



Universidad de Chile  
Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades  
Departamento de Lingüística

“Miltonic influence in John Keats’ creative process of reshaping  
myths in *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*”

Informe final de Seminario para optar al grado de Licenciado en Lengua y Literatura  
Inglesas

Alumno

Daniela Francisca Navarro Aliste

Profesor Patrocinante

Héctor Andrés Ferrada Aguilar

Santiago, Chile.

2016

## Agradecimientos

Gracias a mi maravillosa familia, mis padres, Julio Navarro y Edith Aliste, y mi hermana Camila por su apoyo incondicional y por creer siempre en mí, pero por sobre todo, gracias por soportar mi afán de contradecir todo, y mis quejas diarias sobre la universidad y la vida en general. Gracias infinitas por todo, de verdad sin la motivación que ustedes me brindan habría desertado el primer año, perdiéndome así experiencias maravillosas.

Gracias a los profesores Ximena Tabilo, Pascuala Infante, Guillermo Duff, y Andrés Ferrada, por darme las herramientas y conocimiento necesarios para enfrentar cada desafío, y por su compromiso que va más allá de lo académico.

Gracias a mis comprensivos amigos. Perdón por no prestarles la atención que merecían por estar haciendo algo relacionado con la universidad. Por sobre todo a Javier Duarte por su preocupación constante, a Pablo Loza por estar siempre ahí, a Valentina Moya, Fabiola Salas, Macarena Urriola, Claudia Rojas, Valeria Villa, Tania Muñoz, y Carla Fierro, por ser una constante en mi vida y por soportarme ya tantos años. Y a las hermosas personas que conocí en este proceso, a los cabros, al Alexis mi partner, Maripapa, Coni, Cami, y Lilí de verdad que marcaron la diferencia en esta experiencia universitaria y me los llevo para el resto de mi vida. Los quiero mucho.

## Index

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Theoretical Framework.....	10
3. Literary Approach.....	23
4. Analysis.....	25
5. Conclusion.....	51
6. References.....	54

## Introduction

At the moment of referring to art, as human expression in any of its forms, the concept of influence seems to inexorably come by its hand. The word *influence* comes from the Old French astrological term used to describe the “streaming ethereal power from the stars acting upon [the] character or destiny of men” (Harper), that is to say, it is the capability of an element or entity to impact or have an effect on the character or destiny of an individual. In this regard, poets or writers draw their creativity from this external ethereal power whose source are not stars but individuals made up by stars, namely, other poets. Influence bears a dual quality: it can be caustic and warranted at the same time. Writers can find in influence the *primum mobile* which motivates their creative process, but they can be haunted by the challenge of improve and surpass the original work, their source of influence. It seems that influence is an inexorable power from which no man can run away from. Artists are driven by their predecessors, the majority of their creative processes are driven by the need of recreating or reacting against the art that came before.

In relation to literature, the towering figures which have been inspiring new writers and poets are the ones of Homer, Shakespeare, Milton, and Dante, to mention some. During the Romantic Movement the tallest figure, and the most outstanding source of inspiration was that of Milton. Harold Bloom in his work *Anxiety of Influence* asserts that “if one examines the dozen or so major poetic influences before this century, one discovers quickly who among them ranks as the great Inhibitor, the Sphinx who strangles even strong imaginations in their cradles: Milton” (32). John Milton’s influence seems to be transversal in the Romantic period.

From proto-romantics like William Blake, writers from the first generation of Romantics such as Coleridge and Wordsworth who “sought to emulate *Paradise Lost*” and “had the ambition to replace [it]” (Bloom, “Visionary” 275) participants of the Satanic school like Byron and Shelley, to Keats from the Cockney school; from the very beginnings of the Romantic movement to the very last representatives of this movement, all of them were allegedly influenced in a way by John Milton’s work (Shears). Especially by *Paradise Lost*.

The Romantic Movement is usually depicted as one of the first and most daring poetic revolutions (Paz 40) because it was the first that dared to explore the realm of dreams, of unconscious, thought and eroticism. Besides from that, it was the place where the most significant change in the configuration of mythology was carried out. During this period, the social agency acquired by literature is heightened. Literature was the staircase from where the poet could denounce iniquity and injustice. Accordingly, romanticism is a hallmark when religion is addressed, and likewise. Romantic religion is “heresy, syncretism, apostasy, blasphemy, conversions” (45), there is a fracture in religion which is prompted by irony –that exposes the duality in that which seemed whole, a disruption of the principle of identity–, and anguish –which reveals nothingness into the fullness of existence, and shows the emptiness of existence: life is death and heaven is desert. Fracture that is portrayed by Romantic poets.

Until modernity, the Judeo-Christian belief of the Biblical God dominated literary and philosophical traditions. It was through Romanticism, with the help of the ideas of Enlightenment, where one of the first major changes in this patterns of mythology and beliefs was made. Romantic writers through their writings re-articulated mythology, and showed their rejection towards this hegemonic religious vision. Therefore, insofar as Romanticism acted as an outlet for the ongoing tensions between ideas of social order, human nature, and God, which were present in this period, religion contributed as well “to both the content and expression of many Romantic public visions. Many Romantic authors identified with dissenting, Christian traditions that put them at odds with the religious and political establishment of the day” (Cladis 57), thus initiating the shift of the religious hegemonic paradigm.

Romanticism can be seen as the motivator of this open attitude in society towards mythology. Mythology is understood as the set of myths, which are makings of imagination. The re-articulation of myths opened up a new vision on the world, and caused the old Cosmo vision to be perceived with fresh eyes, hence believed in a new brand way. Each poet conceives his own mythology by mixing different beliefs, personal obsessions, and rediscovered myths (Paz 44). For example, this behaviour can be seen in Shelley with

her work *Prometheus Unbound* and *Frankenstein*, in Blake's *Urizen*, to mention some. This might explain why *Paradise Lost* had such an impact on writers of that period.

The first generation of romantics was characterised by their dissention towards "established systems in poetry and criticism" (Greenblatt 8) and *Paradise Lost* leads the way to go. This work is the first who offers a new perspective of Satan, narrates the story from his point of view, and proposes him as a hero instead as a miscreant. As opposed to the image offered by the Holy Bible that propose him as the evil who deceives the world, and is the opposite of true life. This work is the first crack in religious hegemony, crack that will be augmented by Romantic writers.

In particular, Keats was profoundly influenced by Milton's *Paradise Lost*. The majority of the works that tackle the problem of influence, and more specifically Milton's influence on Keats, assert this influence by making direct reference to biographical evidence. For instance, Lau's work asserts that among his collection of books, the only one which was heavily annotated and marked was Milton's one. Keats also owned several books of Shakespeare, Chaucer, and Dante, but none of them was as marked and annotated as this one. It is important to highlight that the *Divine Comedy* survives intact but *Inferno* is heavily marked and annotated (Lau 2). Additionally, Keats throughout his career used Hellenic and ideas retrieved from Greek mythology. Keats was fascinated with the ancient culture and especially with its system of beliefs.

According to Bloom, Milton was one of the few writers who did not suffer from the anxiety of influence. This is mostly because he was able to surpass and outshine his predecessors. Bloom states that "Milton is the central problem in any theory and history of poetic influence in English" (33), thus he is the towering figure that all English writers, especially the ones that belong to the Romantic Movement, looked up to. Bloom quotes Hazlitt to exemplify the impact that reading his works had on the readers by saying that "in reading [Milton's] works, [they] feel [themselves] under the influence of a mighty intellect, that the nearer it approaches to others, becomes more distinct from them" (34). The ethos of the post-Enlightenment poetry was created out of the mutual influence of Milton and Wordsworth.

However, there are no works that stick strictly to the texts to demonstrate said intertextual relationship between Milton and Keats. As it was exemplified in the previous paragraphs, the bulk of studies that have researched about this topic confirm Milton's influence on Keats poetry solely guided by the examination of letters, diaries, and the annotations that John Keats made in his books. There are limited studies that through a close inspection of their poetry, that create relations between plots, characterization, settings, among other elements, to offer a stronger support to said statements.

Thus, this study has as its object Keats' creative process of re-creation of myths. Keats, unlike his movement partners, engaged in the re-creation of non-linear myths. Keats seems to draw most of his poetic creation from Greek mythology. In order to explore this relationship, works by Keats: *Hyperion*, and *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*, and Milton's *Paradise Lost* will be analysed. In the analysis two key moments from *Hyperion*, and two from the cantos of *The Fall of Hyperion* will be compared with their counterparts, for separate, in *Paradise Lost* in order to establish intertextual relationships, and support the claim that Keats' creative product is heavily influenced by John Milton *Paradise Lost*. The ultimate intention of this dissertation is to draw the attention towards those points that are prevalent in Milton and Keats reformulated myths, for instance, the prevalence of the mind as an indispensable element in both myths which is approached in different fashion by the authors, and how they decided to approach the mind is decisive for the development of the narrative.

Through the creative process of the re-articulation of myths under the influence of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* — influence that shows itself through Keats' employment of similar story-structures, akin characters that share appearance yet very dissimilar in psychological terms, and analogous themes (e.g. the fall), subjects, and locations (e.g. the Eden Garden, the councils located in the underworld), and aided by the capability of myths of imposing personal truths as the absolute truth, Keats transmits and spreads his own beliefs stressing the improvement prompted by a particular aesthetic vision, namely, the importance of beauty and truth —ubiquitous elements in his poetic production— as main premises in the configuration of this new world generated by the manipulation of the myth of the Titan Hyperion and of the Fall of Man.

However, Keats did not overcome the anxiety of influence. Predominantly because he discontinued both works. Nonetheless, in the first attempt Miltonic influence is not as subtle as it is in the second attempt. This might hint an attempt from Keats' part to distancing his poetic labour from the influence that Milton exerts in him in a second instance—which is *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*.

What is innovative in Keats' reformulations is how he, aided by the power that myths have (that of making certain ideas appear eternal and necessary) and by a specific selection of myths— that contain characters that seem fit to carry certain meanings (e.g. Apollo as the figure of the poet) and thematic (e.g. the necessary development of power structures. Titans replaced by Gods), and producing innovative characterisations of characters that break with classical stablished canons of the personification and description of certain individuals (e.g. Hesiod's Saturn who does not hesitate about eating his children because they were a threat is the most common and widespread characterisation of Saturn. Characterization that is not continued in Keats' works) that help him to enforce and strengthen the point he makes in each poem.

The main and general objective of this dissertation is to expand and develop further the way in which myth is approached in Romantic literature, observing it beyond its classical content but as a process which enable poets, in this case John Keats, to universalize and disseminate their own beliefs and visions of what is truth.

The specific objectives are to discover the influence that Milton's poetic endeavour had in Keats' reshaping of myths. Additionally it would be explored in which way does this influence expresses itself in Keats' *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*, how does Keats overcome the anxiety of influence, and how does he permeates the reshaped myths with his own Cosmo vision prompting thus creative, and innovative myths.

Keats was chosen as the focus in this dissertation because of his interest on cyclical myths which contain ideas, concepts, and knowledge which were not commonplaces back then. For instance, Greek mythology, compared to Christian mythology, is polytheistic and has a cyclical perspective, which is to say that every event could be repeated: the dead could resuscitate and come back. Idea that is diametrically different from the Christian rectilinear and irreversible perspective (Paz 45). Another aspect is that the Olympian



pantheon is concretely embodied by actual fleshy and tangible entities who wandered amongst forests alongside men, whilst the Judeo-Christian god is just one, who is abstract and has never been seen by men. Keats does not stick with Christianity—which was the widespread religion in England. Instead, he proposes a completely different system of beliefs from the one that dominated back-then. This is opposed to the re-creation of linear myths (e.g. Blake) that propose a reaction against Judeo-Christian hegemony by re-configuring it.

The bulk of studies that have explored Miltonic influence in Keats' poetry have done it taking into account biographical evidence —like Lau's work which is based in the analysis of book annotations made by Keats, or Sperry's whose analysis and interpretation is supported with biographical data and letters. The main objective of this dissertation is to read and analyse John Keats' mythological poetry, more specifically *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream* in order to demonstrate the extent of Milton's influence in the creative process of Keats' mythopoesis, through the tools offered by New Criticism. That is to say, avoiding historical and biographical data, sticking solely to the texts.

## Theoretical Framework

At the moment of describing the fundamental elements of romanticism the creative power of the mind and its active perception of truth and reality are the most outstanding characteristics of the epoch. In the poetry of John Keats this power is seen as a means to create a vision of beauty that transcends time and all considerations. The Grecian urn, the nightingale's song, Hermes' love, all of them are depicted as beautiful elements that will never perish. Keats strongly believed that the power of poetry lies mainly in its eternity; opposed to the fleeting nature of human life. Thus his poetry offers an escape into a world of classic beauty. Ideas that are depicted and elaborated in Keats mythological poetry.

In order to understand Keats' poetry in the light of this work the concepts of influence, myth, and mythopoeia will be defined. These concepts are hallmarks of Keats' poetry and are transversal in his creative product. It is important to mention that there is awareness on the fact that myth and mythopoeia are complex terms at the moment of articulating this framework. Hence those terms will be tackled in the attempt of offering a definition which will be mainly making reference to its social and creative component.

In relation to the concept of influence Harold Bloom's *The Anxiety of Influence*, "The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition" by Hassan, and "Tradition and the individual talent" by T. S. Eliot will be consulted to elaborate a comprehensive definition of the concept of influence.

*The Anxiety of Influence* was written in 1973 by Harold Bloom. This book was one of the first books that proposed a new revisionary approach to literary criticism. In this work, Bloom works on influence and intertextuality. He defines influence drawing from its etymology *influenza* –an astral disease (135). This disease is directly linked with the anxiety that writers undergo in their attempt of competing with, and overcoming their ancestors; a "disease of self-consciousness" (29) which is only overcome by strong poets. His main thesis is that poets and writers are inspired by the great works of their predecessors, but by writing under their influence the outcome is a text of lesser quality. By using the Freudian Oedipal rivalry, Bloom illustrates the relationship between the

predecessor and the successor. The son, which is the influenced, wants to become the father –who is not his father for the muse and him “failed to beget him. He must be self-begotten, he must engender himself upon the Muse” (37)–, the influencer, to finally own the Muse. Thus becoming the great I, the influencer.

Bloom summarises his ideas stating that every poem is a misinterpretation of a parent poem. Those poems do not overcome the anxiety but are embodiments of the very anxiety. Poetry is “the anxiety of influence, is misprision, is a disciplined perverseness. Poetry is misunderstanding, misinterpretation, misalliance” (95). Every poem is the product of the poet’s melancholy, they arise from the illusion of freedom of poets. Poems are products of the creative minds of poets, an invention that comes out of their imagination which is an accumulation of personal experiences and readings. “The poem . . . is a made thing, and as such is an achieved anxiety” (96). The covering cherub –which is a symbol of anxiety, continuity with the past, and the hardness that prevents the poets from reaching the full extension of their creative potential– is what thwarts the poets to reach immortality and divinity, it is the sin that shames them and strangles them – it is “the power that blocks realization” (25). The poet is condemned to be moulded by history and to receive a nature, but those who overcome this hardship can make their quest for immortality.

In this regard, Keats’ covering cherub is embodied in Milton. Milton is the source of inspiration that motivates him to rearticulate the myth of Hyperion and the fall of his Titan siblings, fashioning it in a way that resembles and follows the key moments of *Paradise Lost* (e.g. the introduction of Satan, and the council in Hell). But at the same time, it is the same Milton who thwarts this attempt of writing under his influence to such extent that he decides to abandon his task for feeling unable to reach saying that he “lately stood on [his] guard against Milton [because] life to him would be death to [me]” (Sherwin 383). This is to say, once he realized that his first *Hyperion* contained too many Miltonic inversions he abandoned the task of keep on writing it. Continuing this line of work would signify to keep on using Miltonic forms, thus reproducing Milton’s way of writing and not showing his Keatsian forms, namely, his own way of writing. Nevertheless, from Milton’s *Paradise Lost* Keats enriches his own myth of Hyperion drawing from those elements that are

essential and giving them an alternative development which diverges from the one given by Milton, and that affect and permeates the whole narration.

On the other hand, Hassan proposes that a sharper characterisation of the character of the problem of influence and its implications is needed. Therefore he attempts to reach a definition of said problem.

He states that when reading a work and looking for its influence several issues should be taken into account. Hassan states that when it is stated that *A* has influenced *B* “we mean that after literary or aesthetic analysis we can discern a number of significant similarities between the works of *A* and *B*” (68), and those similarities might not only be in terms of aesthetics but also of points of contact between the lives or minds of those writers. We have to establish ‘what’ we precisely mean when we say that an author has been influenced, because authors are influenced by great many things (67). There are vast agents that are said to have exerted influence on literature such as historical events (The Black Death), literary conventions (the Ciceronian oration), cultural traditions (Courtly love), theories or ideas (Platonic essences), a thinker (Aristotle), a literary movement (Romanticism), authors (Hemingway), literary works (*The Wasteland*). According to Hassan, all those agents are legitimate objects of influence that have to be taken into account at the moment of analysing a work of art. But among those agents none seems to be more central to literary history than the one that seeks to define the relationship between the works of an author with the ones of other author.

When assessing *A* influence in *B* we need to know what made a writer susceptible of that influence, and it is heavily important to know the extent of the contact between the influenced and the influencer. Because, as stated by Hassan, there had been authors that “have been sometimes unaware of works that were supposed to have directly influenced them” (73). This is why he advises that when reviewing the influence of certain author in another a deep research on

[L]etters, diaries, notebooks, histories, social documents, ideological manifestoes . . . are all to be considered, not simply to the degree they establish the ring and hue of a cultural context, but, more important still, to the degree they and the context they

establish are contradicted by those literary works which we intent to place in meaningful apposition (73).

Which is to say, it is important not to assume *a priori* that some author has been influenced by another but to look for empiric data that can strengthen our argument.

In this regard it is important to highlight that Keats was aware of the influence that Milton exerted on him. There are dozens of correspondence where he makes direct reference to this issue, and according to Lau's research on his personal library, the only book that is heavily annotated is that of *Paradise Lost*. But as the objective of the present work is to demonstrate and analyse this influence without the aid of elements that are external to the poems this kind of evidence will not be utilised in this investigation. Instead in this enquiry the attention will be solely on the poems that will operate as autotelic artifacts independent from the author's history, or its context of production. For this the strategies offered by close reading, related to new criticism, such as paying attention to word choice, imagery, structure, and descriptions will be employed. Nevertheless, this biographical information will be kept in mind, in order to fulfil this requirement proposed by Hassan of being aware of the extent of the contact between the influenced (Keats), and the influencer (Milton) at the moment of carrying out an enquiry of this kind.

This is the reason why he divided the concept of influence into the two principles of similarity and causality. Similarity is related to tradition, namely, taken with reference to a developed system of norms. Causality is related to development, it is the modification of a tradition into another. To exemplify this point he quotes T.S Eliot saying that "true originality is merely development" (75). These two concepts represent the dynamics of the concept of influence because they "guide and restrain us in evaluating the relation of writer to writer, period to writer, or period to period" (75). Therefore, influence is not just causality and similarity operating through time but multiple correlations and similarities functioning in a historical sequence; it is the dynamic relationship between tradition and development and its progress.

A contrary idea is proposed by T. S Eliot in his essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent". Here he tackles the problem of tradition in poetry. Even though he does not make direct reference to the concept of influence the way in which he tackles tradition proves to

be useful. He opens his essay talking about the different uses of the concept tradition, and of criticism stating that it is “as inevitable as breathing” (13). He states that there is a tendency to praise writers for the aspects of their work that resembles anyone else, that is to say, the individual and the peculiar. But he argues that often “the most individual parts of his work may be those in which the dead poets . . . assert their immortality most vigorously” (14). This sharing across poets, when it is not a mere following of the ways of the immediate generation before us in a blind adherence to its successes (14), involves the historical sense. The historical sense “compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order” (14). Therefore, a traditional writer has a sense of the temporal and of the timeless together. And this perspective is not merely inherited, but obtained through hard work.

According to Eliot, all poets are interconnected with one another, “no poet, no artist of any art, has his own meaning alone” (15). They cannot be valued alone but be compared with the dead, but this evaluation is by no means a one that says that *A* work is better or worse than *B*, but to prove if this new work fits into the history of art. A poet should be conscious of the past, of what has been done before his own creation. There is no real originality without this historical awareness.

Then he says that honest criticism and sensitive appreciation should be directed towards the poetry and not upon the poet. The bulk of criticism addresses the names of writers but “if we seek not Blue-book knowledge but the enjoyment of poetry, and ask for a poem, we shall seldom find it” (17). For Eliot the poet mind should be like a piece of platinum reacting with two inert gasses, that is to say, unaltered. The best poet is the one that leaves himself out of the poem; their personality should not be valued in the process of creation, just the poem.

Keats is historically aware of what has been done before, and he is more so aware of Milton’s creations –as it was discussed before. From this historical awareness Keats is going to extract those elements that will enhance his own creative process of re-creating myths, and that will help him to improve the expression of his ideas of beauty and truth.

And at the same time, following T.S Eliot's ideas, these reformulated myths will possibly alter the already existing perception that readers have on the poetic axes of beauty and truth, causing thus a readjustment on the old order to welcome this new perception. Additionally, he will take those elements present in Milton's work and influenced by them will give them a turn that will enable him to reach his own originality.

Therefore influence can be defined, for the objective of this work, as the intertextual relationship between two authors, where one is the exemplary figure or the influencer, and the other, the receiver of the influence. The result of this relationship is the transmission of features, topics, themes, or characteristics from one unit to the other. The influenced writes under the influence of a towering figure, whilst possessing a historical sense. He is conscious of the past, and at the same time is moulded by History; elements that are reflected in the final result of his creative process.

It is heavily important to state that the perspective that this work will adopt is the one proposed by Eliot, because Hassan's account solves the problem of influence relegating influence on the author's biographical aspects—a revision of his/her diaries, book annotations, letters, among others—. In this work this way of tackling the influence will be avoided in order to favour an analysis based solely on the texts.

As the aim of this work is to discover the influence—concept that was already defined—in Keats' creative process of reshaping myths, it is of importance to build a definition that can allow us to approach the concept of myth under the light of the present study. Hence, in order to elaborate a definition on the concept of myth, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms, Mythologies* by Barthes, and *Anatomy of Criticism* and *Creation and Recreation* by Northrop Frye will be reviewed.

The definition offered by the *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* is that of a “story or rudimentary narrative sequence, normally traditional and anonymous, through which a given culture ratifies its social customs or accounts for the origins of human and natural phenomena, usually in supernatural or boldly imaginative terms” (Baldick 163), like the social creation of the God of sea to explain natural disasters. Then the concept ‘mythologies’ is introduced and defined as a “body of related myths shared by members of

a given people or religion” (164) or even by a single individual as the personal mythologies of William Blake.

Barthes composed his work *Mythologies* during the 1950's. This epoch was marked by the World War II and all the problems it caused. This is the reason why his theory is frequently exemplified and concerned with political and social issues. For instance, the utilisation of the example of a magazine cover where a black soldier is shown saluting the French flag to exemplify his second-order model of semiology. That is to say, at a first-order level the picture denotes an event –the soldier saluting the flag– but in a second-order level it expressed the idea of France being a multi-ethnic empire.

Barthes in this work attempts to dissect myths and its process of creating. The book is composed by two main sections, each with a different objective. In the first part Barthes offers essays on modern myths, such as Einstein, toys, among others. While on the second part he engages in answering what is a myth, and what they mean nowadays. It is this second part the one that this account will consider to retrieve the definition of the concept of myth because the first part does not offer information that is related to the present enquiry.

Barthes defines myth as “a type of speech” (107), a system of communication, a message. They are a play on the analogy between meaning and form, there are no myths without motivated forms (125). Myths make certain signs seem eternal, absolute, they freeze some signs making them perpetual. Their main objective is

[G]iving a historical intention a natural justification, and making contingency appear eternal. Now this process is exactly that of bourgeois ideology. If our society is objectively the privileged field of mythical significations, it is because formally myth is the most appropriate instrument for the ideological inversion which defines this society: at all the levels of human communication (142)

Myths for him are tools utilised by the ruling social class to perpetuate an idea of society that adheres to their current ideology. Myths make their particular agendas seem natural and essential, and help to maintain the status quo and convince people that structures of power are eternal and necessary



This is quite significant in the context of Keats' rearticulation of myths mainly because myths "convince people that structures of power are eternal and necessary" which is exactly the most important and central point made in *Hyperion*. But the difference with typical western myth is that Keats through this poem also rearticulates this idea of power being eternally portrayed by the same entities. He through this myth also proposes a fresh concept of structures of power with the replacement of the Titans, and by Oceanus words he prompts this idea of the need for power structures to be constantly changing because evolution is necessary. Those who have reached excellence, and have developed should be the ones that rule.

By reshaping this myth, Keats also reconfigures contingency proposing that structures of power must evolve, thus leaving aside this idea of eternal tyrants which are supported by their own myths. Keats took a quite neglected cultural taproot, which is classical antiquity. He did not manipulate common classical myths, such as the ones that involve Zeus, Hades, or Atenea—namely, gods. He manipulated the ones that involved archaic ruling entities. He took an essential element from the very origins of western cultural history with an already made vocabulary and symbolism, that is to say, which was already extensively developed, reshaped it, and endowed it with his own visions thus creating his own myths.

Myths are received rather than read, the reader/receiver is not expected to construct any meaning nor to interpret it. They only require certain cultural background knowledge to be received. Consumers of myths do not see the construction but its signified (128). What they see is reality, and are convinced so as if they actually underwent the experience. They consume goals, commands, statement of facts, meanings and images, not signs. Additionally, myths just state facts, but they are not based on any theory. The facts exposed in myths are taken as self-present and not as mysteries to be explained, "Myth is read as a factual system" (130).

On the other hand, Northrop Frye around the same period (1950's) wrote his work *Anatomy of Criticism*. In this book he brings together four essays where he engages with the formulation of a "sort of morphology of literary symbolism" (7) from a critical perspective. His objective is to make sense of such words like *myth*, *symbol*, *ritual* and *archetype* as he mentions in the preface of his account. And *Creation and Recreation*

which was published few decades later. Several lectures and essays are drawn together in this book. In these essays he deals with the concept of creation mostly.

The preliminary definition that he offers of myth is “a story about a god” (Frye, “Anatomy” 33) or “stories, or sequential acts of personified beings” (Frye, “Creation” 28); stories which are produced by every culture in their own concrete way. But first of all he establishes that myths are basically “*mythos* or narrative, words arranged in sequential order” (“Creation” 27), definition that is more related with the idea that myths can also be intertextual archetypes. He addresses the concept of mythology, which is made up by myths, and defines it as “the total structure of human creation conveyed by words, with literature as its centre” (7) and it is the embryo of literature and arts. Myths –and therefore mythology– are continuously updated across time either by cultures or “by the poets in each generation” (7); and it is from this cultural product, out of the story patterns contained in mythology, that literature develops (28). Frye explains that poets can do what they like with their myths and can marry them with other myths, thus producing an imaginative offspring of myths (28).

He distinguishes three main organizations of myth: the undisplaced myth, which is concerned with gods or demons and that takes the form of two contrasting worlds, one desirable and other undesirable (“Anatomy” 139). These two opposites are usually identified with the heaven and hells of the religions which are contemporary with the literature that produces them. The second one is the romantic, this is more related to human experience and the association of mythical patterns to said experience. And the last one which is the tendency of realism which throws more emphasis on the content and representation than on the shape of the story. But in more general terms he defines myth as symbols that function beyond a single text because their meaning is understood and defined by a culture rather than a single author.

The myth that results from the reshaping made by Keats is influenced by the undisplaced myth that is *Paradise Lost*, where two opposed forces are clearly discernible. However, the myth he constructs from that influence does not fit in the category of undisplaced myths. Mainly because Keats offers a myth which content is concerned with the representation of blameless entities (e.g. the Titans and the dreamer) which are

overthrown—loosing forever their innocence and divinity, for unknown reasons. The blameless Titans are replaced not by their immediate opposite, which is what happens in an undisplaced myth, but by entities that are like them. To sum up, even though Keats gets his inspiration from an undisplaced myth where two opposite forces clash, his process of reshaping does not finish with a myth alike in nature but with a myth more concerned with content and experience instead of with the battle of two forces.

Keats took the myth of the Titans and their fall, and organized it in his desired fashion marrying it with his own ideas of truth and his own mythology. Once the myth and Keats perception on the world meet, both change. Even though he guides himself with Milton's *Paradise Lost* at the moment of writing his works, he does not possess the same mind and perception that Milton had on things. Therefore, his perception and beliefs will inevitably permeate the development and reformulation of myths. And not just the specific myths of Hyperion and of the Fall of men, but also the concept of myth in itself (e.g. like the break with the idea of the need of eternal structures of power which are supported with myths, because *Hyperion*'s moral is completely contrary to this idea which is inherent in the genesis of a myth).

Therefore, the definition of myth that will be utilised in this work is: a piece of narrative which is created by an individual or a group of people with different purposes. Among these purposes, the chief motive underlying the creation of myths is the construction of accounts that answer questions such as 'What are we here for?', 'Where did we come from?' among others. This need to answer such questions would explain why myths are inherent in all cultures. Furthermore, they can be created by individuals in order to express their own beliefs, to give an explanation of certain phenomena, or to demonstrate their own Cosmo vision. They, archetypically, are stories about gods, and do not have any solid theoretical basis that supports their content. They cannot be proved through a process of falsification<sup>1</sup>. However, even though myths are considered as a complex kind of

---

<sup>1</sup> This word is used with the intention of evoking Karl Popper's idea on how in order to prove a theory a process of refutation is needed. If something cannot be refuted nor contrasted with a contra argument, this theory is accepted provisionally but not held as completely true (These theories are categorised as pseudo-scientific. In this group religion and myths are found). On the other hand, if the theory can be contrasted and it is possible to refute it, the theory is proved as true.

knowledge, in poetry they find a way of being expressed and interpreted. Poetry enables an approach between myth and reader's experience. This capability of poetry is what enables Keats and Milton to take those seemingly impersonal aspects of myths (e.g. Satan's lack of ethos in *The Holy Bible*) and permeated them with their own experience and world vision.

The objectives of myths depend on their creators; for instance, when created by hegemonic groups they are usually aiming to maintain the status quo (e.g. *The Holy Bible* gathers Judaeo-Christian mythology and has been used as a moral-code book for centuries, and used to establish what is right and what is not). And the ideal consumer of myths is expected to receive them without further analysis and believe what it is said as reality.

From the concept of myth, the concept of mythopoeia arises inexorably. Myths do not appear out of nothing. So it is of great importance to dive in the process of creation of myths and offer a more detailed account that explains the process behind myths. Process which is closely related to the object of study of this research which is the re-articulation of myths.

In order to offer a continuity on these two related terms –myth and mythopoeia– two of the texts that were utilised to define myth will be utilised to build the definition of mythopoeia –*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* and *Mythologies*–. The main reason why *Anatomy of Criticism* will not be employed is because *Creation and Recreation* by the same author offers a more fitting treatment of the subject for the purposes of this work.

*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* defines mythopoeia as “the making of myths, either collectively in the folklore and religion of a given culture, or individually by a writer who elaborates a personal system of spiritual principles . . . the term is used in a loose sense to describe any kind of writing that either draws upon older myths or resembles myths” (Baldick 164), which is to say, they can be generated out of nothing, or can be drawn from already existing myths.

Barthes' description of the creative process behind myths is full of terms borrowed from the field of linguistics, especially from the structuralist tradition. He draws from semiology, more specifically from the Saussurean theory of the linguistic sign. In a summary,

Saussure's theory proposes a dyadic model where the sign is composed of two elements: the signifier, which is the mental and acoustic-image, the word; and the signified, which is the mental concept triggered by the enunciation of the sign.

He states that myths cannot be objects, ideas, nor concepts. Signs do not have intrinsic meanings, they acquire meaning once they have been appropriated by society. It is society that establishes the link between a concept and its sign, or signified and its signifier. The nature of this link, when talking about the linguistic sign is arbitrary. That is to say, there is no natural relationship between the word 'cat' and the mental concept of cat. Cats do not have a kind of 'catness', the word assigned to the concept is purely arbitrary, there is no motivation behind the assignment of a certain sign to a concept. The sign is born when people associate the word with an idea. On the contrary, mythical signification is never arbitrary, because it is always in part motivated, and contains some analogy (Barthes 124).

Myths, according to Barthes, operate under similar rules. He states that everything in the world can become a myth through an appropriation by society. He exemplifies this point by saying that a tree is a tree, but a tree as expressed by Minou Drouet, which is embellished and has a type of social usage added to the pure matter, is no longer the same tree. This social usage is the key element that he will utilise to develop the concept of mythopoeia. Myths acquire their status throughout time, "myth is a type of speech chosen by history" (108) for they have historical foundation, and it is history that converts reality into speech. Myth is a type of speech chosen by history, there is no myth that evolved from the nature of things. It is not confined to oral nor written speech, it can be expressed through pictures, sport, publicity, or cinema, etc. Any material can be arbitrarily endowed with meaning

Myth is an extension of the signification system proposed by Saussure, he adds a third element to the dyadic model of Saussure. Myths are a "second-order semiological system" (113) and are created when the sign produced through the initial signification becomes the signifier for another level of signification.

This process is depicted as a meta-signification, which also is called mythopoesis, and the sign produced by the second process is the myth. It is important to highlight that the materials of mythical speech are reduced to a pure signifying function as soon as they are caught by myth.

Frye starts by stating that humans are free to shape their beliefs, beliefs that will be mirroring human concerns and society. Mirroring that is strongly related with the concept of mythology –a compendium of myths. He asserts that there are as many varieties of myths as there are societies to create them (30); but among the plethora of narratives produced by cultures there are two main domineering types of myth-making that can be discerned. In order to explain the underlying process of myth-making he proposed a primeval myth-maker detached from his social context, alone in the Garden of Eden. The place he is looking at will be the defining feature which will differentiate the two kinds of myth-making. The first is the one that is generated if the primeval myth-maker is looking at the earth: the sexual-creation myth with earth mother as the womb and tomb of life (31), and death as its principle. The second kind of myth is originated if the primeval myth-maker is looking towards the sky and sees the solar cycle, which suggests a cycle of the same. This myth does not start with sexual union but with a higher and superior power that controls this cycle, a sky-father. Individuals will derive their myth-making from their notions of birth and death

Therefore, it can be said that traditionally, mythmaking is the process of bestowing nature with some characteristics and attributes of human beings and animals. The concept of mythopoeia that will be utilised throughout this work is: the creative act by which an individual or a group can either create out of nothing a new system of beliefs, or take an already existing myth, manipulate it, and re-create it adding their own particular Cosmo vision. The nature of the myth will be heavily influenced by the world perception of the myth-maker because, as an example, if he has a more cyclical perception of time he will be more inclined to create/modify myths that will fit this sensitivity. For instance, Nerval in his poem “Christ in the Olive Garden” manipulates Judaeo-Christian mythology and offers a new development of the events. He proposes a godless world where Jesus becomes God by his sacrifice. But the new-acquired nature of this God is not under the Christian tradition; he is brought back from death and elements from Greek Cosmo vision are integrated to the narration (e.g. Julio Caesar asking the oracle of Jupiter Ammon who this new God was).

## Literary approach

This work will utilise the tools offered by New Criticism to analyse Milton's and Keats' works. That is to say, in this work no reference will be made to outside sources such as the author's biography, historical background, personal journals, and annotations found in books of their ownership. I am not stating that this kind of evidence is irrelevant nor unimportant, it is just that they have little bearing on the pursue of the main objective of this work, which is to demonstrate Milton's influence in the creative process of Keats in the re-articulation of myth focusing solely on the works—as opposed to the bulk of studies that have their foundation on biographical data.

The specific tools that will be employed in this enquiry, and that are proposed by new criticism, is first, the close analysis in fine detail of the pieces of work selected in this study. This close reading is heavily important for the construction of a larger analysis. The focus on small-scale details like the author's choice of words will enable an analysis that will go beyond interesting to significant.

The procedure for the reading and analysis of the texts will be that of understanding, observing, and then explaining. The first step is aimed to understand the texts that will be analysed grasping their surface meaning. This prevent us to make wrong assumptions and going ahead speculating and reading wrongly between lines. Once this step is finished, the texts will be observed and analysed. The text will be minutely analysed in terms of word choice, structure, imagery, symbolism and literary devices. The last stage is explaining, in this stage time will be devoted to explain the effects of the details and elements that emerge from the previous step.

New criticism, as it was already mentioned, is not concerned with context. It is concerned with the text in itself speaks to the reader, “with articulating the very poem-ness—the formal quintessence— of the poem itself” (Selden 19), how the parts of the poem relate with each other. This approach favours and aims for an objective “more scientific, or precise and systematic” (Selden 19) criticism. New criticism is strongly related with the term of close reading. That is to say, a careful analysis of a text that pays attention to such

elements like characterization, plot, metaphors, setting, and point of view (Hassanian 3). Elements which will help and support the interpretation of a literary work.

Therefore, the present work will favour a close reading of the texts so as to find interactions in and between the texts. It will also encourage an analysis of the texts avoiding effects like affective and intentional fallacies, which affect and taint the interpretation of texts. The affective fallacy claims that our own personal baggage and subjective personal interpretations might pollute the interpretation of a text, while the intentional fallacy claims that it is impossible to determine the reasons why an author produced certain pieces without asking him/her directly, and even if we could access such knowledge it would prove useless because texts, as organic entities, carry their own value. An author's reputation should not smear our appreciation of his poetic work.



## Analysis

Keats' unfinished poem "Hyperion", and the posterior "The Fall of Hyperion: a Dream" are based on the *Titanomachia*, which very roughly is the Greek myth about the war between the Titans and the Greek gods (Coleman, 1021). Hyperion was one of the twelve titans that were born from the union of Earth –Gaia– and the sky –Ouranos. He represented light, wisdom, and watchfulness. Sometimes his name was also utilised to refer to the sun itself (Grimal 209), mainly because his name means "he who looks from above" (Harper). His offspring are Selene (the Moon), Helios (the Sun), and Eos (Dawn). Hyperion and four of his brothers conspired with Kronos against their father Ouranos. With the help of his titan brothers they held Ouranos and castrated him. Then they ruled the Universe. Later, he and his brothers were deposed by Zeus and confined into the pit of Tartarus. He and his sister and wife Theia have no myths on their own (Hard 43), therefore it can be said that the two poems written by Keats are possibly the first narratives which main concern is Hyperion and his story.

In *Hyperion* the fall of the titans and the loss of their empire are narrated by a variable persona poetica, that is to say, this persona is going to assume different voices throughout the narration thus expressing different points of view. Which is quite similar to the shift of lyric speaker in *Paradise Lost*, which varies giving voice to Satan, Beelzebub, and Belial, to mention some. Same happens in *Hyperion*, where throughout the narration the voice of the persona poetica changes to offer a wider narration of the events, and different perceptions on the same event.

The titans, especially Hyperion, are struggling and coming to terms with this loss, and with the fact that they are being replaced by new Olympian gods. In particular, Hyperion is replaced by Apollo who is the god of light, sun, beauty, music, truth and poetry (Coleman 80). It is interesting to highlight that this god is associated with few elements that are a recurring topic in Keats' poetry –beauty and truth–. Additionally, it is important to pinpoint that Keats does not distinguish Roman mythology from Greek mythology, he considers them both as Greek mythology. He takes the names of the gods from both mythologies and

utilises them in a mixed way in his works –for instance he prefers the utilisation of the name Jupiter instead of Zeus, or Saturn instead of Kronos.

This poem starts *in media res* with the god Saturn bemoaning the loss of his empire by the hands of his very son Jupiter. Thea, who is also in this mournful state, comes to console him with her words but her own sadness prevents her, thus she tells him to “sleep on! While at thy feet [she] weep[s]” (I, 71). Hyperion, while “other realms big tears were shed[ing]” (I, 158) still kept his sovereignty; but was tormented and apprehensive because his kingdom was about to be claimed by Apollo. Hence he was preparing himself to help Saturn. In the second book the council of Titans is narrated from the eyes of a witness who as the events develop is going to assume the different voices of the debaters. Here the ideas of beauty and truth are incorporated in the myth in the voice of Oceanus, who is the first to share a piece of his mind. In the third book, and the last, the rise of Apollo is described. The ceremony is witnessed by Mnemosyne –the goddess of memory–. He held a little conversation with the goddess, stating that “knowledge enormous makes a God of [him]” (III, 113). When his metamorphosis begins the poem is cut. And there are no ideas of how Keats intended to continue this epic, which was meant to be composed of ten books.

It is important to highlight that *Hyperion* starts not with general statements, which are characteristic of Keats’s early poetry, instead it starts in a Miltonic fashion (Williams 119), where the persona poetica employed different and varied stylistic devices modelled after Milton. In what regards to style, in *Hyperion* there are various instances of what Keats calls “Miltonic Inversions”. These instances emulate the way in which Milton wrote. For instance, one of them is the utilisation of nouns followed by adjectives. In *Paradise Lost* there are various examples: “His own: for neither do the *Spirits damn’d*” (II, 482), “For I will clear thir *senses dark*” (III, 188), “In whom the fullness dwels of love divine” (III, 225), “Like Quivers hung, and with *Praeamble sweet*” (III, 367). In Keats work this is also seen as in “And *palpitations sweet* and *pleasures soft*” (I, 315), “For thou art weak to sing such *tumults dire*” (III, 4), “Oft made Hyperion ache. His *palace bright*” (I, 176), “For as among us mortals *omens drear*” (I, 169), “Of thunderous waterfalls and *torrents hoarse*”

(II, 8), and “Distinct, and visible; *symbols divine*”<sup>2</sup> (I, 316) among others. As it was observed, this was the most used Miltonian inversion by Keats.

Research carried out by Fowler indicated that Milton mostly employed Greek, Latin, and Italian structures, and it was “as if Milton were attempting to appropriate the linguistic qualities of all Europe and naturalize them in a single, universally intelligible, pre-Babelian utterances” (15), maybe with the objective of have an “additional validation of ancient or other customary usage” (ibid), additionally the wielding of these languages and the possible structures they offer are so much freer than the ones offered by the English language.

Among the other stylistic resources adopted from Milton, the placement of the verb before the noun, and the listing of more than one adjective after the noun are the others that Keats usually employed in the making of *Hyperion*. Examples of the first inversion are “There *saw she* direst strife” (II, 92), “So *leant she*, not so fair, upon a tusk” (II, 61), “Pale *wox I*, and in vapours hid my face” (I, 326); and of the latter “His old right hand lay nerveless, listless, dead / Unsceptred” (I, 18-9), “And at the fruits thereof whay shapes they be, / Distinct, and visible” (I, 315-6), and “In sad demeanour, solemn, undisturb’d/, unruffled, like high Gods, ye liv’d and ruled” (I, 329-30). The usage of these Miltonian forms or inversions, denotes that his influence goes beyond a simple imitation of topic, theme, and narrative structure. Furthermore, the preference for these forms also speaks about his fondness for Greek and classical traditions, so there might be a confluence of his admiration towards Milton and Greek culture.

Apart from this, the first similarity that can be pointed out between *Paradise Lost* and “Hyperion” is their epic organization and thematic. First, in order to give a thorough analysis of these epics the definition and requirements that a narrative has to fulfil in order to be an epic will be drawn from Pratt who states that

[Epics] should be divided into either twelve or twenty-four books and written in the same metre and style throughout, preferably in a high style. It should start *in media res* (in the middle of things). It should tell a continuous narrative of the adventures

---

<sup>2</sup> Italics mine. Here, italics are employed in order to highlight those parts in the text that aid me to make readers focus on what I consider important in the examples.

of a heroic figure, these should contain lists; it should include a visit to the underworld; and it should begin with an address to the muse (333)

*Hyperion* is compound by three books –it is a possibility that the number intended of books was higher but as Keats abandoned the enterprise of continuing this myth, the poem is integrated only by three books. Conversely, *Paradise Lost* is ten books long. Also, both works begin *in media res*. That is to say, these stories begin in the middle, with the fallen beings –The Titans and Satan— omitting an introduction on the reason of their fallen states. But differences can also be spotted in this regard. While *Paradise Lost* follows the requirement of the summoning of the muses to start the narration, which is seen in the very first stanza where the persona poetica says

Of Mans First Disobedience, and the Fruit  
Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal tast  
Brought Death into the World, and all our woe,  
With loss of EDEN, till one greater Man  
Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat,  
Sing Heav'nly Muse that on the secret top  
Of OREB, or of SINAI, didst inspire  
That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,  
In the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth  
Rose out of CHAOS (I, 1-10)

Here the persona poetica is summoning not a classical muse, but the Holy Spirit. Same Holy Spirit who inspired “that Shepherd”, namely Moses, to write Genesis. Milton wishes to follow Moses steps and by the inspiration that the Holy Spirit might give him, to narrate and re-tell the Fall of Adam and Eve. However, *Hyperion* does not fulfil this requirement until the third book. Keats displaced the epic conventions by placing the invocation of the muses in the beginning of the third book –the last book. The persona poetica states “O leave them, Muse! O leave them to their woes; / For thou art weak to sing such tumults

dire: / A solitary sorrow best befits / Thy lips, and antheing a lonely grief. Leave them, O Muse! For thou anon wilt find” (III, 3-7). Hence, breaking the epic convention of placing this summoning in the very beginning of the poem. In its place the persona poetica starts the narration by presenting the reader the fallen Saturn.

Saturn and Satan are similar characters in terms of how they are represented. Saturn is presented in his fallen state, mourning for the loss of his empire “deep in the shady sadness of a vale” (Keats I, 1), while Satan is exiled and “as far removed from God and light of heav’n / As from the center thrice to th’ utmost pole” (Milton I, 73-4). They are surrounded by darkness and stripped of their divinity. The fallen Saturn “far sunken from the healthy breath of morn / far from the fiery noon, and eve’s one star” (I, 2-3) is completely still, sitting quiet as a stone, “his old right hand lay nerveless, listless, dead, / unscathed: and his realmless eyes were closed” (I, 15-6), completely immobile grieving his loss. There is a sense of decay in his state, he just lost his sovereignty not his immortal status yet his body is dead, nerveless, and listless. This last adjective is not usually applied to a bodily state but to a state of mind, so the titan is so overwhelmed by the loss of his kingdom that his immortal status is also forgotten, allowing the reader to contemplate a weakened immortal Titan in mind and body. A Titan whose eyes stay closed for they have no kingdom to look over. The fallen Archangel is in a similar condition “stretched out huge in length the Arch-Friend lay / chained on the burning lake, nor ever thence / had ris’n or heaved his head” (Milton I, 209-11). Saturn and Satan seem to share their condition and reaction towards the loss of their divinity. State from which they will be awakened by one of their equals, Saturn by Thea, and Satan by Beelzebub.

The main difference between these two characters is that while Saturn doubts his sovereignty, Satan is highly convinced of his might. Saturn urges Thea to

Look up, and tell [him] if this feeble shape

Is Saturn’s; tell [him], if thou hear’st the voice

Of Saturn; tell [him] if this wrinkling brow, naked and bare of its great diadem,

Peers like the front of Saturn (I, 98-102)

Because he was “away from [his] own bosom: [he has] left / [his] strong identity, [his] real self, / somewhere between the throne, and where [he] sit[s]” (I, 113-5). He doubts his own identity as if by being stripped of his throne also meant being stripped of his identity. Satan “though chang’d in outward lustre; that fixt mind / and high disdain, from sence of injur’d merit, / that with the mightiest rais’d me to contend” (I, 97-9), which is to say, that even though he underwent a physical change in his fall he kept his mind fixed, he does not doubt his own identity. Satan knows who he is and believes in the superiority of his mind. Additionally, he has the “courage never to submit or yield” (I, 108) which can be paralleled with the Titan’s, namely Saturn and Hyperion, relative fast submission to the new gods. While Satan demonstrates his great self-confidence, and his greater will of not giving up, Saturn shows a defeated and submissive stance towards the change. Satan’s identity was not stripped with his divinity, was not endowed in his past-divine status like it happened with Saturn.

Satan’s self-assurance and confidence are demonstrated in his dialogue with Beelzebub when he says that

All is not lost; the unconquerable will  
and study of revenge, immortal hate  
and courage never to submit or yield:  
And what is else not to be overcome?  
That glory never shall his wrath or might  
extort from me. To bow and sue for grace  
with suppliant knee, and deify his power  
who from the terror of this arm so late  
doubted his empire (Milton I, 106-14)

This is Satan’s manifesto against God, against the entity responsible of his fall. His unconquerable will and his immortal hate —that hints a previous and lasting hatred— are the elements that will never allow God to extort that glory from Satan. The glory of defeating and making Satan submit to him. Then he mentions that God’s power is not secure because he lately has been doubting his empire. The lack of confidence of God on his empire can be linked with that of Saturn’s and Hyperion’s who by doubting their sovereignty ultimately

lost them. The image of Satan and the endowment of a free-will and an ethos, emphasize his humanization (which was not observable in *The Holy Bible*). Keats by breaking with the classical pattern of characterization with Saturn also offers the reader a more human and approachable Saturn who is weak and defeated, instead of that almighty and ruthless tyrant depicted in Hesiod's work.

The exchange between Beelzebub and Satan can be compared with Thea's and Saturn's dialogue. Thea, even though the fallen state of the Titan, still has the reverence of addressing Saturn as a king, being the first time that his position is explicitly exposed in the poem when she says "Saturn, look up! –though wherefore, poor old King?" (Keats I, 53). Saturn, in his weakened state, is still an authoritative figure in the eyes of Thea. And this is the first time in the poem that his position has been explicitly mentioned in an active way

Beelzebub, Satan's second in command, in the first lines when he assumes the voice of the persona poetica addresses Satan as "O Prince, O Chief of many Throned Powers" (I, 128), recognizing his superior position. Just like Thea, he attempts to humour his superior but in the end they realize their condition and become doubtful. Beelzebub starts doubting and voices his doubts because he believes that God cannot be overpowered by them

[What if God] Have left us this our spirit and strength intire

Strongly to suffer and support our pains,

That we may so suffice his vengeful ire,

Or do him mightier service as his thralls

...

What can it then avail though yet we feel

Strength undiminish'd, or eternal being

To undergo eternal punishment? (I, 146-55)

He is questioning if even after their rise against God, they still are slaves of God and if this strength of spirit "though all [their] Glory extinct" (I, 141) –strength they seem unable to employ for they are swallowed up in endless misery (I, 142) — is the real punishment of

God. Thus Beelzebub seems to realize the atrociousness of their situation. Yet, unlike Thea, Beelzebub is not in a defeated stance nor weeping at Satan's feet. He is positive that "the mind and the spirit remains / Invincible, and vigour soon returns" (I, 139-40) which is substantially different from Thea's "I have no comfort for thee, no not one" (Keats I, 53). Both, Thea and Beelzebub, are the ones who urge Saturn and Satan. Beelzebub says

Leader of those Armies bright,  
Which but th' Omnipotent none could have foyld,  
If once they hear that voyce, their liveliest pledge  
Of hope in fears and dangers, heard so oft  
In worst extreams, and on the perilous edge  
Of battel when it rag'd, in all assaults  
Their surest signal, they will soon resume  
New courage and revive (I, 272-9)

He wants Satan to gather with them and to revive them by speaking with the rest of fallen angels. Likewise, Thea with "quick-voic'd spake, yet full of awe" (I, 149), to Saturn after hearing his despair of having lost his reign. She tells him "come to our friends, / O Saturn! Come away, and give them heart (I, 150-1) and he obliges following her. Thea and Beelzebub are similar characters in the respect that they both are the first characters that confront these fallen entities that seem to be the most powerful ones, and on the go recognize their superiority and sovereignty. Also they are the ones who attempt to comfort them and trust them to do the same with the rest of the fallen ones.

The second key moments which can be paralleled in both poems are the councils held by the fallen entities. In *Hyperion* this takes place in the second book. When Saturn and Thea arrive, the fallen Titans are already there "not assembled: some chain'd in torture, and some wandering" (II, 17-18). Saturn commands them to talk and to ideate a plan to get back their power. Oceanus is the first to talk and he seems to have accepted this situation and urges his siblings to "writhe at defeat, and nurse [their] agonies" (II, 174) because "[they] fell by



course of Nature's law, not force / of thunder, or of Jove" (II, 180-1), this change is a natural and inexorable process. He tells to Saturn that he was "not the beginning nor the end" (II, 190) for he also received the power from his father. Additionally he argues that they were not defeated by sheer brute force or violence but by beauty because "a power more strong in beauty, born of [them] / and fated to excel [them], as [they] pass / in glory that old Darkness" (II, 213-5) was going to replace them. These new gods were "above [them] in their beauty, and must reign/ in right thereof; for 'tis eternal law/ that first in beauty should be first in might" (II, 227-9). Eternal law that will also be applied to the new Gods, who eventually will be overthrown by a yet more beauty and brighter order. He ends by praising the beauty of Neptune, his dispossessor who "with such a glow of beauty in his eyes" (238) enforced him to bid sad farewell. His statement is supported by Clymene, a sea nymph and his daughter, who describes the beautiful music produced by the earth to salute Apollo. Enceladus, on the other hand, swallowed in wrath does not agree with them and urges the Titans to challenge the new gods reminding them that Hyperion, "[their] brightest brother, still is undisgraced—" (II, 344); same Hyperion, who has already accepted his defeat, made his entrance.

Here the concept of beauty stands not necessarily for aesthetic pleasure—although Greek gods are always depicted as owners of an endearing and blinding beauty. The beauty that Oceanus mentions is a metaphor of a higher sense, a higher development, and a necessary step into the evolution ladder that inexorably makes Greek Gods more suitable for ruling than the Titans, who do not possess this beauty. This idea of evolution will be elaborated more extensively in the incoming paragraphs.

The council in *Paradise Lost* takes place in the second book as well, after the fallen angels came forth one by one and assembled before Satan. This high council takes place in their palace, the Pandemonium. Here Satan discuss what should they do against God in order to reclaim heaven for themselves. Four demons speak their minds with different perspectives. Moloch states that "[his] sentence is for open Warr", Belial does not agree and says that "This Hell then seemed / A refuge from those wounds" (II, 167-68) that is to say, to accept that they no longer dwell in heaven and stay in hell peacefully because he thinks that God has not punished them as hard as he could do it. Additionally, he harbours

the hope that God one day may forgive them. Mammon also thinks that Hell is a good place to stay away from God not being his slaves. He utters “Live to ourselves, though in this vast recess, / Free and to none accountable, preferring/ Hard liberty before the easy yoke/ of servile pomp.” (II, 254-57). He sees in Hell, his new house, freedom and liberty from the slavery of Heaven. All demons found themselves agreeing and enraptured applauded Mammon’s words thus deciding unanimously that they desired to stay in hell. Then Beelzebub speaks, he does not agree with Mammon stating that “This place our dungeon, not our safe retreat” (II, 317), and deviates the attention from heaven and earth towards “[a]nother World, the happy seat / Of som new race, call’d MAN, about this time / To be created like to us, though less / In power and excellence” (II, 347-50) but held higher in regard by him who rules above. Therefore, the demons decide to “waste his whole creation, or possess / All as our own” (II, 365-66).

These two councils are very alike but different in the outcome. While Milton’s council is filled with aggressiveness and desire for revenge, Keats’ one is surrounded with a sense of resignation and defeat. *Paradise Lost* council’s debate is opened with Moloch’s opinion that favours violence and proposes that they should be open to challenge Heaven to a war. On the other hand, Keats’ one is opened with Oceanus’ pacific but strong opinion that they should respect the natural flow of power and sovereignty, where those who are in the peak of perfection should rule. Moloch finds his correspondence in Enceladus’ ideas of confrontation, who is furious at the coward acceptance of their fate from the Titans part. Enceladus is the one that closes the debate in *Hyperion*. Oceanus finds his pair in the demon Belial, and Clymene in Mammon. Belial, just like Oceanus, offers a pacifist and resigned perspective who is partially supported by the rest of witnesses of the debate; opinions that are supported by another Titan/Demon who enforces their argument with words that convince further the rest.

However, *Hyperion*’s debate lacks of a figure like Beelzebub to offer such a radical idea. Instead the council of the Titans is closed with the arrival of a crushed Hyperion —same Hyperion that was mentioned by Enceladus as the last hope. While Beelzebub’s figure raises the spirits of the demons, Hyperion’s appearance finishes destroying the hopes of the Titans. This turn is what provokes the divergence in the aftermaths of both stories.

Difference that enables the reformulation of the concept of myth in itself by Keats. As it was already discussed, myths' objective is to promote certain agendas, that is to say, they make structures of power seem eternal and necessary. Keats takes advantage of this turn and proposes an idea that is straightforwardly related to greediness of power, and its structures. He, with Oceanus' statements, refutes the idea of eternal rulers. Instead he states that beauty, and those who possess it, are the ones fitter for ruling. This implies a constant evolution and handing over power to those who are more beautiful, breaking with the promotion of an eternal structure of power: structures have to change in order to allow those who are more beautiful to access power positions because within them the truth is contained. This also provokes a change on the perception of beauty in the reader.

Milton's delineation of the council could be pointing towards the ineffectivity of political debates. There are four main positions in that debate: Moloch's one who is bloodthirsty, he believes that nothing could be possibly worse than the current state of affairs, therefore he proposes war as an effective way of regaining their prior state, after all they have nothing to lose. There also is Belial who supports inaction, he wishes to stay in Hell in order not to fight God. Then Mammon, who is the voice of reason, advocates for their own freedom, and that they can be free in Hell finding in it their own heaven there. And lastly, Beelzebub, who proposes a plan that seemingly will soothe their pain, but that in the end will just legitimate Satan as the leader in hell, and consequently his place next to him. Milton utilised this council to depict governmental issues, and how democracy and common well is undermined by those who wish to maintain their positions of power.

Satan displays the full range of political skills because he convokes assemblies, he charms, persuades and convinces the rest, states that he is devoted to the common good, and conceals motives and intentions (Fallon 79). It is not correct to assess that he is acting like a tyrant because he is not, in the sense that he does convoke an assembly integrated by different points that might represent every single political position, and allows the discussion and debate of ideas without imposing his own. But he is actually employing his political skills in order to reach his own interests. Milton's Satan is charming, the readers find too much to admire in his figure for he is presented to the readers as a leader who refuses to submit

What though the field be lost?

All is not lost; the unconquerable Will

And study of revenge, immortal hate,

And courage never to submit or yield

And what is else not to be overcome? (I, 106-7)

Satan's charm as it works in the readers direction, also works in the direction of the legion of fallen fiends. He is portrayed as a courageous leader who "durst defy th' Omnipotent to Arms" (I, 49) and who saved his fallen soldiers from the burning lake and "gently rais'd / Thir fainting courage, and dispell'd thir fears" (I, 529-30). Here the humanization of the characters can be observed because Satan relates the fall strictly with the mind because the owner of the mind is the one that can control his fate. He realizes that and declares himself as the proprietor of his mind and hell. He regains his divinity by doing so, and consciously starts exerting power in his surroundings, and his new reign. The power of mind is again pinpointed in

Nor wanting power to mitigate and swage

With solemn touches, troubled thoughts, and chase

Anguish and doubt and fear and sorrow and pain

From mortal or immortal minds (I, 556-9)

Satan exerts such authority among the fallen devils that he is able to share his state of mind with his followers. He knows that both, mortal and immortal minds are susceptible of being swallowed by doubt, sorrow, and pain. Therefore, he knows that he and his army must get rid from this suffering that threatens to take over their minds rendering them against God authority—human suffering that is pretty much what makes humans obey God. That is to say, if they do not possess a fixed mind controlled and strong, they are susceptible to wander and be invaded with emotions that will effectively cause their fall.

Keats also offers a more humanized character in Saturn, who is not in possession of a strong mind like Satan, his mind is overconsumed with feelings of dread, fear, and doubt. His fall is in effect physical and over all mental. He lost power and his own perception of himself as divine. The possibility of being overwhelmed, of feeling fear and doubt are not typical of almighty entities like Titans, they are more common in humans. Therefore, with the loss of divinity Saturn and the rest of the pantheon are left feeling vulnerable, naked, and weak, just like human beings. The explanation on why Satan keeps a strong mind whilst Saturn does not could reside on agency. Saturn did nothing to be blamed and punished, unlike Satan who had an active agency on his fall. Saturn, just like humans, is unaware on what he did to be overthrown from his position of power leaving him full of doubts and unsure; on the other hand, Satan knows exactly what he did in order to be dethroned.

Satan is a Byronic hero<sup>3</sup> whose ambition was the greatest ever. He aimed towards ruling the universe by attempting to defeat the Omnipotent, he failed and was punished also in the highest fashion. But unlike Saturn who evokes sympathy and pity because of his defeated state, Satan evokes admiration and appraisal because of his strength of mind and will. He clashed with the most powerful entity and failed doing so, but he did not repent; he will keep on resisting God. And he convinces the rest of devils not by means of sheer force but by exerting the extent of his political skills and the art of persuasion.

It is important to pinpoint that the second book of Keats' *Hyperion*, in the words of Bode "offers the historico-philosophical core of *Hyperion*, not only a theory of historical evolutionary change but also an explanation of the blindness of rulers and autocrats" (32), it is in this moment where Keats' ideas of beauty and truth are incorporated into the myth as truth, and expressed by the Titan Oceanus who states that "[a]bove us in their beauty, and must reign/ In right thereof; for 'tis the eternal law/ that first in beauty should be first in

---

<sup>3</sup> The Byronic hero is a variation of the Romantic Hero. The Romantic hero is a character usually placed outside the structure of civilization because he has been rejected by it. He is amoral or ruthless, yet with a strong sense of power and leadership. This character rejects norms and conventions. See Northrop Frye's *A Study of English Romanticism* (New York: Random house, 1968) p.41. Additionally the Byronic hero has a greater degree of psychological and emotional complexity; he is cunning, intelligent, cynic, impulsive, and manipulative.

might” (II, 227-29); additionally Oceanus reminds them that they are not the first sovereigns, they were preceded by another entities and so they have to undergo the same situation. Therefore, the sum of these two ideas can be summarised in that this eternal law is that those who have reached perfection, which is beauty, and have improved should be the ones that rule. And someday they will also be replaced by those who are more perfect than them. As Oceanus says “yea, by that law, another race may drive / Our conquerors to mourn as we do” (II, 230-31). Making thus a critic towards those egomaniacs who “cannot see themselves in an historical perspective, in a relationship to a before and an after” (Bode 32), same egomaniacs who stop the flow of power and that do not respect transition and evolution hence restricting and impeding the development towards greater beauty, and freedom. Saturn is the embodiment of that tricky nature of the structures of power “blind from sheer supremacy” (II, 185), who do not evolve and do not allow younger and more capable individuals to take over.

Oceanus words do little to comfort his siblings Titans —unlike Satan’s that inspire, embolden, and encourage his fiend soldiers. Oceanus’ intervention is aimed to alert and awake the Titans who had become too engrossed with their own myth. Barthes states that the ultimate objective of myths is that of making contingency appear eternal (142) and make particular agendas seem natural and essential, aiding in the maintenance of the status quo convincing people that structures of power are eternal necessary. Oceanus’ opinion pops the myth in which the Titans have been living: their sovereignty is limited, and not permanent. The empowerment of the new gods and goddesses is what breaks the myth, exposing thus the artificiality of the structures of power. Therefore creating a new myth which expresses the indispensable evolution of power.

Hence, both councils can be considered as the authors’ opportunity to express their ideas of governmental issues and political concerns, and integrate them into myths. Milton with the depiction of how the employment of political art of persuasion helps individuals (Satan) to reach their ends in the name of common good, and Keats’ with his portrayal of the addiction of power from those who do not accept others —who are evidently better than them— to access power, and the posterior establishment of a new sovereignty that fits better with the new myth.

*Hyperion* from the very beginning is surrounded with this sense of immobility, from the listless form of Saturn, to the irresolute assembly. In Keats' poem

[N]othing really happens . . . much noble description, many lofty speeches, Keats has certainly given us, but *Hyperion* is supposed to be a narrative poem. In reality it is nothing of the kind; it is distinctly static and sculpturesque, with a tone, style, and manner admirably adapted to depicting the colossal deities of an elder world, but to Keats at least hampering and cumbersome when it came to making them move (Havens 208-9)<sup>4</sup>

That is the main difference between both councils. The council in hell is dynamic and from the discussion a course of action is proposed and followed. Inversely, the council of the Titans is static and no course of action is prompted by the Titans, just Enceladus proposes to take action and fight but it stays just as a proposal. The council seems to be utilised by the poet to introduce more characters and describe their situation. The expectation that arises in the reader when reading the assembly is that of waiting for a fight that would help the Titans to regain their prior states, yet in an anticlimactic way, the reader is faced with Hyperion's arrival as the end of any possible course of action. In *Hyperion* there is "no movement or action on a grand scale, only static movements of reflection or passion" (Sherwin 387), the Titans seem stuck in their state and unable to go beyond their fallen state. The reason on the Titans' immobility could reside in their unawareness on the motive of their fall. This unawareness prevents them from acting because any *faux pas* could push them into a more several punishment. They cannot trust in themselves nor in anything because they are stumbling in the dark looking for the motive of the punishment that stripped them of their power. This anticlimactic instance is seen also in "Ode on a Graecian Urn" where the culmination on a concrete climax seems impossible, and both point towards beauty being the ultimate truth.

Here, to go back to the state of mind would prove useful to analyse the immobility present in *Hyperion*. As stated by Satan in *Paradise Lost* the mind is what determines the fallen state, and in *Hyperion* the bulk of 'action' happens in the mind of the characters.

---

<sup>4</sup> Italics mine. They do not appear in the original text. I italicized *Hyperion* in the quote in order to distinguish *Hyperion* the poem from *Hyperion* the character.

Divinity is only a state of mind that expresses itself physically (e.g. physical form, regal like behaviour) and it is exerted through the influence on other beings.

Now if the Titans have lost their divinity, they have also lost their state of mind — which does not happen to Satan. Therefore, as they are not in control of their mental faculties they cannot exercise it physically, hence their immobility is just another outcome of their fallen state. The Titans after their fall are too affected that they cannot overcome that powerful emotion they had just experienced. Consulting with Burke's account on the sublime he assess that ideas of pain and danger produce the sublime, which is the "strongest emotion which the mind is capable of feeling" (58-9), is not the pain but the idea of pain that overcomes the mind and causes the sublime. Burke elaborates further and considers that when the mind is governed by this passion causes astonishment. Astonishment is the most powerful state of the soul where "all its motions are suspended, with some degree of horror. In this case the mind is so entirely filled with its object, that it cannot entertain any other, nor by consequence reason on that object which employs it" (95-6); consequently it can be observed the inconspicuous influence of Milton on Keats in the vital importance that the mind has in the development of the story. Following the premise that divinity is a state controlled in the mind, and who directs his own mind is less susceptible of being controlled by others, and more capable of controlling their own fate; Keats offers an alternative that diverges from that exposed in *Paradise Lost*.

This listlessness and passivity is also present in that part which is omitted to favour the *in media res* narration. The Titans are blameless of their fall, nothing like the rebellious angels who maintained an active and challenging stance before and after their fall. The Titans were not replaced because they were incompetent in their duty. Then Oceanus provides the answer and asserts that it is the Natural law, "not [the] force / of thunder, or for Jove" (II, 181-2) and "to bear all naked truths, / and to envisage circumstance, all calm, / that is the top of sovereignty" (II, 203-5). Therefore, yet another cause for the passivity and lack of action from part of the Titans is because they are aware that their loss of divinity and suffering are necessary so the earth can progress to a higher level. Through the acceptance and submission to natural flow of power they gain the possibility of regaining their serenity and divinity for themselves.



Keats offers the readers the alternative that shows what happens when such powerful and potent characters as Hyperion and Saturn are overthrown of their empires, and they instead of remaining strong like the characters in *Paradise Lost*, take the other path and are utterly shattered by the steeply change. They will not recover their sovereignty, but from this event they gain experience and humanization. Their weakness, this stumbling in the dark looking for unattainable reasons, and this fear that does not allow them to move forwards is comparable to the state in which humans behave towards God. Through this experience the reader can observe the Titans with fresh eyes. Suddenly, they are no longer almighty and unapproachable entities, but characters that the reader can identify himself with.

From the way in which his characters act to the way in which the same state of mind of the character does not allow the poem to get a dynamic nature. The state of mind of the Titans permeates the whole narration.

Hence, Milton and Keats took two myths about defeat from different traditions. Milton took one that belonged to the back-then hegemonic tradition—the Judeo-Christian myth of the clash between God and Lucifer, and the eventual fall of men. Mostly his intention was to demonstrate that the Fall of Men was part of God’s plan, “[t]hat, to the highth of this great Argument, / I may assert th’ Eternal Providence. / And justifie the wayes of God to men” (Milton 2). Keats, on the other hand, seemed to find the Greek myth of the fall of the Titans suitable to immortalize his idea of truth and beauty. Hence, he took the not so widespread myth of Hyperion, and modified it, and applied his ubiquitous belief — advanced previously in the final lines of his poem “Ode on a Graecian Urn” where the persona poetica expresses that “When old age shall this generation waste, / Thou shalt remain, in midst of other woe . . . ‘Beauty is truth, truth beauty, —that is all / Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know” (Keats 46-50). The replacement of the Titans for more beautiful Gods was the inspiration Keats needed in order to preserve and convey his idea of beauty with the aid of the organization provided by Milton’s *Paradise Lost*.

It is demonstrated how this influence expressed in Keats’ creations. He took a not so explored myth of his favourite tradition which is the Classical one. Then, following the same structure that Milton employed in his epic, and adopting the idea that divinity is more

a state of mind than a physical one, he proposed a new outlook of the fall of the Titans, and at the same time permeated them and immortalised his belief of progress and beauty being the ultimate truth. This myth also reshapes a constitutive element of myths, that of making certain agendas eternal and necessary. With his belief in progress, embodied by beauty, comes as this innovation on the scheme of the objectives of myths. Suddenly, Keats proposes a myth that regulates itself with the premise that what is more beauty has to replace that that becomes obsolete, as the Titans had ancestors who ruled, so will the Gods be replaced. The same operates for the truth of beauty that keeps evolving and improving.

*The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream* is an epic as well—just like *Hyperion* and *Paradise Lost*. But it is composed of *cantos* instead of books, unlike the other two works. A *canto* is defined as a “sub-division of an epic or narrative poem . . . Outstanding examples of its use are to be found in Dante’s *Divina Comedia*” (Cuddon 109) among others. Nevertheless, this poem does follow the same short-lived direction that its predecessor went: this poem is only composed by two *cantos*. Therefore it does not fulfil the epic requirement of being long narratives.

This poem was composed after *Hyperion*, hence after Keats abandoned the endeavour of writing it. This poem shares its destiny with its predecessor in the sense that it was also abandoned before it was finished. Nonetheless, this poem is different from the previous one because it is shaped in a more intimate way where the *persona poetica* exposes not a second-hand experienced event but his own experiences and dreams. The narration is not shifted between different voices, but narrated in first person throughout the whole poem.

In this poem Keats introduces a dreamer/poet-narrator who comes to define the visionary nature of the poet. This is quite appropriate for a mythopoeic poem because, referring to Barthes who stated that myth-making is a process that helps to promote certain agendas, and additionally the product of this process is believed as the ultimate truth; this poem immortalises Keats’ conceptions and ideas on poetic labour.

As it was already stated, the *persona poetica* narrates the experience of a dream within a dream where he meets the Titaness Moneta. Moneta is the “goddess of prosperity, an aspect

of Juno” (Coleman 709) who belonged to the Roman and African tradition<sup>5</sup>. However, in this poem Keats intended Moneta to play the role of the Greek Mnemosyne who is the “Greek Titaness of memory . . . mother of [all] the Muses” (Coleman 705). Same Titaness who under the name of Mnemosyne received the god Apollo in *Hyperion* in the third and last book. It is interesting to note that Moneta’s name comes from the Latin *moneō* that means “to bring to the notice, remind, tell . . . to suggest a course of action, advice, recommend, [and] warn” (Glare 1130). She gave him the poet’s golden lyre, and enabled him to finally ascend into power. Hence, Moneta is one of the fallen Titans and through the projection of her memories on the event, she enables the dreamer to witness and experience her memories of the *Titanomachia*<sup>6</sup>.

Even though the title of the poem makes direct reference to the titan Hyperion, that the bulk of names employed by the author in the poem belong mostly to the Greek tradition, and that the dreamer witnesses the fall of the titans, this poem takes and re-articulates the myth of the Fall of Men. Through the reconfiguration of this myth Keats exposes his view on the nature of the poet and of poetic labour. To do this he utilised the figure of a dreamer who expresses his ideas of poetry, and through his dreamlike experience he is bestowed with a vision that allows him to finally decide what a poet is and what makes a poet, and permits him to be witness and victim of the sufferings that humankind has to undergo.

According to Sperry “*The Fall* was an allegory of poetic sin and expiation through intensity of suffering” (316). The persona poetica in the very beginning of this poem clearly states that every men, even fanatics and savages are able to dream. But what makes poets different is their unique gift with language, and their preoccupation towards human suffering: their vision allows them to participate in all human existence, thus their joy and suffering. Hence the poet, according to the dreamer experience, in order to redeem himself has to make use of that gift and act like “a sage; / a humanist, physician to all men” (I, 189-90), an ointment that will soothe man in his pain.

---

<sup>5</sup> In African mythology she is known as ‘Aje’.

<sup>6</sup> Greek term utilised to refer to the war between the Titans and Greek Gods. Already mentioned in page 25.

The first canto begins with the persona poetica introducing the reader into his dream. He makes a statement explaining that while everyone possess the ability of dreaming, even savages and fanatics, poets' dreams are superior because

Poesy alone can tell her dreams

With the fine spell of words alone can save

Imagination from the sable charm

And dumb enchantment (I, 8-11).

As opposed to savages' and fanatics' who solely "live, dream, and die" (I, 7). A poet cannot be called a poet if he does not tell his dreams because every man "whose soul is not a clod / hath visions, and would speak, if he had loved / and been well nurtured in his mother tongue" (I, 12-5).

This brief statement can be considered as the epic feature of the summoning of the muse, but it has a little twist in this poem. Instead of invoking and inspiring his endeavour in the memories that could be provided by a muse, he leaves that function to dreams. According to the statement, all the inspiration that men could get is from dreams and visions, and poets have the ability to transforming those visions. Therefore it can be presumed that this poem does fulfil the epic requirement of the invocation of the muse— like in *Paradise Lost*, where the nature of this muse was equally different for he did not ask the muses for inspiration but the Holy Spirit.

Having made his little statement, the poet engages in the narration of a particular dream. He initially describes how he found himself in an exotic landscape— reminiscent of Milton's description of the Garden of Paradise. This place is full of exotic trees ranging from "palm, myrtle, oak" to "sycamore and beech" (I, 20), odorous blossoms, and shower-like fountains. While he wanders around he stumbles upon the remnants of a feast "of summer fruits, / which nearer seen, seem'd refuse of a meal / by angel tasted or our Mother Eve" (I, 29-31) hence making direct reference to the preliminary events of the Fall of Men—events which are narrated in *Paradise Lost*. Then he feels an overpowering hunger "more yearning than on earth [he] ever felt" (I, 38), and proceeded to eat and drink the remnants

of the feast. These remnants produced in him such effect which he “struggled hard against” (I, 52) with no avail because he falls into a swoon anyway.

The unbearable thirst and hunger the dreamer felt upon feeding on the remnants of the feast, are the effects of the fall as well. Because the food had the same effect in *Paradise Lost*, when Satan told Eve that the fruit had “Divine effect / To open Eyes, and make them Gods who taste” (IX, 865-6). The dreamer when he found the leftovers of the banquet states that they were “pure kinds [he] could not know” (I, 34) hinting his lack of knowledge. The food and his leaving from the palace of art will have two effects on him: it enables him to celebrate close communion with a former state of innocence, and with the whole human-race; and at the same time he will experience a terrible pain. Both effects will enable him to acquire higher knowledge of humanity, the proper material of poetry. Knowledge that is granted to him by the Titaness Moneta, mother of all muses. But in order to satiate his appetite, the poet/dreamer has to resort to his own imagination.

Once he comes into his senses again he finds himself in a different landscape which is completely different from the one he experienced before. He finds himself in the ruins of an “eternal domed monument” (I, 56) in the ruins of an abandoned temple. Which reminds us of the fallen Saturn and Satan, because Keats does not start this narration with fallen characters but with an abandoned feast, and an abandoned sanctuary. These elements might stand for the whole events of the fall of the Titans and Men at the same time.

The shift from the first landscape which is the garden of paradise, full of light and surrounded by a plethora of species of trees and plants, to the uninviting and desolate sanctuary marks the state in which the dreamer is. From a paradisiac environment he is overthrown into this forsaken place. This event marks the persona poetica’s fall from innocence to experience, from irresponsibility to responsibility, from unawareness to awareness on the sufferings and fate of humanity. And there is no turning point because the “black gates [of the sanctuary] / were shut against the sunrise evermore” (I, 85-6), doors that will not open a second time.

The persona poetica describes this temple with the utmost detail, and in his wandering he is confronted with an altar and a stair. Then he hears a voice warning him

If thou canst not ascend

These steps, die on that marble where thou art.

Thy flesh, near cousin to the common dust,

Will parch for lack of nutriment thy bones

Will wither in few years, and vanish so

That not the quickest eye could find a grain

Of what thou now art on that pavement cold (I, 108-13)

The voice reminds him how fragile he is. Then the same voice commands him to “ascend/ these steps” reminding us of the directions that the angel Michael gave Adam to “ascend / this Hill” (XI, 366-7). Both Adam and the dreamer take the cue and “ascend / in the Visions of God” (XI, 367-7). In spite of the warnings of eminent death the dreamer undertakes the risk and descends the stairs. The pain the persona poetica experiences is very similar to the pain experienced by Apollo in the third book of *Hyperion*, because he also had to “die into life” (“Hyperion” III, 130). As Apollo underwent human suffering to become a God, so the poet—a man, has to experience another’s pain “to see as a god sees” (“Fall of Hyperion” I, 305).

Once he ascends the shadow appears. She tells him that he survived, and was saved just because those who ascend are “those to whom the miseries of the world / are misery, and will not let them rest” (I, 148-9). Because of his awareness on the world’s desolation and because his preoccupation he was saved. However, she tells him “thou art a dreaming thing” (I, 168) and proceeds to urge him to justify his existence. In a first instance, she categorizes him with the dreamers. The distinction between a dreamer and a poet because “the poet and the dreamer are distinct / diverse, sheer opposite, antipodes, / one pours out a balm upon the World, / The other vexes it” (I, 199-202). That is to say, dreamers “thoughtless[ly] sleep away their days” (I, 151) not really caring about humanity and its pain. On the other hand, according to the persona poetica a poet is “a sage; / a humanist, physician to all men” (I, 189-90) but he thinks he does not fit into the role.

The dialogue between the poet-dreamer and the shadow—who we later know is Moneta, is a strong statement on the nature of poets. True poets, dreamers, and false poets are all pinpointed in the exchange. One of the objectives of myths is that what it is said in them is assumed as reality and truth. Hence by offering this dialogue in this poem Keats is immortalising his own definition of what a true poet is, and what the poetic mission means offering them as the ultimate truth. Moneta, is just like the grim temple, and just like the Grecian Urn. She stores all the History of human-kind, the art, and the culture of human race. All the knowledge that is the fruit, and at the same time the only way to keep going forward. This is precisely why the figure of Moneta is elemental in the interpretation of *The Fall of Hyperion* as a mythographic<sup>7</sup>, and mythopoeic work. She dramatizes the connection between the poet and human-kind. The dreamer and Moneta, as well as Apollo and Mnemosyne, are set as the example for the relationship Keats wants to establish between the poet and his audience. That is to say, the poet acquires his power as a poet because of the inspiration he gets from his ability to access the history of humanity, witnessing its joy and its pain. Again referring to Barthes ideas on mythopoesis being a process that helps to promote certain and specific agendas, and that makes certain events eternal and contingent, the mythopoeic element here is provided by the belief that every poet should act like Apollo or the dreamer. The idea that poets should feed from human woes and triumphs to produce their poetry, and on the go to ease the woes of humanity is what transcends in this poem.

It is not fortuitous that the dreamer from *The Fall of Hyperion*, was also received by Mnemosyne— just with another name, and that he had to undergo the same hardships that Apollo had to in order to become a god and replace the Titan Hyperion. Neither is the fact that the dreamer is recognized as a poet. This poem can be seen as a reworking of the figure of Apollo. Therefore it can be said that Keats through the outlining of these works he exposes his idea of “the poet and his function with relation to some major intellectual, political, and historical of the age” (Sperry 155).

---

<sup>7</sup> Pertaining to mythography. According to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* mythography refers to the representation of myths in art: either visual, musical, or written.

Continuing with the comparison between the dreamer and Adam, it can be assessed that the dreamer is very similar to Milton's Adam in the closing books of *Paradise Lost*. The poet, just like Adam, committed a sin by pursuing greater knowledge, "knowledge both of good and evil" (Milton IX, 752) that went beyond ordinary and human knowledge. The poet and Adam wanted to acquire God's vision, and in the attempt to doing so they lost an important element in their lives that they cannot regain: their innocence. Once they acquired this superior vision were overwhelmed by it. The way in which they express about what they feel towards this vision is similarly depicted in both works. While the dreamer tells Moneta "High Prophetess", said I, "*purge off, / Benign, if so it please thee, my mind's film*" (I, 145-6), in *Paradise Lost* this removal is portrayed as it follows

Michael from Adams eyes the *Filme* remov'd

Which that false Fruit that promis'd clearer sight

Had bred; then *purg'd* with Euphrasie and Rue

This visual Nerve, for he had much to see. (XI, 412-5).

Both lyric speakers refer to this greater vision as a film. And in both characters, Adam and the dreamer, the vision they are given instead of bringing them greater joy, just makes them restless, and gives them deeper knowledge of human pain and fate.

Similar reactions are observed in the agony that both characters experience because of the vision they acquired after they had "felt/ what 'tis to die and live again before/ [their] fated hour" (I, 141-2). The dreamer, after witnessing Thea's and Saturn's misery states

Oftentimes I pray'd

Intense, that death would take me from the vale

And all its burthens—Gaspings with despair

Of change, hour after hour I curs'd myself (I. 396-9)

Adam shares a similar reaction towards his sighting of the future of all his progeny

O Visions ill foreseen! Better had I



Liv'd ignorant of future, so had borne

My part of evil onely, each dayes lot

Anough to bear (XI. 759-62)

But unlike Adam, the dreamer witnesses the panorama without any concrete hope of redemption, as Adam does—hope that is embodied by Christ. The angel Michael shows Adam “what shall come in future days / to thee and to thy offspring” (XI, 357-8) with the purpose of encouraging Adam not to give up and face adversity, so he faces adversity because his entire progeny depends on him. Moneta plays a role that is similar to the one of Michael, because she leads, informs, and warns the *persona poetica*. By sharing and experiencing Moneta’s memories, the poet becomes a witness of the pain of the Titans, a victim of the pain, and a poet that sees in the sorrow of the Titans the coming misery that will befall in Humanity. Over all things, she grants him the ultimate knowledge that it is to be used as a tool to soothe humanity’s pain. This is why both, Moneta and Michael, can be paralleled. Even though they are the ones who give Adam and the dreamer this higher vision of the future, they also are the ones that give them the tools to redeem themselves.

In relation to style, in *The Fall of Hyperion* there are scarce instances of Miltonic inversions, as opposed to the first version *Hyperion*. Among those that were utilised more frequently in the first version of the poem, the employment of the verb in pre-subject position was spotted few times as in “Then *shouted I*, / Spite of myself, and with a Pythia’s spleen” (I, 202-3), “*Cried I*, with act adorant at her feet” (I, 283), and “Fright and perplex, so also *shudders he*” (II, 19). The other inversions—as the utilisation of the adjective after the noun, and the listing of various adjectives after the noun, are not frequent in this poem. Nonetheless, they appear when Keats rephrases the events of the first poem. For example, “Make great Hyperion ache. His *palace bright*” (II, 25), “Savour of poisonous brass and *metal sick*” (II, 33), and “And all those acts which *Deity supreme* / doth ease its hear of love in” (I, 416), as instances of the noun-adjective form. And “His old right hand lay *nerveless, listless, dead, / Unsceptred*” (I, 323-4) as an instance of adjective listing. These Miltonic inversions appear in the exact same way they appeared in *Hyperion*.

*The Fall of Hyperion* is Keats second attempt of expressing his interpretation of *Paradise Lost*. This new attempt integrates the figure of the poet into the equation and in the process he makes a statement on the poetic labour and on his idea of what the job of a poet is and should be. As Sperry stated “*The Fall of Hyperion* must be regarded as one of the major attempts within European romanticism to reconcile the imagination with a realistic and humane awareness of the suffering of man-kind” (“Keats, Milton, and the Fall of Hyperion” 83). The fall of Man depicted by Milton in *Paradise Lost* seemed suitable to formulate this new metaphor that contrasted with *Hyperion* is less optimistic in nature and naïve, and more realistic in content. The initial conception portrayed in the first *Hyperion* towards the ideas of progress and optimism embodied by beauty, are left behind to introduce a more tragic concept of the same beauty. Beauty is truth, but this truth is painful for humans and for the dreamer.

Keats did not abandon Milton when he stopped writing his first *Hyperion*. This second poem reveals the immense influence that *Paradise Lost* had in his poetic endeavour. The influence runs beyond mere similitudes in structures and organization. From the metaphor of the Garden, to the command to ascend, and the similarities between the visions. Keats by taking the myth created by Milton, which at the same time is based in the Judaeo-Christian myth of the Fall of Men, exposes an allegory of sin, atonement, and the effects of the pursuit of higher knowledge. Here in this poem he exposes the dangers and perks of imaginative experience. The figure of the poet is paralleled with that of Adam who tasted the fruit of imagination and lost his innocence. He only can be redeemed through this particular vision of the pain of men.

In *Paradise Lost* two falls are depicted: first, the fall of the rebellious angels, and then that of man. The fall exposed in *Hyperion* parallels the first one, and the second one is narrated in *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*. The three narrations have the same consequence: although the falls are tragic, they are necessary for a greater good to ensue. The cycle exposed in *Paradise Lost* is very much the same proposed in *Hyperion*: fall, redemption, and ascent. But while Milton pinpoints moral perfection as the result of the fall, Keats emphasises aesthetic perfection.

## Conclusion

*Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*, even though they were not finished, are John Keats' biggest poetic efforts. Both poems focus mainly on the decline of an old generation and the ascension of a brand new generation, and both highlight the relationship between poets and humankind. As it was observed throughout this dissertation Milton's influence is at times subtle and runs beyond than mere rhetorical resemblances like it was observed in what regards to story-line structure where *Hyperion* emulates exactly what happens in *Paradise Lost*—its beginning *in media res* focusing on the strongest character in an already fallen state, then the attention is on the councils where the tension of the plot unfolds and reaches its major peak. In both works special attention is directed on this crucial debate where the path which the story will head is decided. In *The Fall of Hyperion* Keats takes the metaphor of the garden exposed in *Paradise Lost*, and takes the figure and hardships that Adam had to endure in order to get a higher knowledge that leads to an omnipotent vision, in order to expose his own idea on the mission of the poets and their unique enterprise.

Nonetheless, one question arises from this analysis. Throughout the reading of *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* the reader gets to know in depth Keats' version and vision on the Fall of the Titans, especially that of Saturn. Straightforwardly the main focus could have been shifted from Hyperion to Saturn, or Oceanus. Nevertheless, Keats decided to focus on the ongoing exchange of power between Hyperion and Apollo. As it was already mentioned in the analysis, Apollo is the god of poetry, beauty, and the sun—which makes the relationship between these two characters, and the decision of choosing Hyperion clearer for he is the Titan in charge of the sun. Through the fall of Hyperion, Keats is also creating a myth about how Apollo, the poet and father of all verse, finally came to power.

It was also found that Keats' myths are not read like classical dictionaries. This is to say, while he is attempting to emulate Greek myth-makers he is not mechanically copying and reproducing the same myths created before him. He adopted the myths and permeated them with his own wit. For instance, he did not use classical references in the articulation of myths—e.g. when he delineates the character of Saturn does not make reference to his

ruthlessness, greediness, or selfishness, nor makes reference to the classical myth where Saturn—also known Cronos, eats his children in fear of being overthrown by them. Instead he offers the reader a very weak and defeated Saturn that does not fight his children like Hesiod's one—which is the widespread version of the *Titanomachia*. Keats attempts to produce an innovative characterisation to endow the characters different identities from the ones that are in the original myths.

A similar phenomenon happens in *Paradise Lost*. Milton neither stuck rigorously to classical references. For instance, he took the character of Satan that in *The Holy Bible* is always depicted as evil, the supreme being of sin whose feelings, reasons and thoughts are never explained. He seized this character and gave him rationality, he went beyond the epithets utilised in the Bible, such as “the serpent” (Genesis 3:4), and “the author of evil” (Job 1:6), adding support to this characterisation, and going beyond endowing Satan with an elaborated and expanded ethos. Additionally, the canonical representation of God is also disrupted by Milton, who depicts God as tyrannical, unfair and hurtful towards Satan, and the responsible one for evil because God “created evil” (II, 623) and also “where all life dies” (II, 624) thus letting “all monstrous, all prodigious things” (II, 625) to corrupt goodness. The way in which Satan is delineated by Milton emboldens him and changes the readers' perception on the mythical figure. Suddenly Satan becomes a victim and a very charming character who can finally explain and justify his behaviour, which exposes why he finds the context in which the fall happened unfair, a character that is hard not to sympathise with.

The present dissertation adds to the already existing literature that attempts to assess the influence that Milton could have had in the poetic endeavour of John Keats. This dissertation proposes a different perspective in the assessment of this influence: that of a close examination on the texts instead of one supported in biographical information and the like. However, this work can support further said works, and likewise, be supported with the perspectives those works propose. The main shortcoming of this research is the lack of experience on the employment of a specific literary approach. Sometimes psychological readings were offered, which disrupt with the intention of new criticism. Nevertheless, they were offered only when they strengthened a point.

It is important to consider that neither the poetic endeavour, nor poems are located in a historical and political void, therefore it would be highly interesting to continue this line of study and merge both, the biographical data and the rigorous examination of the poems altogether in order to get a more comprehensive and a deeper understanding on the influence that Milton exerted in Keats. By gathering biographical data, and by reading his letters we could access information that is not provided by his poems— as the reason why Keats did not finish *Hyperion*, nor *The Fall of Hyperion*.

Likewise, it would be remarkable to amplify the scope and explore more writers who might have influenced Keats' poetic labour, thus enriching and establishing new interrelations between the authors and the works. For instance, it was noticed in the analysis that the figure of Saturn, apart from sharing some features with Satan, he also shares several attitudes with Shakespeare's King Lear. Or that Moneta from *The Fall of Hyperion* plays a role that reminds us of Beatrice from Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Such intertextual relationships would give a more all-encompassing answer to the question of influence.

It is possible that given the chance of keeping on writing these myths, and by the little divergences observed on the developments of them (e.g. *Hyperion*'s characters emotional incapability of moving forward and the nature of their loss of divinity; and *The Fall of Hyperion* and the differences between Adam and the dreamer of dying into life and envisioning the future of Humanity); if that would have happened it is possible that the structures might have departed from the ones presented in *Paradise Lost*. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to carry out a more intensive, thorough, and meticulous analysis. Examining line by line both poems in the lookout for more discreet and subtle similarities such as prosodic features, punctuation, or rhetorical devices to strengthen and enforce the point of Miltonic influence.

Notwithstanding, Keats seems not to have overcome the anxiety of influence which is mainly hinted by his abandonment of the two works whose main influence was Milton. However, he achieved the reconfiguration of the myth that belonged to classic antiquity quite successfully in his two attempts, and in the process he could also change one feature of myth.

## References

### Cited Works

- Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. PDF file.
- Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. New York: The Noonday Press, 1972. PDF file.
- Bloom, Harold. *Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- . *The Visionary Company: A Reading of English Romantic Poetry*. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1961. PDF file.
- . *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: John Keats*. New York: Chelsea House, 2007. PDF file.
- Bode, Christoph. "Hyperion, 'The Fall of Hyperion', and Keats's Poetics". *The Wordsworth Circle*, 31.1 (1999): 31-37. Web. 6 Dec. 2015.
- Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the origin of our ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. PDF file.
- Cladis, Mark S. "Looking Back -to See Forward: Romanticism, Religion and the Secular Modernity." *Nations under God: The Geopolitics of Faith in the Twenty-First Century*. Eds. Luke M. Herrington, Alasdair McKay, and Jeffrey Haynes. Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing, 2015. 56-62. PDF file.
- Coleman, J. A. *The Dictionary of Mythology: An A-Z of Themes, Legends and Heroes*. London: Arcturus Publishing Limited, 2007. PDF file.
- Cuddon, J.A. *Dictionary of Literary Terms & Literary Theory*. London: Penguin Books, 1998. PDF file.
- Eliot, T. S. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1932. Print.
- Fallon, Robert Thomas. *Divided Empire: Milton's Political Imagery*. Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 1995. PDF file.

- Fowler, Alastair. *John Milton: Paradise Lost*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 1968. PDF file.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975. Print.
- . *Creation and Recreation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980. PDF file.
- Glare, P.G.W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. PDF file.
- Greenblatt, Stephen and M. H Abrams. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000. PDF file.
- Grimal, Pierre. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. PDF file.
- Hard, Robin. *Handbook of Greek Mythology*. New York: Routledge, 2004. PDF file.
- Harper, Douglas. "Hyperion". *Online Etymology Dictionary*. n.d. 2015. Web. 23. Nov. 2015.
- . "Influence". *Online Etymology Dictionary*. n.d. 2015. Web. 22. Sept. 2015.
- Hasan, Ihab H. "The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes towards a Definition". *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 14.1 (1955): 66-76. Web. 4 Oct. 2015.
- Hassanian, Mehdi. *New Criticism*. Putra: University of Putra Malaysia, 2008. PDF file.
- Havens, Raymond Dexter. *The Influence of Milton: On English Poetry*. London: Forgotten Books, 2013. PDF file.
- Keats, John. *The Complete Poems of John Keats*. London: Wordsworth Poetry Library, 1994. Print.
- Lau, Beth. *Keats's Paradise Lost*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998. PDF file.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993. PDF file.
- Paz, Octavio. *Children of the Mire: Modern Poetry from Romanticism to the Avant-Garde*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974. Print.

- Pratt, Lynda. 'Epic', in *Romanticism: An Oxford Guide* ed. Nicholas Roe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. PDF file.
- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Pearson Longman, 2005. PDF file.
- Shears, Jonathon. *The Romantic Legacy of Paradise Lost: Reading Against the Grain*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2009. PDF file.
- Sherwin, Paul. "Dying into Life: Keats's Struggle with Milton in Hyperion". *PMLA*, 93.3 (1978): 383-395. Web. 6 Dec. 2015.
- Sperry, Stuart. *Keats the Poet*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973. PDF file.
- . "Keats, Milton, and the Fall of Hyperion". *PMLA*, 77.1(1962): 77-84. Web. 10 Dec. 2015.
- The Holy Bible, King James Version*. Cambridge Edition: 1769; *King James Bible Online*, 2015. <<http://kingjamesbibleonline.org>>
- Williams, Meg Harris. *Inspiration in Milton and Keats*. London: The MacMillan Press, 1982. PDF file.

#### Consulted Works

- Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: John Milton*. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004. PDF file.
- Freer, Scott. *Modernist Mythopoeia: The Twilight of the Gods*. New York: Pallgrave Macmillan, 2015. PDF file.
- Frye, Northrop. *Fables of Identity*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. PDF file.
- . *Thy Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1947. PDF file.
- Gilley, Sheridan & Sheils, W.J. *A History of Religion in Britain: Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 1994. PDF file.



Shawcross, John T. *John Milton: The Self and the World*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1993. PDF file.

Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Penguin History, 1991. PDF file.