A. Shlipp. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1958. 379-400.

Lee, M. *Rousseau's Impact on Shelley: Figuring the Written Self*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.

Levi-Strauss, C. "The Structural Study of Myth." *Structural Anthropology*. New York and London: ASIC Books, Inc. Publishers, 1963. 206-231.

---. "Structural Analysis in Linguistics and Anthropology." *Structural Anthropology*. New York and London: ASIC Books, Inc. Publishers, 1963. 32-4.

Loewenberg, I. "Identifying Metaphors." *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. 1978. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 154-81.

Luck, Georg. "Witches and Sorcerers in Classical Literature." *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe*. Eds. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999. 159-266.

Marwick, Max. *Witchcraft and Sorcery: Selected Readings*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1970.

McFarland, T. "Imagination and Its Cognates: Supplementing Considerations." *Coleridge's Theory of Imagination Today*. Ed. C. Gallant. New York: AMS Press,1989. 15-30.

Meletinsky, E. M. *The Poetics of Myth*. 1976. Trans. G. Lanoue and A. Sadetsky. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.

Montagu, M. F. "Cassirer on Mythological Thinking." *The Philosophy of Ernst*

Cassirer. Ed. A. Shlipp. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1958. 359-77.

Nietzsche, F. *Philosophical Writings*. Eds. Reinhold Grimm and Caroline Molina Vedia. New York: Continuum Publishing Company, 1995.

Ogden, C. K. and Richards, I. A. *The Meaning of Meaning*. New York: Harvest Publishing, 1923.

O'Neil, Michael. "Writing and History in the Hyperions." *Keats and History*. Ed. Nicholas Roe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 143-164.

---. *The Human Mind's Imaginings: Conflict and Achievement in Shelley's Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Parker, P. "Fairy Lands Forlorn." *Critical Essays on John Keats*. Ed. Hermione de Almeida. Boston: G. K. Hall&Co., 1990. 102-128.

Plato. *The Republic*. Ed. G. R. Ferrari and Trans. T. Griffith. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

--- "Ion"(937-49). *Plato: Complete Works*. Ed. J. M. Cooper: Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997. 937-49.

Ricoeur, P. *The Rule of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto P, 1977.

---. "The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling." *On Metaphor.* Ed. S. Sacks. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 141-157.

---. "Word, Polysemy, Metaphor: Creativity in Language." *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination.* Ed. M. J. Valdés. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 65-85.

---. "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality." *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination.* Ed. M. J. Valdés. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 117-136.

---. "The Human Experience of Time and Narrative." *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination.* Ed. M. J. Valdés. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 99-116.

---. "Mimesis and Representation." *A Ricoeur Reader: Reflection and Imagination.* Ed. M. J. Valdés. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 137-155.

---. "Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics." *Paul Ricoeur:*

Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Ed. J. B. Thompson. Paris: Cambridge University P, 1981. 165-181.

---. "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics." *Paul Ricoeur: Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences.* Ed. J. B. Thompson. Paris: Cambridge University P, 1981. 101-127.

---. "The Narrative Function." *Paul Ricoeur: Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences.* Ed. J. B. Thompson. Paris: Cambridge University P, 1981. 274-296.

Richards, I. A. "The Philosophy of Rhetoric." *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. 1936. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 48-62.

Rousseau, J. J. *Essay on the Origin of Languages*. Trans. J.H. Moran and A. Gode. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Searle, J. R. "Metaphor." *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. 1936. Ed. M. Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981. 249-285.

Shelley, P. B. "A Defence of Poetry." 1821. *The Critical Tradition*. Ed. D. H. Richter. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 323-340.

---. "Essay on the Devil and Devils." *Shelley's Prose: or the Trumpet of a Prophecy*. Ed. D. L. Clark. London: Fourth Estate Ltd, 1988. 264-275.

---. *Shelley: Poetical Works*. Ed. T. Hutchinson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Simpson, D. E. (1986). "The Spots of Time." *William Wordsworth's The Prelude*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1986. 137-44.

Stein, R. L. & Stein, L. *The Anthropology of Religion, Magic, and Witchcraft* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., 2005.

Stephens, I. K. "Cassirer's Doctrine of the *A Priory*." *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*. Ed. A. Shlipp. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1958.

Stillinger, J. The *Hoodwinking of Madeline*. Urbana: Un. Of Illinois Press, 1971.

Vico, G. *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*. 1744. Trans. T. G. Bergin and M.H. Fisch. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1968.

---. *Selected Writings*. Ed. and Trans. L. Pompa. London: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Waldoff, L. "The Silent Work of Imagination." *Critical Essays on John Keats*. Ed. Hermione de Almeida. Boston: G. K. Hall&Co. 1990. 183-206

Wasserman, E. R.. *Shelley: A Critical Reading*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1971.

Weisman, K. A. *Imageless Truths: Shelley's Poetic Fictions*. USA: Un. Of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Wellek, René. "Romanticism Re-Examined."*Romanticism Reconsidered*. Ed. Northrop Frye. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1963. 107-133. .

Werkmeister, W. H. "Cassirer's Advance Beyond Neo-Kantianism." *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer*. Ed. A. Shlipp. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1958. 757-798.

West, David R. *Some Cults of Some Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin*. NeuKirchener: Verlag Butzon &Bercker Kevelaer, 1995.

Weston, P. "'Hyperion' and 'The Fall of Hyperion': Progress Through Suffering." *Critical Essays on Keats*. Eds. L. Cookson and B. Loughrey. New York: Longman, 1988. 101-111.

Wiebe, M. *Myth as Genre in British Romantic Poetry*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999.

Wimsatt, W. K. "The Structure of Romantic Nature Imagery." *Modern Essays in Criticism*. Ed. M. H. Abrams. London: Oxford University Press, 1977. 25-36.

Wordsworth, W. "Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*." 1802. *The Critical Tradition.* Ed. D.H. Richter. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 285-298.

---. *William Wordsworth: Selected Poems*. Ed. D. V. Davies. London: Everyman, 1994.

---. "Preface to *Poems.*" *William Wordsworth: Selected Prose*. Ed. John A. Hayden. London: Penguin Books, 1998. 372-386.

---. "Essays on Epitaphs." *William Wordsworth: Selected Prose*. Ed. John A. Hayden. London: Penguin Books, 1998. 322-371.

---. "The Sublime and the Beautiful." *William Wordsworth: Selected Prose*. Ed.

John A. Hayden. London: Penguin Books, 1998. 263-74.

Yarnall, Judith. *Transformations of Circe: The History of and Enchantress*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

APPENDIX A

TURKISH SUMMARY

İngiliz Romantik şiirindeki metafor ve mit (söylence) kullanımı bu şiirin incelenmesinde her zaman temel ilgi konularından biri olmuştur. Ancak metaforun mitsel yönü ve mitin metaforsal yönü üzerine ayrıntılı bir çalışma yapılmamıştır. Giambattista Vico, Immanuel Kant, Jean Jacques Rousseau ve Gottfried Herder metafor ve mitin ayrılamaz ve birbirini tamamlayan etmenler olarak anlaşılmasını olanaklı kılacak felsefi bir zemin hazırlamışlardır. Vico, Rousseau ve Herder metafor ve mitin doğayla iç içe yaşamış ilk insanların imgelemleriyle doğaya tinsel, ilahi veya canlılara özgü nitelikler yüklemesinin ifadesi olduğunu savunmuş, Kant ise bu iki türün doğada 'yüce' ve 'güzel' olan ile karşılaştığında imgelemin (imagination) başvurduğu bilişsel eylemler olduğunu söylemiştir. Bu filozofların düşüncelerindeki ortak nokta metaforu ve miti, öznenin imgelemiyle doğadaki nesneleri anlamlandırmasının ve onu biçimlendirmesinin ifadesi olduğunu düşünmeleridir. Dolayısıyla bu düşünceler özne-nesne metafor-gerçek anlam gibi ayrımları reddederek doğada 'nesnel' ve dilde 'gerçek anlam' olarak görülen şeylerin algılama sürecinden ve algılayan özneden bağımsız düşünülemeyeceğini, algılama sürecinin de özünde mit ve metafor yoluyla nesneyi özneye tabi kılma ve dilde metaforu hakim kılma eylemleri olduğunu savunmuşlardır.

Bu filozofların düşünceleri romantik poetikanın oluşmasında doğrudan etkili olmuştur. Hatta William Wordswoth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Percy Bysshe Shelley ve John Keats gibi romantik şairlerin düşünceleriyle bir adım ileriye taşınmışlardır. Bu şairler, 'nesnel gerçeğin' algılanmasında insan imgeleminin önemine ve onun bu gerçeği biçimlendirme ve yeniden yaratma

yetisine işaret etmişlerdir. Ancak bu şairler tarafından imgelem bazen tanrısal ve aşkın bir varlık olarak görülürken bazen nesnel olguyu metafor ve mit yoluyla dönüştüren bir yeti olarak düşünülmüştür. Bu şairler arasında Wordsworth Vico, Rousseau ve Herder'in düşüncelerine benzer bir şekilde metafor ve miti bir çocuğun veya ilkel bir insanın doğayı algılama ve anlamlandırma sürecinin içkin yönleri olarak ele almıştır. Coleridge ve Shelley daha çok Kantçı bir bakış sergileyerek imgelem, onun aşkın yönü ve yaratım özelliği üzerinde durmuşlar, Keats ve bazı şiirlerinde Shelley imgelemi doğayla etkileşim sonucunda mit ve metafor üreten bir varlık olarak almışlardır. Aralarında bazı farklar olsa da Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley ve Keats'in ortak özelliği özneyi, usunu ve imgelemini algılama sürecinin ve sanatsal yaratımın merkezine koymaları, özne-nesne ve metafor-gerçek anlam gibi ayrımları reddetmeleri ve Kant'ın düşüncesinde de yer alan imgelemin 'benzeştirici' yönünü imgelemin, algılamanın, ve metafor ve mitos yaratımının belirleyici özelliği olarak görmeleridir.

Bu çalışma İngiliz Romantik şiirinde metafor ve mitin kapsamlı bir incelemsinin ancak modern metafor ve mit kuramlarının da göz önüne alınmasıyla mümkün olduğunu savunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, I. A. Richards, Paul Henle, Max Black, John Searle, Ina Loewenberg, Ted Cohen, Monroe Beardsley ve Wayne Booth'un metafor kuramları ile James Frazer, Northrop Frye ve Levi-Strauss'un mit kuramları özetle verilmiştir. Bu kuramlar Wordsworth, Shelley ve Keats'in şiirlerinin çözümlenmesinde zaman zaman kullanılsa da çalışmanın dayandığı asıl modern teoriler neo-Kantçı ve neo-Romantik diye nitelenebilecek Alman filozof Ernst Cassirer'in metafor ve mit düşüncesiyle Fransız Paul Ricoeur'un metafor düşüncesidir.

The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms adlı üç ciltlik kitabında (ki birinci cilt dil felsefesini, ikinci cilt mitsel düşünceyi, üçüncüsüyse bilimsel bilginin dilini ele almaktadır) Ernst Cassirer sembolik biçimler diye adlandırdığı dil, mit ve bilim arasındaki etkileşimi ele almakta ve yaratımlarında insan bilincinin rolünü irdelemektedir. Kantçı bir bakış açısıyla Cassirer insan usunun 'biçimlendirici' ve 'sembolleştirici' bir varlık olduğunu savunmakta ve dilin bu yetinin içkin bir

niteliği olduğunu söylemektedir. Başka bir deyişle, algılama sürecinde usun doğadaki farklı nesneler arasında yapay benzerlikler kurarak nesnelere biçim verdiğini, bunun da temelde nesneyi öznelleştirme ve onu sembolize ederek mitolojinin yabancılaştırıcı dünyasına dahil etme eylemi olduğunu düşünmektedir. Cassirer'i diğer Kantçı ve Romantik düşünürlerden faklı kılan mitin kapsamlı bir çözümlemesini yapması, yaratım süreçlerini incelemesi ve dilini diğer dillerden ayıran özellikleri ele almasıdır. Cassirer mitin de diğer dilsel biçimler gibi sembolik bir biçim olduğunu ve insan usunun içsel bir işlevi olduğunu savunmaktadır. Ancak onu diğer biçimlerden farklılaştıran ve doğadaki nesneyi tanınmaz ve yabancı hale getiren kendine özgü bir nedensellik, zaman, uzam ve dil kullanımı olduğunu düşünmektedir. Sembolik dil ve mit arasındaki yakın ilişkiyi ele alması ve bunların ikisini de usun/imgelemin içsel ifade türleri olarak görmesi Cassirer'in düşüncesini bu tez için önemli kılmış ve Wordsworth, Shelley ve Keats'in şiirlerindeki metafor ve mitin imgelemsel ve bilişsel özelliğinin incelenmesi için kuramsal bir zemin oluşturmuştur.

Paul Ricoeur ise "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality," "The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination and Feeling" ve *The Rule of Metaphor* başlıklı çalışmalarında metaforu Aristo'nun iyi metaforlar yapmak farklılıklar arasında benzeştirme yapma yeteneğine bağlıdır düşüncesinden hareketle ele almıştır. Ricoeur'a göre imgelem farlılıkların benzeştirildiği ve dolayısıyla metaforun gerçekleştiği yerdir. Ricoeur Aristo'nun düşüncesini Kant'ın 'şemalaştırma (schematization),' 'benzeştirme eylemi (synthetic operation)' ve imgelem düşünceleriyle ve Husserl'in olgusalcılık (phenomenology) kuramıyla birleştirerek metaforun, edebi ve tarihsel söylemlerin yaratımında insan usunun ve imgeleminin önemine vurgulamıştır. Ona göre, metaforsal dil ancak 'yaratıcı imgelemin' 'ikonik (görsel imgeler yaratma) işleviyle,' yani farklılıklar arasında benzerlik görme ve bir şeyi başka bir şey olarak algılayabilme yetisiyle mümkündür. Bu yönüyle metafor sözcük düzeyinde değil söylem düzeyinde ele alınmalıdır çünkü dil, özellikle de edebi dil, imgelemseldir ve imgelemsel olan her şey aynı zamanda metaforsaldır. Ricoeur'un bu düşünceleri tez için büyük önem

arz etmektedir çünkü bu çalışma söz konusu Romantik şiirlerindeki metaforu söylem düzeyinde ve yaratıcı imgelemin ikonik işlevi bağlamında ele alacaktır.

Bu tez yukarıda bahsedilen metafor ve mit kuramlarına dayanarak William Wordsworth, Percy Bysshe Shelley ve John Keats'in şiirlerinde metafor, mit ve imgelemsel özelliklerini incelemiştir. Tez, söz konusu şairlerin şiirlerinde mit ve metaforu imgelemin ve algılama sürecinin birbirini tamamlayan etmenleri olarak ele almış ve yaratımlarında öznenin işlevsel rolüne işaret etmiştir. Çalışma, yukarıda özetlenen düşüncelerden hareketle imgelemin özünde metafor ve mitoloji üreten bir yeti olduğunu çünkü bir öznenin imgelemi için algılama eyleminin doğadaki nesneleri biçimlendirme ve farklılıklar arasında benzerlik görme eylemi olduğunu, bunun da temelde metafor ve mit yaratımı anlamına geldiğini söylemektedir. Bu biçimlendirme eylemi esnasında, söz konusu şairlerin şiirlerindeki konuşucu özneler imgelemleriyle doğadaki nesnelere tinsel, canlılara özgü veya ilahi özellikler yükleyerek onları mitolojinin doğaüstü ve yabancı dünyasına dönüştürürler. Tez bu eylemin farklılıklar arasında benzeştirme yapmaya dayandığını, mitolojide sık sık rastladığımız güzel bir ağacı bir tanrıçaya (örn. Defne), gür akan bir nehri veya okyanusu bir tanrıya (örn. Xanthus, Poseidon) ya da güzel bir akarsuyu bir periye benzetme eyleminin mitleştirme eylemi olduğunu, iki farklı şeyin benzeştirilmesinden dolayı da bunun aynı zamanda metaforlaştırma eylemi olduğunu savunmaktadır.

Bu çalışmada William Wordsworth, Percy Bysshe Shelley ve John Keats'in şiirindeki metapfor ve mit başlıca iki bağlamda incelenmiş ve şiirler bu iki bağlama göre sınıflandırılmıştır. Birinci bağlamda, metafor ve mit imgelem ve algılama sürecinin özünde varolan nitelikler olarak ele alınmış ve imgelem ile doğa arasındaki etkileşim antik çağdan, Romantik döneme ve günümüze kadar mitolojinin kaynağı olduğu savunulmuştur. İkinci bağlamda ise mitolojinin şiirsel imgelem tarafından sürekli yeniden yaratılan bir şey olduğunu göstermek için Romantik mitografi ele alınmış ve Shelley ve Keats'in şiirlerinde eski mitlerin nasıl yeniden yaratıldığı gösterilmiştir. Her iki bağlamda şiirsel imgelem mit ve

metafor yaratımı yoluyla yeniden kuran ve doğayı mitolojinin yabancı dünyasına dönüştüren biçimlendirici bir güç olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Tezin 'Introduction' bölümünden sonraki bölümde Kantçı, Romantik ve modern neo-Kantçı (Cassirer ve Ricoeur) düşünceler sunulmuş, üçüncü bölümde birinci bağlamda sınıflandırılan şiirler ele alınmış ve dördüncü bölümde de ikinci bağlamda sınıflandırılan şiirler incelenmiştir.

Birinci bağlamda sınıflandırılan şiirler çözümlendiğinde, bu şiirlerde metafor ve mitin algılama sürecinde konuşucu özne imgelemlerinin doğayla etkileşiminin ürünleri olduğu sonucuna varılmaktadır. Buna göre, bu şiirlerde algılama süreci konuşucu öznenin imgelemi için doğadaki nesnelerin tinsel, ilahi ve canlılara özgü niteliklere büründürülmesi süreci olduğu gözlenmiştir. Bu şiirlerde, Keats'in "I Stood Tip-toe Upon a Hill" şiirinde gösterdiği gibi, imgelem ve algılama antik dönemlerden günümüze kadarki bütün mitolojinin kaynağı olarak sunulmuştur. Doğanın güzellikleri ve yüceliğiyle karşı karşıya geldiğindedir ki 'eski bilge şair' Psyche, Narcissus, Pan, Diana, vb. mitolojik figürleri yaratmıştır.

Ancak şiirsel imgelem ile doğa arasındaki etkileşim bu şiirlerde değişik biçimlerde görülmektedir. Bu farklılık kendini seçilen temalarda görülmektedir. Tematik açıdan yaklaşıldığında, Wordworth, Shelley ve Keats'in şiirlerinde kaybetme duygusunun, insan yaşamının geçiciliğinin ve doğal güzelliğin ve sanatın ölümsüzlüğünün en sık karşılaşılan temalar olduğu görülür. Ancak Wordsworth'un şiirinde bu temalar konuşucu öznenin çocukluk dönemine karşı duyduğu nostalji ve yaşlanmadan kaynaklanan üzüntü bağlamında verilirken, Shelley ve Keats'in şiirlerinde ölümlülüğün sınırlarından kurtulmak için konuşucu öznenin doğal olgudan mitleştirme yoluyla ölümsüzlüğü simgeleyen bir güzellik (beauty) dünyası kurgulama bağlamında karşımıza çıkar. Bunun dışında, bu özette de görüleceği üzere bazı şiirlerde şairlerin mit ve metafor-yaratımcı imgelemleri çocukluğu, gençliği ve mutluluğu bahar mevsimi ve sabah ile, yaşlılığı ve acıyı sonbahar, öğleden sonra ve akşam ile, veölümü kış ve geceyle özdeşleştirir. Bu

temalardan ayrı olarak, özellikle Wordsworth ve Shelley'in bazı şiirlerinde biçimlendirici, yaratıcı ve her yerde var olan bir güç olarak mitleştirilen Us temel tema haline getirilmiştir. Özellikle Wordsworth'un şiirlerinde görülen başka bir temaysa eğitim konusudur. Rousseau ve Herder'in düşüncelerinin etkisiyle yazıldığı gözlenen bu şiirlerde kurumsallaşmış eğitim eleştirilir ve doğada yetişme bir alternatif olarak sunulur.

Daha önce ima edildiği gibi Wordsworth'un bazı şiirlerinde şiirsel imgelemin doğadaki nesnelere tinsel özellikler yüklediği ve doğayı çocuğuna (yani şaire) annelik yapan ve onu hayatla ilgili eğiten dişil bir figür olarak mitleştirdiği gözlenmiştir. Bu şiirlerde çocukluk veya insanlık tarihinin ilkel dönemleri, insanın doğayla bütün olduğu ve mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma eylemlerinin algılama süreçlerini nitelediği dönemler olarak yüceltilmiştir. Uygar yaşamın ortaya çıkışıyla çocukluğa veya ilkel döneme ait duyguların yitmesi Doğa Ana'dan kopma, ve metaforlaştırma ve mitleştirme yetisinin kaybolması şeklinde sunulmuştur. Bu şiirlerde Vico, Rousseau ve Herder'in ilkel ve doğal insana ve kurumsallaşmış eğitime alternatif olarak doğal eğitime dair düşüncelerinin etkisi açıkça görülmektedir.

Bu şiirlerden biri Wordsworth'un *The Pedlar* adlı şiiridir. Bu şiirde, the pedlar (seyyar satıcı) diye adlandırılan kişi çocukluğunda doğayla yaşadığı etkileşimin ve doğanın ona annelik yapmasının kendinde bir mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma yeteneği geliştirdiğini ve onu yaşamın farklı yönleriyle ilgili eğittiğini anlatmaktadır. Bu konunun ele alınmasında bu şiirin ayırt edici özelliği imgelemin doğa tarafından eğitildiği insanlığın ilkel dönemini imgelem tarihinde bir başlangıç noktası olarak ele alınmakta ve insan usunun bu dönemde kazandıklarının ona ileriki dönemlerde kılavuzluk ettiği söylenmektedir. Başka bir deyişle, yetişkinlik ilkellikten kopma olarak değil, ilkellik döneminde edinilen bilgilerin ve deneyimlerin uygulandığı dönem olarak ele alınmaktadır. Bu bağlamda incelendiğinde *The Pedlar*'in şiirsel imgelemin gelişimini ve doğayla etkileşimin eğitsel yararlarını anlattığı söylenebilir.

The Pedlar gibi Wordsworth'un *The Two-Part Prelude* adlı şiirinde de doğanın annelik yapmasıyla şiirsel imgelemin nasıl geliştiği ve mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma yetisi kazandığı anlatılır. Şiirin bazı yerlerinde çocukluğun geçmiş olmasına üzüntüyle ve bir cennetin kaybedilmesi edasıyla yaklaşmasına rağmen konuşucu özne *The Pedlar*'da olduğu gibi hayata ve doğaya bakışını çocukluk dönemine dayandırmakta ve o dönemde edindiklerinin daha sonraki yaşantısına nasıl ışık tuttuğunu anlatmaktadır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında imgelemin gelişim tarihinde belli bir sürekliliğin var olduğu ima edilmektedir. Her iki şiirde, çocukluk döneminde kişinin doğadan mit ve metafor yaratım yetilerini kazandığı ve bu yetiyle yetişkinlik döneminde hayata eleştirel yaklaşabildiği vurgulanmaktadır.

"Ode: Intimations of Immortality" ve *Home at Grasmere* şiirlerinde de Wordsworth doğadaki nesneleri tinsel özelliklere büründürerek doğayı canlı bir varlığa dönüştürür ve onu çocuğunun şiirsel imgelemini besleyen ve onda mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma yetisi geliştiren bir anne figürü olarak mitleştirir. Ancak *The Pedlar* ve *The Two-Part Prelude*'un aksine bu iki şiirde uygar toplumda veya onun yozlaşmışlığıyla özdeşleştirilen yetişkinlik döneminde doğayı tahrip etmesiyle insanın nasıl doğa-anadan koptuğu ve mitleştirme yeteneğini nasıl yitirdiği anlatılır. Bu şiirlere göre yetişkin olmak ilkel ve saf duyguların yitirilmesi ve rasyonel düşünmenin etkisiyle hayata kalıplarla bakma anlamına gelmektedir. Çocukluk ve onunla özdeşleştirilen ilkel yaşama kaybedilen bir cennet olarak bakılır. Böyle bir kaybetme duygusu "Ode: Intimations of Mortality" şiirinin başlıca temasıdır. Paul Fry'ın ifade ettiği gibi, bu şiirde konuşucu "ilkel toplumu veya kişiliğin oluştuğu ilk zamanları kutsal olarak gördüğü bir uzama yerleştirmektedir" (Fry 60). Konuşucuya göre bu kutsal dünya uygar toplumun ve rasyonel düşünmenin ortaya çıkmasıyla birlikte yitirilmiştir. Bu yüzden, *The Pedlar* ve *The Two-Part Prelude*'un aksine bu şiirde büyümek yaşam deneyiminde bir sürekliliği değil, bir kopmayı ifade etmektedir.

Home at Grasmere'de de yetişkinlikle birlikte insanın doğayla ilişkisinde bir boşluğun oluştuğu ve uygarlığın konuşucuyu anne figürü olarak mitleştirdiği

doğadan ayırdığı anlatılmaktadır. Şiir boyunca konuşucuda annesiyle yeniden birleşme ve onunla bozulan ilişkisini yeniden kurma çabası vardır. Bu süreçte doğada ona çocukluğunu hatırlatan nesnelere baktığında onlara tinsel özellikler yükleyerek onları imgeleminde canlı birer varlığa dönüştürür. Bu yönüyle mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma eylemleri bağlamında yukarıda ele alınan şiirlere benzemektedir. Ancak onlardan farklı olarak özellikle şiirin sonlarına doğru konuşucu, mitleştirme eylemi sırasında John Milton'un *Paradise Lost* ve Edmund Spenser'in *The Faerie Queen* adlı eserlerinde görülen mitolojik figürleri kullanır ve dolayısıyla bu eylem daha karmaşık hale gelir. Başka bir deyişle, doğadaki nesneler mitin yabancılaştırıcı dünyasında tanınmaz hale gelirler.

Shelley'in "Mont Blanc," "Ode to the West Wind ve "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" adlı şiirlerinde ise konuşucu özneler imgelemleri ile doğal varlıklardan doğaüstü varlıklar yaratırlar. Konuşucuların ikonik imgelemleri algılama nesnelerini aşkın ve her yerde var olan birer 'Güç' veya bütün evreni kapsayan ve doğadaki döngünün temel nedeni olan Tek Us olarak mitleştirirler. "Mont Blanc" şiirinde Mont Blanc adlı dağ böyle bir 'Güç' olarak mitleştirilmiştir. Bu 'Güç' her yerde etkisini gösterir, yeryüzündeki yaşam akışının temel kaynağı olarak gösterilir ve aynı zamanda hem yıkıcı hem de yaratıcı olmasıyla yeryüzündeki yaşam döngüsünün sebebi olarak sunulur. "Ode to the West Wind" şiirinde bu 'Güç' bu sefer bir batı rüzgarıyla özdeşleştirilir. "Mont Blanc"takine benzer bir şekilde, bu şiirde konuşucu batı rüzgarını her yerde var olan ve aynı zamanda hem yıkan hem yapan bir doğaüstü güç olarak mitleştirir. "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty" şiirinde 'görünmez Güç' şiirin ana teması olur ve şiirsel imgelem tarafından tanrısal bir güç olarak kutsanır. Bu 'Güç' Plato'nun Mutlak Tini gibi hem doğada içkin bir şekilde vardır, hem de aşkındır. Şiirde denildiği gibi, "bizim aramızda gezer," "bu dünyanın çeşitli yerlerini ziyaret eder" ve kendini 'her insanın yüreğinde ve yüz ifadesinde" hissettirir (2-3, 7). Her üç şiirde de 'Güç' tanrısal bir us veya aşkın bir imgelem olarak sunulmuştur.

Northrop Frye "The Drunken Boat" adlı makalesinde şöyle der: Romantik şiirin temel vurgusu duyu değil, usun yaratıcı gücüdür" (11). Bunu takiben miti

şöyle tanımlar: "mit tanrıların hikayesini anlatır ancak bu tanrılar hem biçim ve karakter açısından insana benzerler, hem de aynı zamanda güneş-tanrısı veya ağaç-tanrısı veya okyanus tanrısı olarak adlandırılırlar. Buna göre mit, şiirin de temel işlevlerinden biri olan insan olmayanı insanla benzeştirme eylemidir" (15). Bu iki alıntıdan hareketle Romantik şiirde mitin doğadaki cansız nesnelerin us tarafından insanlaştırılmasının ifadesi olduğu söylenebilir. Keats'in "I Stood Tip-Toe Upon a Hill" şiiri miti şiirsel imgelemin doğal olguyu canlılaştırması ve Kant'ın deyimiyle doğada 'güzel' olanla karşılaştığında imgelemin yarrattığı bir benzeştirme türü olarak sunar. Bu şiiri yukarıda özetlenen diğer şiirlerden ayıran şey, antik Yunan mitolojisinin doğaya tinsel özellikler yükleyerek onu canlandırma geleneğini uygulamasının yanında Yunan ve Roma mitolojilerindeki bazı figürlere doğrudan atıfların olması ve şiirsel imgelemin bütün mitolojilerin kaynağı olarak gösterilmesidir.

Ölümlülük ve insan yaşamının geçiciliği Wordsworth, Shelley ve Keats'in şiirlerinde en sık işlenen temalardan ikisidir. Konuşucu öznenin imgelemi diğer bütün temalar gibi bu temaları da mitolojik ve metaforik bir çerçevede düşlerler. Buna göre, insan yaşamının aşamalarını bir yılın veya günün aşamalarına benzeştirirler. *Anatomy of Criticism* adlı kitabında Northrop Frye edebiyatta mitsel elementlerin ve imgelerin 'döngüsel hareketler' şeklinde görüldüğünü söyler. Bu döngüsel harektlerden en sık karşılaşılanı bir tanrının ölümü ve yeniden doğuşu, kayboluşu ve geri dönüşü, veya vücuda gelmesi ve geri çekilmesi şeklinde gerçekleşir. Bu eylemlerin her biri doğanın bir veya birden fazla döngüsel süreciyle özdeşleştirilir. Tanrı ya gece ölen ve sabah yeniden doğan bir güneş tanrısıdır, ya da kışın ölen ve baharda yeniden doğan bir bereket tanrısıdır. Frye'a göre doğadaki döngüsel hareket yılın dört mevsimi veya günün dört aşamasıyla simgelenir. Günün dört aşamasında şafak vakti doğum ve baharla; öğlen vakti yaz, evlilik ve zaferle; akşam sonbahar ve ölümle; ve son olarak gece kış ve umutsuzlukla özdeşleştirilir. Buna benzer bir düşünceyi James Frazer da *The Golden Bough* adlı kitabında ortaya koyar. Bu kitabında Frazer mevsimsel

döngülerin mitolojik anlamlarıyla ilgilenir ve mitolojiyi mevsimsel döngüye paralel olarak bir tanrının ölümü ve yeniden canlanması bağlamında ele alır.

Northrop Frye ve James Frazer'in gün ve mevsim döngülerinin mitolojik anlamlarına dair düşüncelerinin ışığında incelendiğinde Wordsworth, Shelley ve Keats'in bazı şiirlerde sabah ve ilkbaharı çocukluk ve gençliğin ilk zamanlarıyla, öğlen ve yaz mevsimini orta yaşla, akşam ve sonbaharı yaşlılıkla, ve gece ve kışı ölümle özdeşleştirdikleri görülür. Wordsworth'un *An Evening Walk*, Keats'in "To Autumn" ve Shelley'in "Autumn: A Dirge" adlı şiirlerinde Frye ve Frazer'in kuramlarını doğrulayacak bir şekilde gün ve yıl döngülerinin konuşucu öznelerin mit ve metafor üreten imgelemleri tarafından insan yaşamının aşamalarına benzeştirildiği gözlenir. Ölümlülük, yaşamın geçiciliği ve yaşamın baharının kaybetme üzüntüsü gibi temalar bu mitleştirme yöntemiyle anlatılır. *An Evening Walk* adlı şiirde Wordsworth'un diğer şiirlerindeki gibi konuşucu özne doğadaki nesneleri tinsel ve canlı varlıklara dönüştürür ve doğayı 'çocuğunun' şiirsel imgelemini yetiştiren bir anne olarak mitleştirir. Ayrıca, "Ode: Intimations of Mortality" ve *Home at Grasmere* şiirlerinde olduğu gibi insanın doğadan ve çocukluk/ilkellik dönemindeki saf deneyimden kopuşu anlatılır ve çocukluk dönemine yitirilmiş bir cennet olarak bakılır. Ancak bu şiirlerden farklı olarak *An Evening Walk* şiirinde kaybedilen cennete duyulan özlem ve yaşlılık konuşucunun imgeleminde akşama (evening), çocukluk ve gençlik ise sabaha benzeştirilmektedir. Konuşucu yaşamının akşamında çocukluk dönemini ve o dönemde doğayla nasıl iç içe olduğunu düşünür. Şiirin sonunda yeni bir gün başlar ama Frazer'in düşüncelerini destekler bir şekilde bu günün şair için gençliğe dönüş anlamına gelmediği, bu dünyadan gidip yerini yeni doğana bırakması gerektiği iması vardır.

Keats'in "To Autumn" şiirinde insan yaşamının 'akşamı' bu sefer sonbaharla (autumn) simgelenmiştir. Ancak *An Evening Walk* şiirinden farklı olarak doğa bir anne figürü olarak değil, bir insan şeklinde görünen, ekinlerinin ve olgunlaşmış meyvelerinin arasında yatan (Antik Yunan mitolojisindeki Demeter ve Roma mitolojisindeki Ceres figürünü simgeleyecek bir şekilde) bir bereket

tanrıçası olarak mitleştirilmiştir. Şiirde sonbahar mevsimi, doğanın olgunlaşması ve yaklaşan kış dahil her şey yaşlılığın ve insan yaşamının geçiciliğinin birer simgesi haline getirilmiştir. Keats'in "To Autumn" şiirinin ikizi sayılabilecek Shelley'in "Autumn: A Dirge" adlı şiirinde şiirin başlığından da anlaşılacağı gibi sonbahar bu sefer ölümle özdeşleştirilmiştir. Konuşucu sonbaharı yılın ölümü olarak sunmuş ve şiir boyunca ölümle ilintilendirilebilecek sözcükler ve mitsel imgeler kullanmıştır.

Shelley'in "To a Skylark" ve Keats'in "Ode to a Nightingale" şiirlerinde ise şiirsel imgelem bu sefer doğal olguları veya nesneleri konuşucu özneyi ölümlülüğün sınırlarından kurtaracak aşkın ve ölümsüz varlıklar olarak mitleştirmiştir. Shelley'in "To a Skylark" şiirinde bir tarlakuşu aşkın bir varlık haline dönüştürmüş ve müziğinin ölümsüz ve sanatsal niteliğiyle konuşucuyu ölümlülük halinden kurtarabilecek ruhani bir güç olarak mitleştirilmiştir. "Ode to a Nightingale" şiirinde ise konuşucu imgeleminde ölümsüzlüğü ve sanatın aşkınlığını simgeleyecek şekilde bir bülbülü mitleştirmiş ve ancak bülbülün ölümsüz dünyasının bir parçası haline gelerek nesnel dünyanın bağımlılıklarından ve sefaletlerinden kurtulabileceğini düşlemiştir. Her iki şiirde de konuşucular düş dünyalarında ölümsüzlüğe dair yarattıkları mitsel dünyaları nesnel dünyaya alternatif olarak sunmuşlardır.

Keats'in "Ode on a Grecian Urn" şiirinde ise ölümsüzlük ve süreklilik bu sefer bir sanat eserinin, yani bir Eski Yunan testisinin üzerinde resmedilmiş figürlerin mitleştirilmesiyle verilmiştir. Bir sanat eseri olarak Yunan testisi Keats'e 'Güzellik' diye isimlendirdiği sanatla ve onun temsil ettiği ölümsüzlük, durağanlık ve süreklilik temalarıyla daha doğrudan ilgilenme fırsatı vermiştir. Şiirde geçen ve şiirin sloganı sayılabilecek "Güzel olan doğrudur, doğru da güzel olandır" ifadesiyle Keats güzellikle ilgili düşüncesini sunmuş ve onu insan yaşamının temel ilkesi olarak göstermiştir.

Romantik şairlerin mitolojiye ilgisi öznenin algılama sürecinde doğadaki nesneleri yeniden yaratıp onları mitolojinin yabancılaştırıcı dünyasına

dönüştürmesiyle sınırlı değildir. Bu özetin başlarında ikinci bağlam kategorisinde sınıflandırdığımız şiirlerde söz konusu şairler antik Yunan, Roma, Hıristiyan, Orta Çağ veya Miltoncu mitolojilere ait figürleri ele alıp yeniden yaratmışlardır. Böylece öncülleri olan mitografların izinden giderek Romantik mitografiyi yaratmışlardır. Bu mitografinin Wordsworth'un şiirinde nasıl olduğu yukarıda özetlenen şiirlerde gösterilmiştir. Bu şiirlerde Wordsworth'un Yunan mitolojisiyle Spenser ve Milton'un mitolojilerini Rousseau ve Herder'in düşünceleri ışığında değerlendirip onları kendi mitografisini oluşturmak için nasıl kullandığı görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, çocukluğu ilkel yaşamla, yetişkinliği de modern toplumun tahribatçı yönüyle özdeşleştirmiştir. Doğayı da çocuğunun şiirsel imgelemini yetiştiren bir anne veya çocuğunu hayatın binbir yönüyle ilgili eğiten bir öğretmen olarak mitleştirmiştir.

Ancak Romantik mitografinin ayırt edici özelliği Shelley ve Keats'in bazı şiirlerinde görülmektedir. Bu şairler, Wordsworth'ten farklı olarak bazı şiirlerinde temalarını doğrudan Antik Yunan, Roma ve Hıristiyan mitolojilerinden seçmiş ve kendi mitografilerini bu mitolojilerin tarih boyunca hemen hemen aynı kalmış içeriklerini değiştirerek oluşturmuşlardır. Bu mitolojileri içeriklerindeki kutsal-kutsal olmayan ayrımını bozarak veya değiştirerek ve onları sanat, yaşam ve tarih ile ilgili düşüncelerini yansıtır hale getirerek yeniden yaratmışlardır.

The Witch of Atlas adlı şiirinde Shelley ve *Lamia* adlı şiirinde Keats antik ve Hıristiyanlık sonrası mitolojilerdeki dişi-canavar ve cadı figürlerini yeniden yaratmış ve onları 'kutsal olmayan' kategorisinden çıkarmışlardır. *The Witch of Atlas*'ta Shelley Hıristiyan ve Orta Çağ mitolojilerindeki cadı figürünü yeniden yaratarak ve şiirindeki cadıyı 'kutsal olan' kategorisine yerleştirerek geleneksel mitsel anlayıştaki kutsal olan-olmayan ayrımını sorgulamıştır. Hıristiyan ve Orta Çağ mitolojilerindeki cadı figürlerinden farklı olarak Shelley'in cadısı antik Yunan mitolojisindeki Hecate'ye benzeyen ve olumlu yönleri ön plana çıkarılan bir tanrıçadır. Hecate gibi şiirdeki cadı figürü hem bir büyücüdür, hem de gücünü insanların iyiliği için kullanan yardımsever bir tanrıçadır. Hıristiyan ve Orta Çağ cadı düşüncesinin aksine insanlara nefretle değil, şefkatle bakar ve elinden

geldiğince onlara yardım etmeye çalışır. Apollo'nun ona hediye ettiği uçan kayıkla gezerken insanların ruh güzelliğini hayranlıkla izler. Yaşadığı yer büyü için kullanılan çeşitli aletlerle doludur ama kendisi bunları birbiriyle kavgalı iki kardeşi, arkadaşı veya toplumu barıştırmak, genç ve saf sevgilileri aşkın kirlenmiş yüzünden uzak tutmak, vb. insanlar yararına olan işlerde kullanmaktadır. Şiirdeki cadı figürüyle Yunan mitolojisindeki Hekate arasında benzerlik kurulmasının, Hıristiyanlıkla birlikte cadı olarak damgalanmış antik tanrıçaları eski saygıdeğer pozisyonlarına yeniden oturtma amacı güttüğü iddia edilebilir.

The Witch of Atlas'ta olduğu gibi *Lamia*'da da şair geleneksel mitsel düşünüşündeki kutsal-kutsal olmayan ayrımını yıkarak tarih boyunca 'kutsal olmayan' kategorisinde değerlendirilen dişi-canavar figürünü yeniden yaratmıştır. Antik Yunan mitolojisinde Lamia'nın Belus'un güzel kızı ve Libya kraliçesi olduğu anlatılır. Lamia o kadar güzeldi ki Zeus ona aşık olur. Zeus'a birçok çocuk verir ancak bütün bu çocuklar kıskançlık nöbetleri yaşayan Hera tarafından öldürülür. Lamia intikamını başkalarının çocuklarını öldürürek alır. Lamia Hera tarafından gövde kısmı yılan ama baş kısmı kadın olan bir canavara dönüştürür.

Lamia şiirini yazarken Keats'in Robert Burton'unun *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) söylenir. Bu eserde de Lamia yılan soyundan gelen bir canavar olarak yansıtılmıştır. Ancak daha önceki anlatımların aksine Keats Lamia mitini geleneksel dişi-canavar görüntüsünden kurtararak Lamia çok güzel, insancıl ve okuyucunun sempati kurabileceği acınacak bir figüre dönüştürür. Keats'in şiirinde Lamia çocukları ve insanları kurban eden bir canavar olarak değil, Hera, erkek egemen sistem ve şiirde Apollonius olarak adlandırılan sofist filozofun temsil ettiği kolektif bakış tarafından kurban edilen olarak karşımıza çıkar. Ayrıca Keats Lamia'yı 'güzellik' diye adlandırdığı sanatın simgesi şeklinde sunarak Apollonius'un onunla savaşını sofist felsefenin sanat ile Aydınlanma dönemine kadar süren kavgasını metaforik düzlemde anlatmak için kullanır ve bu çatışmada Lamia'yla taraf tutar.

The Daemon of the World şiirinde Shelley bu sefer Hıristiyan mitolojisindeki Şeytan figürünü yeniden yaratır. Hıristiyan mitolojisinde

karanlığın ve kötülüğün simgesi olarak anlatılan ve Dante'nin *İlahi Komedya*'sında *Cehennem* bölümünde temsil edilen Şeytan figürünün aksine Shelley'in şeytanı (Daemon) ışığın ve iyiliğin simgesi ve bilginin taşıyıcısıdır. Ayrıca Hıristiyan mitolojisinde geleneksel olarak Tanrı'ya atfedilen yaratıcılık işlevini de kendisi yerine getirmektedir. Her şeyi yaratan kendisidir Işığın simgesi ve bilginin taşıyıcısı işlevini yerine getirerek ve yeni dünyanın habercisi rolünü üstlenerek Iantha adındaki bir kadının ruhuna rehberlik eder ve onu dünyadaki kötülüğün temel kaynağı konusunda bilinçlendirir. Ona göre, insanlığın Altın Çağında tek olan evrenin 'Güç, İnanç ve Gelenek' tarafından cennet ve cehennem diye ikiye ayrılması dünyadaki kötülüğün temel kaynağıdır. Shelley imgelemiyle sadece Hıristiyanlığın ve yaradılış mitolojisindeki şeytan kavramını yeniden yaratmakla kalmamış, aynı zamanda cennet ve cehennem kavramlarını da yeniden yorumlamıştır. Cennet ve cehennem şiirde tek olarak, hayatın birbirini tamamlayıcı iki farklı yönü olarak göstermiştir. Shelley şiirde, tek olması gereken şeyleri zıt hale getiren ve onları birbiriyle savaştıran geleneksel mitsel mantığı reddetmiş ve Şeytanı da sözcüsü olarak kullanarak yaşamın tek olduğu ve insanın otoriteye ve başkaları tarafından dikte edilmiş kavramlara esaretten kurtulduğu hayali bir dünya kurgusu sunmuştur. Yarattığı şetan figürü aracılığıyla Shelley açıkça olmasa da Hırıstıyanlığı dünyadaki savaşların, zıtlıkların ve yozlaşmanın kaynağı olarak göstermektedir. Shelley yeni dünyayı kurma işlevini şeytan figürüne yükler. Bu dünyada cennet yeryüzüyle ruh da vücutla yeniden bir olacak. Tarihin Altın çağı olarak adlandırılan, sürekli baharın yaşandığı ve toprakta bereketin olduğu dönem yeniden kurulacak. Savaşlar olmayacak çünkü insanları savaşa iten İnanç, Güç ve Gelenek etkisinin kaybedecek.

Prometheus Unbound adlı şiirde ise Shelley Prometheus mitini Prometheus'u diktatörlüğe ve zülme karşı politik bir ikon haline getirerek ve *The Daemon of the World*'de şeytana atfettiği yeni dünyayı kurma görevinin bu sefer ona vererek yeniden yaratmıştır. Shelley, Prometheus'la Milton'un *Paradise Lost* adlı eserindeki şeytan, ve Jupiter'le Tanrı arasında benzerlik kurarak şiirde bir anlamda Yaradılış mitolojisini yeniden yazmış ve Tanr'yı zalim Şeytanı da

insanlığın koruyucusu ve yeryüzünü esaretten kurtarak güç olarak sunmuştur. Şiirde temel mantığına göre Jupiter'in iktidara gelişi Altın Saturn Çağının bitmesine neden olmuş ve daha önce bütün olan yeryüzüyle cenneti birbirinden ayırmıştır. Bunu takiben, Vico'nun Tufan-sonrası yeryüzü tanımına benzer bir şekilde, yeryüzünde kıtlık, kuraklık, açlık ve insanlar arasında düşmanlık egemen olmuş ve Altın Çağın sürekli bahar havasının yerini yılın mevsimlere bölünmesiyle yaz ve kış mevsimlerinde aşırı sıcak ve soğukların yaşanması almıştır. Şiirin sonunda Jupiter'in cennetten kovulması ve Prometheus'un esaretten kurtulmasıyla Altın Çağ geri gelir ve yeryüzüyle cennet tekrar bütünleşir. Yaradılış mitolojisinin yeniden yazılması olarak ele alındığında bu son Shelley'in 'Güç, İnanç ve Gelenek' tarafından insanların kavramsal dünyalarında cennet-cehennem ve Tanrı-Şeytan ayrımlarının yok etmesiyle Altın Çağın geri gelmesinin mümkün olabileceğini düşündüğünü göstermektedir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, *Prometheus Unbound* ve *The Daemon of the World* arasında benzerlik olduğu görülmektedir.

Hyperion: A Fragment şiirinde Keats bu sefer antik Yunan mitolojisinde Güneş tanrısı olarak anılan Hyperion'u yaşam, sanat, güzellik ve tarihsel devinim ile ilgili düşüncelerini yansıtacak şekilde yeniden yaratır. Şiirde Yunan mitolojisinde Titanların Zeus'un başını çektiği Olymposlular tarafından iktidardan düşürülüşleri ele alınmaktadır. Titanlardan sadece Hyperion hala Güneş Tanrılığı görevini devam ettirmektedir. Ancak gökyüzünde doğudan batıya doğru hareket etmesiyle zaman döngüsünün temel kaynağı olmasına rağmen zamana ve tarihsel evrime yenik düşecektir çünkü şiirin özündeki felsefeye göre 'güzellikte birinci olan güçte de birincidir ve Olymposlu Apollo daha güzeli temsil ettiğinden iktidarı ele geçirmek üzeredir. Şiirin ana temasını oluşturan bir diğer cümle "Ode on a Grecian Urn" şiirinde de geçen "Güzel olan doğrudur, doğru da güzel olandır" cümlesidir. Keats, bu ve "güzellikte birinci olan güçte de birincidir" cümlelerini şiirin ana teması yaparak ve şiirdeki bütün figürleri bir heykel durağanlığıyla sunarak sanata, yaşama ve tarihsel döngüye dair düşüncelerini yansıtır ve 'güzellik'i sosyal gelişimin ve tarihsel döngünün ana prensibi haline getirir.

Endymion'da Keats güzellik temasını farklı bir açıdan ele alır ve "I Stood Tip-Toe Upon a Hill" ve "Ode to a Nightingale" şiirlerinde güzelliğin nerede aranması gerektiğiyle ilgili tartışmayı bu şiirde de irdeler. Endymion antik Yunan mitolojisinde uyurken Ay tanrıcası Diana'nın aşık olduğu ve bu yüzden Zeus tarafından genç kalma karşılığında sürekli uykuya mahkum edilen bir çobandır. Keats'in şiirinin konusu da Yunan mitindekine benzer: Endymion uyuduğu sırada düşünde Ay tanrıcası Diana'yı görür ve onunla bir aşk yaşamaya başlar. Bu andan itibaren Diana'yla beraber olmanın tek yolunun uyumak ve düş görmek olduğunu zanneden Endymion sürekli uyur ve 'güzelliği' düş dünyasında yarattığı mitlerde arar. Keats Endymion'u "Ode to a Nightingale" ve "I Stood Tip-Toe Upon a Hill" şiirlerinin konuşucuları gibi doğadaki nesnelere baktıkça onlara tinsel özellikler yükleyip onları mitolojinin yabancılaştırıcı dünyasına dönüştüren Romantik bir şair şeklinde sunmuştur. Tıpkı "Ode to a Nightingale"in konuşucusu gibi güzelliği başta hayal dünyasında yarattığı mitlerde arar. Ancak şiirin sonunda güzelliğin doğada olduğu, bu güzelliğin imgelemin devreye girmesiyle ortaya çıkarıldığı, mitolojinin de doğayla imgelem arasındaki bu etkileşimin ürünü olduğu sonucuna varılır.

Bu özette görüldüğü gibi, yaratıcı öznenin mit-yaratımcı imgelemi burada özetlenen bütün şiirlerde hem algılama nesnelerini hem de eski mitleri yeniden yaratan ve onlara farklı anlamlar yükleyen biçimlendirici bir güç olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Birinci bağlamda sınıflandırılan şiirlerde metafor ve mit yaratımının kaynağı olan imgelem, Kantçı, Romantik ve modern Neo-Kantçı düşünceleri doğrular bir şekilde doğadaki nesneleri tinsel, canlı ve ilahi varlıklara benzeştirerek onları biçimlendirir ve mitolojinin tanınmaz dünyasının birer parçası haline getirir. Ayrıca algılama sürecinde bahar ve sabahı çocuklukluk ve gençlikle, yaz ve öğleni orta yaşla, akşam ve sonbaharı yaşlılıkla, ve gece ve kışı ölümle özdeşleştiren halihazırdaki mit temalarını kullanarak da mitleştirme yapar. Mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma süreçlerinde izlenen yollar ve kullanılan mit temaları şiirden şiire değişse de bütün bu şiirlerde algılayan özne, nesneyi kendine

tabi kılan ve doğal olgunun imgelemsel işlemlemesi sırasında dili bir bütün olarak metaforik hale getiren biçimlendirici bir varlık olarak karşımıza çıkar.

İkinci bağlamda sınıflandırdığımız şiirlerde ise doğadaki nesneler yerine öznenin mit-yaratımcı imgelemi bu sefer öncül mitleri biçimlendirir ve onları yeniden yaratır. Bu şiirlerde daha önce hep kutsal olmayan kategorisinde değerlendirilen figürler kutsal, yüce ve güzel haline getirilir. Söz konusu şairler eski mitleri ayrıca yaşam, sanat, toplumsal gelişme ve tarih ile ilgili düşüncelerini yansıtmak için yeniden yorumlarlar. Özet olarak, bu tezde ele alınan bütün şiirlerde özne ve imgelemi anlamı belirleyen ve doğadaki nesneleri biçimlendiren bir varlık olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Mit ve metafor bu biçimlendirme eylemini olanaklı kılan etkenlerdir. Mitleştirme ve metaforlaştırma öznenin şekillendirme sürecinde kullandığı temel ifade araçlarıdır. Böyle bir metaforlaştırma eylemi kuşkusuz söylem düzeyinde gerçekleşir. İmgelem cağrışımsal bir şekilde işlediğinden onun ifadesi olan dil kuşkusuz bir bütün olarak metaforik olacaktır.

APPENDIX B

VITA

Fırat Karadaş was born in Antakya on January 06, 1972. He received his B.A. degree in English Language and Literature from Ankara University in 1997. He worked as a research assistant at Mustafa Kemal University between 1998-9. Since 1999, he has been a research assistant at METU in the department of Foreign Language Education, where he obtained his M.A. degree in 2002 and his P.h.D. in 2007, both in English Literature. His main areas of study are English literature, literary theory and philosophy.

Publications:

"The Monstrous Power of Speech in Edgar Allan Poe's 'The Cask of Amontillado.'" *Interactions*. Spring 2007, Vol. 16.1. 99-107

"Wolfgang Iser's Theory of Reading and a Contrastive Analysis of the Role of the Reader in a Realist and Modernist Text." *Sakarya Üniversitesi II. Uluslararası Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyatbilim Kongresi Kongre Bildirileri*, I. Cilt. 07-08 Eylül 2006. 245-55.

"Yaşar Kemal'in Üç Romanında Düş-Gerçek İlişkisi ve Mitos Yaratımı." *Sakarya Üniversitesi II. Uluslararası Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyatbilim Kongresi Kongre Bildirileri*, I. Cilt. 07-08 Eylül 2006. 256-64.

Paper Presentations:

"The Spatial and Synchronic Character of Myth." ACLA Annual Conference. Princeton University. March 23-6, 2006.

"The Imaginative and Ideational Character of Language in Edgar A. Poe's 'The Cask of Amontillado.'" ACLA Annual Conference. Princeton University. March 23-6, 2006.

"Dialogism and the Role of Female Figures in the Dissemination of Authority in Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony.*" *Ex-Centric Narratives*. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. 15-8 March, 2007.