PROTEAN DEITIES: CLASSICAL MYTHOLOGY IN JOHN KEATS'S 'HYPERION POEMS' AND DAN SIMMONS'S *HYPERION* AND *THE FALL OF HYPERION*

by

HERCO JACOBUS STEYN

submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the subject

ENGLISH

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: DR DW LLOYD

February 2011

Declaration of Own Work

Student number: 4198-288-6

I, the undersigned, declare that this dissertation, entitled "Protean Deities: Classical Mythology in John Keats's 'Hyperion Poems' and Dan Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*", is my own work and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

_____ _____

Signature: Mr HJ Steyn Date

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the following two individuals:

- My supervisor, Dr David Lloyd, for his sustained support and guidance. As I have come to understand, there is a vast difference between knowing the path and walking the path, and he was the master of showing me the path, yet allowing me genuinely to find my own voice within the dissertation.
- My wife, Leonét, for comprehending the importance of this dissertation to me personally, for continuously encouraging me to persist, for unshakably believing in my abilities, and, above all, for her unconditional love.

Contents

‘Science continues to conserve the archaic heritage of myth,
content to clothe it in another form.’

Ernst Cassirer, *Language and Myth*

Summary

This dissertation concurs with the Jungian postulation that certain psychological archetypes are inclined to be reproduced by the collective unconscious. In turn, these psychological archetypes are revealed to emerge in literature as literary archetypes. It is consequently argued that science fiction has come to form a new mythology because the archetypal images are displaced in a modern, scientific guise. This signifies a shift in the collective world view of humanity, or a shift in its collective consciousness. It is consequently argued that humanity's collective consciousness has evolved from mythic thought to scientific thought, courtesy of the numerous groundbreaking scientific discoveries of the past few centuries. This dissertation posits as a premise that Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's supposition of humanity's collective consciousness evolving towards what he calls the Omega Point to hold true. The scientific displacement of the literary archetypes reveals humankind's evolution towards the Omega Point and a cosmic consciousness.

Key terms: collective unconscious, archetype, myth, displacement, allusion, intertextuality, epic, science fiction, collective consciousness, *weltanschauung*, ideology, Romanticism, Omega Point, Hegelian dialectic.

Introduction

This dissertation consolidates several seemingly disparate hypotheses, the first of which is Carl Gustav Jung's postulation of psychological archetypes, which are produced by the collective unconscious. Jung's sense of the psychological archetype is reconciled with the myth critic, Northrop Frye's, conception of literary archetypes. The literary archetypes that are identified in Chapter One provide a concrete point of reference from which the transformation of myth through time, from the Classical Greek period (circa 510-323 BC) to the present day, may be tracked. The tracking of the transformation of myth through time is accomplished by means of employing Frye's literary technique of displacement.

It is therefore argued that modern-day mythmaking is indeed taking place, but that the myths themselves have been 'displaced' in order to reflect humanity's changing perception of the world. For the purposes of this dissertation, humankind's changing perception is traced from the Classical Greek period up to the present day. It is argued that due to certain events (such as the Age of Enlightenment, the Scientific Revolution, and the Industrial Revolution), 'radical' scientific and other theories (such as heliocentrism, the biological classification system, and evolution), and scientific and technological discoveries (such as electricity, computers, robotics, and air and space travel), humankind's perception of the world, and consequently his place in it, have changed.

When speaking of humankind's perception, it is inferred that this perception is the collective perception of humankind. This collective perception of humankind may be usefully related to Émile Durkheim's hypothesis of the collective consciousness of humankind (Jary and Jary, 1991:93). However, if the collective perception of humankind, that is the collective consciousness, changes through the ages in step with scientific and technological discoveries, it would mean that humankind's collective consciousness is evolving, as advocated by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1959:300-301).

Because humankind is not monolithic, the evolution of humankind's collective consciousness in the context of this dissertation is taken to mean the evolution of the collective consciousness of the more educated classes of the West.

Moreover, if humankind's collective consciousness is evolving, it would be reflected by the literature of different periods of Western culture. In this dissertation, it is examined how the literary archetypes are displaced from the Classical Greek period, to the Romantic period, to the contemporary period. This is done by examining the transformation of the same myth, namely the myth of the *Titanomachia* (or Hyperion myth), through the three periods mentioned. It is shown that myths are still produced, but that they are displaced in modern form to reflect the scientific direction of modern humankind's collective consciousness. Because myths are still produced, albeit in scientific garb, I will argue that science fiction is the contemporary guise of myth.

The reason why humankind's collective consciousness evolved from what Claude Lévi-Strauss calls 'mythic thought' (Dubuisson, 1993:119) to a more scientific world view is that new conceptual developments have invalidated many of the old 'certainties' that mythopoeic man implicitly believed, for example that the earth is flat or that the earth is the centre of the universe. For early mythopoeic man, the transcendental or Platonic world consisted of the cosmos with its gods, planets, and other inexplicable phenomena. f, in the contemporary era of scientific myth, the transcendent referent can no longer be the cosmos because scientific research has shown that it is empirically knowable, and thus no longer entirely transcendent (Sutton and Sutton, 1969:235).

As concerns the re-presentation (the hyphen is added intentionally) of the myth of the *Titanomachia*, the three authors that are focussed on in this dissertation are the ancient Greek writer, Hesiod, the Romantic poet, John Keats, and the contemporary science fiction author, Dan Simmons. It is revealed that both Keats and Simmons share an evolutionary world view in which the principle of the survival of the fittest and the most beautiful (with beauty signifying evolutionary superiority) prevails. In addition to subscribing to an evolutionary world view, both Keats and Simmons are revealed to

support Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's proposition that humankind's collective consciousness is evolving towards a certain point in the future, called the Omega Point (which signifies supreme consciousness).

However, it is ultimately concluded that both Keats and Simmons grasp the fundamental characteristic of evolution, namely that it is a relentless quest for improvement and thus it never stops, not even when the supposed Omega Point is achieved because just as it appears as though the Omega Point is about to be attained, it is revealed that it can never be reached. This signifies that humankind will always evolve further and, perhaps more profoundly, that perfection is ultimately unattainable.

With regards to the structure of this dissertation, I acknowledge that the chapters are perilously long. Instead of opting for the more conventional approach of dividing the dissertation into four chapters of approximately thirty pages each, I have chosen to make use of only three chapters of approximately forty pages each. My reason for doing so is that I have a substantial number of seemingly disparate hypotheses and concepts which are consolidated in Chapter One, thus accounting for its length. I have also decided not to split the longest chapter (Chapter Three – the chapter on Simmons) because the archetypes are dealt with in relation to each character and his or her role within the two novels as a whole, thus two chapters would appear repetitious and incoherent. In fact, Dan Simmons (2002:65) himself admits that the two novels were initially supposed to be published as one book, but it was decided to publish it as two due to 'the realities of publishing'.

While I acknowledge that there is a significant amount of repetition in this dissertation, it would be useful for the reader to see it in the context of the fact that the texts span three different eras and three different genres. Furthermore, the various psychological, literary, and philosophical concepts which underpin this dissertation are intricately related to the three representations of the *Titanomachia* and the repetition of certain key concepts is purely for the reader's benefit. The discussion of Simmons's novels in Chapter Three would also appear convoluted due to the various 'versions' of the Keats cybrid and other

conceptual ideas posited by Simmons. However, the reader's prior knowledge of Simmons's novels in question that is assumed for the purposes of this dissertation should mitigate this potential problem.

Chapter I: Methodologies

‘It was the best of times, it was the worst of times…’

I have intentionally refrained from adding a reference to the above quotation because it should, at least to the more educated classes of the English-speaking world, be instantly recognisable as the opening line of one of the greatest English novels of all time.[1] When reading those immortal words, we immediately and involuntarily make the mental connection to Dickens and the two cities which his canonical novel invokes. Similarly, Shakespeare’s famous phrases ‘To be or not to be: that is the question’ and ‘Something is rotten in the state of Denmark’ are still widely used today to denote respectively indecision and suspicion. The reason we are able to make the mental connection to the passages referred to is because we are familiar with the works in which they are used. When such prominent literary references are used in another work, they bring a new dimension to the work in which they are referred to. Thus, such prominent literary references are part of our implicit knowledge of the English language and the canon of English literature.

However, literary references may not always be as prominent as those mentioned above – they may be much subtler and consequently require a wider literary exposure on the part of the reader. Moreover, even if the reader is able to locate the literary reference, it is almost never as straightforward to gauge the extent of the significance and, antithetically, the extent of the meaning of the writing that is lost upon the reader if the literary reference is not recognised and appreciated by the reader.

The literary references mentioned above may be usefully related to the term ‘allusion’. An allusion is an ‘indirect or passing reference to some event, person, place, or artistic work, the nature and relevance of which is not explained by the writer but relies on the reader’s familiarity with what is thus mentioned’ (Baldick, 2008:9). The word ‘allusion’ is derived from the Latin word *alludo*, which means to play with, and allusions in the text are supposed to be recognised as such (Bate, 1994:10). The allusions in any given text

are not there by accident but by purpose, and the author would not have inserted the allusions had they not a special significance to the literary work at hand (Baldick, 2008:9). Allusion enhances or complicates a text because a parallel is drawn between the text and another area of life or literature so that the reader's perception of the events being described is modified by this reference (Peck and Coyle, 2002:143). While we might not always recognise the allusions, they do add to the complexity of the meaning of the work we are reading when we do identify them (Peck and Coyle, 2002:143).

Allusions are evidently intended to enhance the reader's reading experience. However, allusions are also intended to make the reading experience more complex. Therefore, the allusion is supposed to be recognised by the reader, who must be familiar enough with what is being alluded to in order to appreciate the significance of the allusion. It may consequently be deduced that the significance of allusion in itself is threefold: (1) it is supposed to be recognised or identified as an allusion by the reader; (2) the allusion is reliant on the assumption that the reader is familiar with the source of the allusion; and (3) the allusion that is correctly recognised, interpreted, and appreciated by the reader adds a new dimension to the text that is being read by making it more complex and rewarding.

Examples of allusions that are specifically relevant to this dissertation would be to say that a person looks 'as though they are carrying the world on their shoulders' when someone looks worried and depressed, or to liken a much-anticipated sports fixture to a 'clash of the Titans'. We do perhaps not always recognise that we are in fact alluding to the respective myths of Atlas, who was ordered to carry the world on his shoulders as punishment for being the Titans' war leader against the Olympians, or to the actual battle of the *Titanomachia*. For such simple references, it is not required of the reader to be familiar with, for example, the events leading to the *Titanomachia* or about the Olympian gods. However, when the archetypal succession myth and the fundamental urge of achieving individuation (both of which will be discussed later) are alluded to by means of invoking the *Titanomachia*, the significance will lie in how the archetypes of the succession myth and the urge for individuation are displaced. As a result, when

confronted with two authors who have structured their writings explicitly on a Classical myth in its entirety (as is the case with Keats's and Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*), it becomes necessary to have a more thorough knowledge of the original myth in order for its function to be fully appreciated by the reader.

With regards to the mythological characters' names, it may be noted that many of them are derived from the Greek words that embody their character traits, for example the name of Cronus (Father Time) is derived from the Greek word for time (*chronos*), Gaia's (Mother Earth) name comes from the Greek word for land or earth (*gaea*), and the Greek word for reminder (*monere*) has been adapted to denote the name of the goddess of memory, Mnemosyne (Hammond and Scullard, 1970:452, 574 and 698). However, because names can only indicate the core etymologies of the words, they do not signify the actual myths that are associated with the names. Consequently, the full extent of the allusion needs to be investigated in order to determine the significance of the allusion. In order to determine the significance of the allusion, it has to be determined what assumptions are being made with regards to Keats's *Hyperion* poems and Simmons's *Hyperion* novels. It is firstly assumed that both Keats and Simmons (via Keats) have explicitly alluded to the Classical narratives, characters, and themes in their respective versions of *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*, and that the Classical allusions are supposed to be recognised as such. It is consequently assumed that Simmons has explicitly alluded to the life, work, social acquaintances, and health of Keats.

As a literary technique, allusion gives rise to intertextuality. Intertextuality enhances the density of a text and it is used to explain how myth migrates from text to text. The notion of intertextuality is derived from the assumption that:

> Literary texts possess meaning; readers extract that meaning from them. We call the process of extracting meaning from texts reading or interpretation. Works of literature … are built from systems, codes and traditions established by previous works of literature. The systems, codes and traditions of other art forms and of culture in general are also crucial to the meaning of a work of literature. Texts, whether they be literary or non-literary, are viewed by modern theorists as lacking in any kind of independent meaning. They are what theorists now call intertextual. The act of reading … plunges us into a network of textual relations. To interpret a text, to

> discover its meaning, or meanings, is to trace those relations. Reading thus becomes a process of moving between the texts.
>
> (Allen, 2000:1)

The notion of intertextuality is thus based on the presupposition that the act of reading constitutes a means of interpreting a text, and that it plunges the reader into a network of textual relations. Therefore, the meaning of a specific text becomes something which exists between that specific text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates (Allen, 2001:1). Furthermore, intertextuality refers to the way in which 'one text echoes or is linked to other texts either by direct quotation or allusion or simply by being a text' (Peck and Coyle, 2002:175) and it may reveal itself in a number of different ways, such as allusion, anagram, translation, parody, pastiche, imitation, and adaptation (Baldick, 2008:171). Ultimately, the text that is being perused becomes the intertext (Allen, 2000:1). Essentially, allusion and intertextuality are literary techniques that can be employed by the author to enhance the meaning of a text and, should the reader not recognise the allusion or intertextual reference, this 'enhancement' or 'beautification' of the text will be lost upon the reader.

The readers of works in which literary allusions are present are confronted with two structures at work within the writings. The first structure is the conspicuous or primary structure, where the meaning of the writing is taken at face value, meaning that no latent meaning is assigned to, or identified with, the writing, while the second structure is the inconspicuous or secondary structure, in which literary allusions are identified and meaning is assigned to them (Baldick, 2008:217). Should the reader not be able to identify the allusions, it would make no difference to his or her understanding of the primary structure and the writing would still be perfectly interpretable by the reader.

Should the secondary structure of the writing not be accessible to the reader due to a lack of awareness of the literary allusions on the reader's part, a certain part of the meaning of the writing will be lost upon the reader. This part of the writing that is lost upon the reader shall forthwith be referred to as the significance of the literary allusion and this dissertation shall attempt to reveal the significance of the Classical allusions in Dan

Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* in relation to Keats's two epic poems of the same name.

During the course of this dissertation, I have referred to 'myth' an innumerable number of times. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, all references made to myth in this dissertation should be construed as referring to Classical mythology, and in particular Classical Greek mythology. The reason for the emphasis on Classical Greek mythology is that, apart from serving as inspiration to John Keats and Dan Simmons, Classical Greek culture also had a powerful influence on the Roman Empire, which, in turn, carried a version of it to many parts of Europe and the Mediterranean region (Tarnas, 1991:1). Consequently, apart from the Bible, Classical Greece is generally considered to be the seminal culture which has provided the foundation of Western civilisation (Tarnas, 1991:2).

Much has been written about the use of mythology by writers from the English Romantic period, as indicated by the abundance of works available on the topic such as Paul Wiebe's *Myth as Genre in British Romantic Poetry* (1999), Anthony Harding's *The Reception of Myth in English Romanticism* (1995), and less recently, Paul Cantor's *Creature and Creator: Myth-making and English Romanticism* (1984), Warren Stevenson's *The Myth of the Golden Age in English Romantic Poetry* (1981), and Douglas Bush's *Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry* (1957). Furthermore, works such as Dorothy van Ghent's *Keats, the Myth of the Hero* (1983) and Walter Evert's *Aesthetic and Myth in the Poetry of Keats* (1965) confirm that there are also works dedicated to the exploration of Keats's use of mythology. However, very little has been researched about the science fiction and fantasy writer Dan Simmons. A comparison between the use of the myth of the *Titanomachia* (or Hyperion myth) by the Romantic poet, John Keats, and its explicit reworking by the contemporary writer, Dan Simmons, will illuminate shifts in underlying values and beliefs, as well as perceptions of reality. The underlying values and perceptions will be compared against the backdrop of the original myth of the *Titanomachia* according to the Classical Greek writer, Hesiod, as part of his *Theogony* ("Origin of the Gods") (circa 700 BC).

These underlying values and perceptions can usefully be related to the concept of ideology. Although difficult to define, Catherine Belsey distinguishes between two usages of the term. The first refers to systems of thought and beliefs that have been consciously adopted by an individual, such as capitalism, liberalism, or conservatism. Consequently, this first classification of the term refers to explicit socio-political systems of thoughts and beliefs (Belsey, 1980:5). This first and more general meaning of ideology can essentially be construed as the beliefs, concepts, ways of thinking, ideas and values that shape our thoughts and which we use to explain or understand the world (Belsey, 1980:5), and a body of unacknowledged yet fundamental assumptions made about the world (Baldick, 2008:163).

The second usage of ideology is, for Belsey, derived from Louis Althusser's Marxist criticism and it 'assumes that ideology … is the very condition of our experience of the world, *un*conscious precisely in that it is unquestioned, taken for granted' (Belsey, 1980:5, original emphasis). However, ideology is only unconscious in the sense that we do not think about the way in which we internalise our experiences and perceptions of the world – it simply happens. Therefore, as our experiences of the world changes, so do our perceptions about it and, as a result, our ideologies change. Belsey further argues that:

> ideology … is *inscribed in* specific *discourses.* A discourse is a domain of language-use, a particular way of talking (and writing and thinking). … Ideology is *inscribed in* discourse in the sense that it is literally written or spoken *in it*; it is not a separate element which exists independently … but a way of thinking, speaking, experiencing.
>
> (Belsey, 1980:5, original emphasis)

Thus, ideology cannot exist independently from experience because one's ideology would, to a greater or lesser extent, reflect one's experiences of the world. As a result, different people's ideologies will necessarily be different owing to different experiences, and consequently different perceptions, of the world.

For the purpose of this dissertation, Belsey's second definition of ideology, as derived from the work of Louis Althusser, will be used. According to Althusser (1969:234),

ideology ‘expresses a will, a hope or a nostalgia, rather than describing a reality’. For Althusser, ideology is ‘a primordial structure of consciousness’, which means that we are only ‘born into’ an ideology insofar as a child is most likely to adopt the ideology of his or her parents (Leitch, Cain, Finke, Johnson, McGowan, and Williams, 2001:1478). Because ideology expresses a will or a nostalgia and because it cannot exist independently from experience, it is the unconscious ordering of our conscious experiences of the world.

Despite the fact that ideology is reliant on experience and perception, it is not necessarily limited to individual experience and perception. Ideologies may also relate to shared or collective experiences and perceptions of certain groups or societies. This sense of a collective ideology may usefully be related to the French sociologist, Émile Durkheim’s, concept of the collective consciousness. In contrast to Carl Jung’s notion of the collective unconscious, the collective consciousness is used to ‘refer to the shared beliefs and moral attitudes which operate as a unifying force within society’ (Jary and Jary, 1991:93). At this point it is important to note that, because humankind is not monolithic, the use of the term ‘collective consciousness’ will, unless explicitly stated otherwise, forthwith be used to denote the collective consciousness of the more educated classes of the West.

Moreover, the collective consciousness has its source in the collective unconscious (Shelburne, 1988:31), and thus it stands to reason that as soon as the collective unconscious is analysed and classified, it will no longer be the unconscious but become the conscious. Durkheim’s term of the collective consciousness, which acts as a ‘unifying force within society’, is representative of a collective means of perceiving and rationalising the world. Consequently, the collective consciousness can be regarded as the fundamental epistemology of an age or, more broadly stated, its *weltanschauung*. The word *weltanschauung* was calqued from the German words *Welt* (world) and *Anschauung* (view, outlook or perception) and it means a comprehensive world view and an informed worldwide perception (Tulloch, 1993:1786).

A more detailed definition of the term *weltanschauung* is provided by Diederik Aerts, Leo Apostel, Bart De Moor, Staf Hellemans, Edel Maex, Hubert Van Belle, and Jan Van der Veken:

> A world view [*weltanschauung*] is a coherent collection of concepts and theorems that must allow us to construct a global image of the world, and in this way to understand as many elements of our experience as possible. Societies, as well as individuals, have always contemplated deep questions relating to their being and becoming … a world view is a system of co-ordinates or a frame of reference in which everything presented to us by our diverse experiences can be placed … Hence, a world view is a system of co-ordinates or a frame of reference in which everything presented to us by our diverse experiences can be placed. It is a symbolic system of representation that allows us to integrate everything we know about the world and ourselves into a global picture, one that illuminates reality as it is presented to us within a certain culture.
>
> (Aerts *et al*, 1994:8-9)

Due to the fact that 'Societies, as well as individuals, have always contemplated deep questions relating to their being' and because a world view 'illuminates reality as it is presented to us within a certain culture', it is not limited to personal world views but includes collective world views as well. According to Aerts *et al* (1994:13), a *weltanschauung* or world view should comprise seven components: (1) What is the nature of our world? How is it structured and how does it function? (2) Why is our world the way it is, and not different? Why are we the way we are, and not different? What kind of global explanatory principles can we put forward? (3) Why do we feel the way we feel in this world, and how do we assess global reality, and the role of our species in it? (4) How are we to act and to create in this world? How, and in what different ways, can we influence the world and transform it? What are the general principles by which we should organise our actions? (5) What future is open to us and our species in this world? By what criteria are we to select these possible futures? (6) How are we to construct our image of this world in such a way that we can come up with answers to (1), (2), and (3)? (7) What are some of the partial answers that we can propose to these questions? These seven questions articulate different sub-tasks that are entangled with and necessitate each other, and answers to them can only be satisfactory if they form a coherent whole (Aerts *et al*, 1994:13). Due to the fact that a world view and its constituent components may be consciously identified and discussed, it is identified with the collective consciousness. As

already mentioned, the collective consciousness can be regarded as the fundamental epistemology of an age, or the collective world view of a society or particular cultural group. This collective word view, and the events that have contributed to shaping the collective world view of the more educated classes of the West over the previous six centuries, will be discussed later in this chapter.

In moving to the unconscious aspect of the human psyche, Carl Gustav Jung's notion of the 'collective unconscious', as opposed to the personal unconscious, is pivotal. The collective unconscious is in essence the area of the mind which is responsible for recreating and analysing the various typical psychological responses of humankind to fundamental human concerns (Storr, 1983:70). According to Jung, apart from our personal or immediate consciousness and unconscious, we have 'a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals' (Jung, 1981:43). For Jung, 'this collective unconscious does not develop individually but is inherited. It consists of pre-existent forms, the archetypes which can only become conscious secondarily and which give definite form to certain psychic contents' (Jung, 1981:43).

According to Jung, this second psychic system of 'a collective, universal, and impersonal nature' is revealed through what he calls 'archetypes' or 'primordial images', which are in fact structures in the mind. According to Jung, archetypes are merely 'innate possibilities of ideas' (Jung, 1966:65), and they are identified by means of their corresponding archetypal images, which occur and re-occur due to 'a readiness to produce over and over again the same mythical ideas' (Storr, 1983:70). Archetypes may further be defined as constituting 'a predisposition to create significant myths out of the common stuff of day-to-day human experience' (Storr, 1973:40).

For Jung, archetypal images (or images produced by the archetypes) could manifest themselves as events (such as birth, marriage, initiation, and death), figures (such as the wise old man, the loving mother or father, the devil, and the hero), and motifs (such as the apocalypse, the big bang, and the deluge) (Storr, 1983:70). Jung is of the opinion that these recurrent events, figures and motives or themes are all part of humankind's

collective unconscious, meaning that the same archetypal images will emerge, albeit in superficially different guises, in different countries, among different cultures, and in different eras without the different role-players being aware of each other or each other's history and culture (Storr, 1983:70). Ultimately, archetypes and their images are components of myth and help to convey its meaning. At this stage it is important to note that Jung's sense of the archetype is purely psychological. The literary aspect of the archetype as delineated by the myth critic, Northrop Frye, will be discussed at a later stage.

For Jung, the fundamental human desire is to achieve individuation, which according to him is essentially self-fulfilment from a psychic point of view, or psychic wholeness (Storr, 1973:40). The process of achieving individuation is the central concept in Jung's psychology and is essentially a process that firstly takes place in the second half of life (from which we know the term 'midlife crisis'), secondly is esoteric and engages only a select few, and thirdly results in the fullest possible consciousness for an individual – a consciousness that is detached from the world (Storr, 1973:75-76 and 81). The concept of individuation can be traced back to the archetypal quest myth, and Jung himself admits in his autobiography *Memories, Dreams and Reflections* (1963:208) that he saw his own search for psychic wholeness as a quest.

Despite the fact that Joseph Campbell (1972:19) views the figure of the hero as exclusively male, he usefully demonstrates that the quest myth provides a continuous metaphor for humanity's psychological yearning for spiritual fulfilment. The quest myth sees the hero journey to an other-worldly realm, often depicted as some kind of Hades, in which he is destined to confront and vanquish all the nemeses this other-worldly realm pits against him (Leeming, 1981:118). The hero's struggles on his quest myth may be likened to the individual's struggle with his ego. Only once the hero has managed to suppress and surpass his narcissistic nature is he able to recognise and appreciate the harmony in the cosmos. However, the hero must often return to his previous life and manner of existence and this process is often seen as a rebirth (Campbell, 1972:40).

Despite the fact that Carl Jung and Sigmund Freud's psychological ideas are very different, they are not entirely incompatible. Furthermore, like Jung, Freud has his own version of the collective unconscious and rebirth. According to Freud, a child's mother is his first love object (Wollheim, 1971:117). However, in 'falling in love' with his mother, the child becomes a rival to his father in the quest for his mother's affections and as the child wants his mother exclusively to himself, it brings him into direct conflict with his father (Wollheim, 1971:118). Because of the child's desire for his mother and the resultant hostility from the father, the child feels threatened by the father. The hostility experienced by the child is manifested in an even greater antagonism of the child towards the father. The hostility towards the child could manifest itself in the fear of castration (Wollheim, 1971:119-121). This phenomenon of the child trying to 'conquer' the parent was posited by Freud as the 'Oedipal complex' (Wollheim, 1971:117-121). If the child succeeds in 'conquering' the father, he achieves a 'rebirth' to a consciousness no longer dominated by neurosis.

Due to the fact that Freud and Jung's psychological ideas are not entirely incompatible, the Freudian concept of the Oedipal complex may be seen as a symbolic expression of the psyche's need to achieve control over itself, and can therefore be seen as a part of the Jungian quest for individuation: the self's fundamental urge to transcend its present situation. Both the urge for individuation and the struggle between father and son can be seen as archetypal processes or narratives as they were produced by the archetypal structures of the mind.

In moving to the literary sphere of the archetype, Northrop Frye maintains that literature arose out of myth and as such is irrevocably intertwined in myth (Frye, 1963:21). Frye also sees myths as providing the foundation or archetypes on which literary works are built, irrespective of the structure, characters, themes, or situations portrayed (Frye, 1957:136). For Frye, an archetype is 'a symbol, usually an image, which recurs often enough in literature to be recognizable as an element of one's literary experience as a whole' and 'the myth *is* the archetype [Frye's emphasis]' (Frye, 1963:15 and 365). As a result, the study of archetypal patterns and structures that are found in myth will reveal

certain aspects of the nature and structure of literature itself. Literary archetypes may also be seen as a 'vehicle' which helps to convey meaning (Frye, 1957:136). Ultimately, myth is the overarching archetypal narrative which contains the archetypal images, situations, and characters.

Frye's view concerning literature and archetypes is shared by Maud Bodkin, who asserts that 'literature is a reconstructed mythology, with its structural principles derived from those of myth' (Bodkin, 1957:44). Myth is thus the dramatic form of archetypal patterns (Roberts, 1997:1). It may analogously be argued that mythology, as the archetypal narrative within which the archetypes are contained, is the clay with which certain kinds of literature are shaped; or that it remains the fundamental ingredient in a variety of different literary configurations. In this recurrence of the same themes, characters, narratives, and structures in the original mythology concerning the *Titanomachia*, Keats's *Hyperion* poems, and Simmons's *Hyperion* novels, we find evidence of the archetypes. In other words, although tangential points between Keats's and Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* will be duly mentioned, the interest of this dissertation lies within how and why both Keats and Simmons deviate from the original Classical Hyperion myth, and how they differently represent the archetypes that are presented by Hesiod.

As a result, this dissertation may be classified as myth criticism because the displacement of the literary archetypes in the selected pieces of literature will be investigated, and myth criticism is centrally concerned with literary works that embody the recurrent literary archetypes (Frye, 1957:111-112). Myth criticism is predominantly occupied with the symbolism or parallels that appear to connect the narrative and its themes, processes, characters, and events to ancient myths (Frye, 1957:99). Furthermore, in myth criticism, literary archetypes 'play an essential role in refashioning the material universe into an alternative verbal universe that is humanly intelligible and viable, because it is adapted to essential human needs and concerns' (Abrams, 1993:224-225). Thus, myth criticism and literary archetypes are employed to explore essentially human problems and desires.

The task of the myth critic can be seen as firstly to identify a mythical pattern in the structure of the piece of literature being examined, and secondly to show that this pattern forms a coherent and significant whole within the overall structure of the work (Herd, 1996:175). Consequently, it is necessary to identify and interpret the effect that myth has on the chosen pieces of literature, or, as Paul Wiebe puts it, to explain 'how the mythic structures get into literary works and what effect they have on the meaning and function of the literary works' (Wiebe, 1999:43-44).

As concerns the function of myth criticism, John Vickery asserts that:

> The question of what myth criticism is leads logically to what it can do. Foremost is the capacity it shares with all good criticism, to materially sharpen our perception of theme, structure, and character in specific works. … For not only does myth criticism deal with the microscopic meanings provided by symbol and cumulative tradition, it also is a means of coping with such extended and complex narrative patterns as the epic and the novel. Thus the truly historical role of myth criticism may lie in its endeavour to deal with all literary modes and in a manner appropriate to each.
>
> (Vickery, 1966:ix-xi)

Hence, according to Vickery, both the epic and the novel are 'extensive and complex narrative patterns' and in Keats's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* the reader is confronted with the epic, while in Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* the reader is confronted with the novel. Furthermore, if Vickery's hypothesis that 'the truly historical role of myth criticism may lie in its endeavour to deal with *all* [emphasis mine] literary modes and in a manner appropriate to each' proves correct, myth criticism may be effectively applied to deal appropriately with both the genres of epic and the science fiction novel.

In order to explain transformations of myth in literature, Northrop Frye's notion of literary displacement (as opposed to Freud's concept of psychological displacement, which is essentially the unconscious transfer of strong, unacceptable emotions from one object to another), can be usefully employed as a technique to elucidate why certain writings do not strictly conform to, or display, mythic structures (Frye, 1957:136). Frye's notion of displacement relates to the existing inclination in literature to move

progressively away from myth towards a more plausible form of expression (Frye, 1957:136). Thus, displacement pertains to the 'adaptations of myth to the canons of morality or plausibility' and that 'the presence of a mythical structure in realistic fiction, however, poses certain technical problems in making it plausible, and the devices used in solving these problems may be given the general name of displacement' (Frye, 1957:136 and 365). For Frye, displacement is used to describe rather than define the tendency of writing to progressively move away from myth towards verisimilitude or the psychological aspect of myth as the 'ur' literary expressions of the mind (Denham, 1978:17). Thus, subsequent literary treatments differ in the ways in which the myth is presented. While Frye may eschew the explicitly Jungian interpretation of the archetype, he agrees that the function which the archetypes fulfil remains the same (Denham, 1978:46). Therefore, even though the representation and the content of the archetypal images may change, the symbolical meaning of it is common.

Frye's technique of displacement is invaluable to myth criticism because myth criticism assumes that the ideas and notions that underlie our present-day consciousness are derived from mythological thought and the stories presented in mythology focus on the fundamental issues of existence (Cotterell, 1996:6). Consequently, the strength of Greek Classical mythology lies in its collective nature (Cotterell, 1996:10). However, there was never a single, absolute and correct version of any myth because there was no text (such as the Bible[2]) with complete authority over an official version of a myth (Powell, 2002:75). As a result, there are various different versions of the same myth, similar in narrative but subtly different in its variances in recounting the flow of events. Griffin adds that in order 'For a story to be mythical it is necessary for it to be in some sense common property, not the pure invention of one writer; and it should have a sort of simplicity, of a kind easy to illustrate but difficult to define' (Griffin, 1986:12). For example, the battle of the *Titanomachia*, as part of Hesiod's *Theogony* (circa 700 BC), was sparked by the simple act of Zeus demanding his birthright of becoming heir to the throne (Hesiod, 1983:57).

In moving to how myth was presented in Classical Greece, it should be remembered that the theatrical audience in the Greek Classical period was already familiar with the myths presented by the playwrights such as Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides (even if the latter often used myths ironically), who themselves derived their representations of the myths from earlier sources such as Hesiod and Homer (Cotterell, 1996:10). Writers like Hesiod and Homer essentially stabilised mythologies to which subsequent writers are able to refer. Thus the works of Hesiod and Homer form the primary texts because they help to consolidate myth. Hesiod's representation of the myth of the *Titanomachia* has been selected for the purposes of this dissertation because he was the first author to stabilise the myth by writing it down and his *Theogony*, in which the *Titanomachia* is contained, was the source of Keats's *Hyperion* (Shackford, 1925:53).

A further point worth emphasising is that, merely because a piece of writing is a Classical work, this does not mean that it does not contain literary allusions as even Virgil's *Æneid* alludes to Homer's older *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (Baldick, 2008:111). However, for theatregoers in Classical Greece, the interest was not in the actual myth or story that was playing out in front of them (because they were already familiar with the narrative and characters), but rather how the dramatist approached and displaced the familiar themes, motifs, and characters (Cotterell, 1996:10). Similarly, the interest of this dissertation does not lie narrowly in the exact plots or narratives of the myths, for both Keats and Simmons have clearly moulded their writings on the narrative of the *Titanomachia*, but rather on how the recurrent themes, motifs, and characters of the myths are displaced.

Moreover, following Jung's line of argument, myths are not confined to Classical antiquity for they form an integral part of the modern or contemporary unconscious, either consciously or unconsciously (Ziolkowski, 2000:6). Myths have also coloured our imaginations to a considerable extent, and if one can understand the origins and transformations of these myths one would be able to grasp something essential about ourselves (Ziolkowski, 2000:6). In other words, if one is able to lay bare the very foundation on which these myths have been constructed, one would gain indisputable

insight into humankind's collective frame of reference, or more accurately, its collective unconscious. Thus, similar to the previously mentioned primary and secondary structures of literary works in which allusions and literary references occur, myth itself also has a primary and a secondary function (Baldick, 2008:217).

The primary function of myth is to explain the origin of our physical world; where human beings come from; the source of beauty and goodness, evil and sin, and so forth (Morford and Lenardon, 2003:5). Such myths are called 'divine myths' and they 'served a function in ancient cultures analogous to that of theoretical science in our own' (Powell, 2002:85). Myths were used to explain the origin of human economic and social structures, such as the cycle of the season, the growing of crops, and the making of wine (Powell, 2002:85). Hesiod's 1,000-line poem, the *Theogony*, is an example of a divine or creational myth in Ancient Greece as it states how the world as it is known today came into being (Powell, 2002: 86). It provides a narrative of how the gods managed to order the cosmos according to their preferences and it details the accounts of the *Titanomachia* and the *Gigantomachia*. As a source of mythology, Hesiod's *Theogony* reveals and symbolises man's desire to order and communicate reality as a whole (Sandywell, 1996:28). More broadly put, in mythology, one finds humanity's verbalisation of how it is ordering the universe according to its present knowledge and comprehension of the world. It is thus asserted that the ordering or making sense of the world is the primary and pivotal function of myth.

The secondary or symbolic function of myth means that myth is seen to stand for or represent something else, but the idea that is being represented is also usually conventionally associated with what is being represented (Baldick, 2008:327). Baldick (2008:217) adds that the secondary function or meaning of myth is to 'express collective attitudes to fundamental matters of life, death, divinity, and existence (sometimes deemed to be universal)' and that this secondary function and meaning assigned to myth prevails in most literary contexts. This secondary function of myth is also 'a superior intuitive mode of cosmic understanding' (Baldick, 2008:217). Patricia Warrick (1978:3) agrees with this point of view and believes that 'Myths, like dreams, are physically real,

and myths might be called the collective dreams of mankind [sic]'. Thus mythology, considered in its broader context of being representative of a body of individual myths, echoes the collective view of the society of which it is representative.

It has thus been established that while the literary archetypes reveal the contents of the collective unconscious, myth is used to express the collective consciousness by virtue of being the means through which the collective *weltanschauung* of any given society is expressed. As a result, the displacement of myth would necessarily imply changes in the *weltanschauung* of the society in which the myths are used. Whilst the focus of this dissertation is not to make narrowly definitive statements about the epistemology or *weltanschauung* of the Classical period, Keats's age, or our contemporary period, the displacement of the archetypes in the different treatments of the Hyperion myth will reveal a shift in the collective *weltanschauung* of the more educated classes of the West, which is part of the scope of this dissertation. Consequently, in order to ascertain how the archetypes have been displaced, the *weltanschauung* of Ancient Greece and that of the Romantics, as well as the factors that contributed to their respective world views, at least need to be briefly considered so that the shift in the collective *weltanschauung* may be traced.

Because Classical myths provide modern readers with excellent insight into the world view of the ancient Greeks, it is beneficial to study them in their historical context. The end of the Mycenaean Age (circa 1600-1200 BC) heralded the start of the Greek Dark Ages (circa 1200-800 BC). Seen in its historical context, 'Ancient Greece' is the overarching name given to the period of Greek history lasting from the period immediately succeeding the Greek Dark Ages, that is the Archaic period (circa 800-510 BC), to the Roman conquest of Greece after the Battle of Corinth in 146 BC (Green, 2007:xii). More broadly stated, Ancient Greece is used to collectively denote three periods, namely the Archaic period (circa 800-510 BC), Classical Greece (circa 510-323 BC), and the Hellenistic period[3] (323-146 BC) (Green, 2007:xiii).

Due to the fact that this dissertation is concerned with Classical Greek myth, the Classical Greek period (circa 510-323 BC) will specifically be focussed on. The inception of the Classical Greek period is signified by the fall of the last Athenian tyrant, Hippias, who was overthrown by the Athenians in 510 BC, while the end of the period is signified by the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BC (Powell, 2002:57). Within the Classical Greek period falls the Athenian Golden Age, also called the Golden Age of Pericles, which lasted from the end of the Persian Wars in 448 BC to the death of Pericles in 429 BC (Tracy, 2009:1-2). The greater majority of the influential Greek writers in specifically artistic literature, such as Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, lived during this time (Powell, 2002:58).

Because Classical Greek mythology unfolds as a phase in the development of the world and of humans (Dowden, 1992:11), myth was used in Ancient Greece to explain and rationalise the world (Powell, 2002:58). One way in which myth was used to rationalise the world was by means of the assignment of human qualities to natural forces. Even though modern science in its materialism rejects such notions as an anthropomorphism of the cosmos, they still have a wide appeal as we still speak of Mother Nature (Gaia) and Father Time (Cronus) (Powell, 2002:61).

As the ancient Greeks were an advanced and civilised race, they did not simply rely purely on myth: they had documented archives, four-storey buildings with sanitised plumbing, a standardised system of weights and measures, the game of chess, registered trademarks, doors with locks, and a functional calendar broken down into seven-day weeks, twenty-eight-day months, and 364-day years (Graves, 1992:21-22). Furthermore, during Plato's time (circa 428-348 BC), there was already an inclination towards a more scientific world view (Cotterell, 1996:10). The foundation of our contemporary biological classification methodology was essentially laid by Aristotle (circa 384-322 BC) (Mayr, 1982:201-202). His classification is significant because it is the first documented attempt to order humankind's knowledge of all the living creatures that populate the earth. Furthermore, the astronomer Aristarchus (circa 310-230 BC) presented the first heliocentric model of the world in approximately 290 BC (Draper,

2007:172), while around 250 BC, the astronomer Eratosthenes (circa 276-195 BC) accurately calculated the circumference of the earth and thus proved that the earth is round and not flat (Roller, 2010:2). Similarly, Epicurus (341-270 BC) and Archytas (428-347 BC) argued that the universe must be infinite and not finite as Aristotle suggested (von Fritz, 1970:231-233).

The theories of Aristarchus, Eratosthenes, Epicurus, and Archytas tended to be eschewed by the general public in favour of the more popular geocentric and finite views of the universe held by Aristotle and Ptolemy (Draper, 2007:173 and Matthen and Hankinson, 1993:417). Therefore, despite the fact that some of the more progressive astronomers and philosophers were inclined to view the world as round and heliocentric during the Classical Greek period, the most commonly held view of the ancient Greeks was still that the world was flat, the sun revolved around the earth, the earth was the centre of the cosmos, and the universe was finite (Bienkowska, 1973:12-13).

Essentially, the ancient Greek world view amongst the educated classes, at least, relied heavily on Plato's philosophy of the 'world of ideas' and the consignment of a deeper reality to existence (Cotterell, 1996:10). In his *Republic* (circa 380 BC), Plato distinguishes between the physical world, which represents 'mutable copies of timeless universals, called Forms or Ideas', and the transcendental world of forms or ideas (Leitch *et al*, 2001:33). Therefore, a term which has come to be intimately associated with Plato is his adaptation of the word *mimēsis*, or imitation or representation. For Plato, all art (and Plato includes poetry under art) is merely a copy of what is already present in nature in one way or another. Therefore poetry is 'merely a copy of a copy, leading away from the truth rather than toward it' and thus, for Plato, poetry is a third remove from reality (Leitch *et al*, 2001:33).

Plato was also the first person to use the word 'mythologia', which he derived from the Greek word *muthos*, literally meaning 'a false account' (Powell, 2002:1-2), and he used this term to distinguish between imaginative accounts of divine events and factual descriptions of events (Cotterell, 1996:10). In his *Republic*, Plato severely criticised the

mythological heritage of Ancient Greece and he would have banned the poets and their mythical tales as he thought that the fictional and ungrounded stories of Homer and the other poets had a distorting effect on the uneducated Greeks in particular, specifically because they represented to the untutored mind a false sense of reality (Powell, 2002:18).

Plato's sense of poetry is, however, not monolithic: in his *Phaedrus* (circa 370 BC), Plato argues that divine madness is a gift from the gods which allows the poet to temporarily perceive the transcendental world of ideas (*Phaedrus*, 244a). For Plato, the poet is a divine madman and, in his mad state, he may sometimes transcend the mundane physical world and reveal the world of ideas through his poetry (*Phaedrus*, 244a). Thus, while the more progressive philosophers and physicists in Ancient Greece were inclined to a more scientific world view, the prominence of myth and its expression through poetry could still be highly regarded by society at large due to Plato's influence.

In moving to the world view of the English Romantic period – the age of Keats – it may be noted that an important aspect of the Romantic period is the desire to compensate for the overly scientific rationalism of the Age of Enlightenment, the Scientific Revolution, and the Industrial Revolution (Baldick, 2008:294). The reason for this 'rebellion' against the scientific method is that the Romantics saw it as impersonal, artificial, and mechanical (Baldick, 2008:294). While it is difficult to define the exact dates of the Enlightenment,[4] the Industrial Revolution had its inception in the numerous groundbreaking theories of scientists, physicists, astronomers, and evolutionists such as Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), Isaac Newton (1643-1727), Carl von Linné (1707-1778), Georges Buffon (1707-1788) and the proto-Darwinian theories of Charles Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802) (Hampson, 1968:23). Nicolaus Copernicus's *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres* (1543) and Andreas Vesalius's *On the Fabric of the Human Body* (1543) are widely regarded as the instigating forces behind the Scientific Revolution (Harman, 1983:4). Furthermore:

> The Scientific Revolution is the term traditionally used to describe the spectacular intellectual triumphs of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European astronomy and physical science. By around 1700 educated men conceived the universe as a

> mechanical structure like a clock, the earth was regarded as a planet revolving round the sun [thanks to Copernicus], and the mysteries of nature were supposed to be open to investigation by means of experimentation and mathematical analysis.
>
> (Harman, 1983:1)

The Scientific Revolution was also instrumental in the adoption of scientific knowledge by popular consciousness and it advocated highly controversial ideas, such as that the sun, and not the earth, is at the centre of the solar system, and that all matter was not merely made up of Water, Fire, Earth, Air, and Aether as Aristotelian theory suggested (Harman, 1983:4-6).

Two of the most important theories of the Scientific Revolution were the theories of Nicolaus Copernicus and Isaac Newton. The heliocentric theory of Copernicus replaced the Aristotelian astronomical theories, which proclaimed that the world was built in concentric spheres that carried the Sun and planets in one eternal and perfect circular motion around the Earth, which rested immovably in the centre of the universe (Bienkowska, 1973:13). With the publication of his *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres* (1543), Copernicus proved that the sun was the centre of the universe and he provided rational, physical explanations for natural phenomena such as the passing of day into night (as a result of the earth turning around its own axis every twenty-four hours) and the changing of the tides (the moon is closer to the earth at certain points during its monthly orbit of the earth, creating the ebb and flow tides of the ocean) (Bienkowska, 1973:14). For his part, Newton's *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (1686) theorised that man was part of an ordered system within the universe and that the universe itself was governed by recognisable laws (Coombs, 1978:81). Newton regarded the cosmos or universe as unbounded and infinitely large and his laws of motion are generally regarded as a formulative moment in the Scientific Revolution (Coombs, 1978:81). Newton's theories essentially advocated a mechanistic world view, according to which everything can be explained by physical causes.

Furthermore, as regards the biological sciences, two pieces of writing that were published during the eighteenth century essentially lay the foundation for Charles Darwin's theory

of evolution: in his *Systema Naturae* (1767), Carl von Linné catalogued all the living creatures into a single system (called the 'Linnean classification system') that defined their morphological relations to one another (Anderson, 1997:62-63), while Georges Buffon's thirty-six volume *Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière* (1749-1788) included everything that humankind knew about the natural world up until that date (Fellows and Milliken, 1972:149).[5] Georges Buffon is also cited as the 'father of evolutionism' and as such can be seen as a precursor to the work of Charles Darwin (Mayr, 1981:330). Moreover, in 1780, Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, formed a society in order to translate the works of Carl von Linné into English, which also helped to consolidate the proto-Darwinian theories of the late eighteenth century (Schultz and Schultz, 2008:146).[6] Thus, the Romantic world view was influenced by several significant revelations about the natural world and humankind's subsequent conceptions about perceiving and ordering it. As a result, writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such as John Keats, can posit very different views of myth than did ancient writers such as Hesiod.

After Keats's death, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw various other scientific theories which would influence the world view of modern-day man. Perhaps the single most influential piece of writing of the nineteenth century was Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859). In his controversial research, Darwin challenged the generally accepted world view that species were immutable and he held that each species was adapted almost perfectly to their natural surroundings by means of a process which he called 'the process of natural selection' (Waters, 2003:116). According to Darwin's process of natural selection, nature would weed out the unnecessary traits of any given species over time, resulting in a species that is near-perfectly adapted to its surroundings (Waters, 2003:117). When Darwin published this highly controversial research, people in his native England were outraged that he could even suggest a theory that all life forms had evolved from common ancestors (Waters, 2003:119). Darwin did not imply that all species are related because of one common ancestor, but he did believe that all animals descended from four of five common ancestral species and that all plants descended from four common ancestors (Waters, 2003:118-119). As a result, Darwin presented mid-

nineteenth century man with the question not of where humankind is heading, but where it came from. Darwin's theory of evolution essentially advocates new materialism because it displaces God and therefore displaces man. This decentralisation of God and of man resulted in the certainty of the mechanistic world view of Newton being displaced by Darwin's decentralised world view.

In contrast to Darwin's evolutionary theory, which deals with humanity's past, Albert Einstein's special theory of relativity (1905) and his general theory of relativity (1915) adumbrate future possibilities (Rindler, 1977:7). In his special theory of relativity, Einstein formulated the most famous equation of the twentieth century: $E = mc^2$ (Hawking, 2001:2). This equation held that tiny amounts of mass could be converted into huge amounts of energy and was essentially the forerunner to the development of nuclear power (Einstein, 1905:639-641). Later, in 1929, Edwin Hubble established that the universe is continuously expanding (Hubble, 1936:1-12). Furthermore, in the twentieth century, two world wars, holocausts, the failure of the imperial endeavour and the possible extinction of the earth itself have meant that writers of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, such as Dan Simmons, can posit very different views of myth than did ancient writers, such as Hesiod, or Romantic poets, such as John Keats. Knowledge that the universe is continuously expanding and Einstein's verified theories of a connected cosmos, where all particles are attracted to each other to greater or lesser degrees, greatly contributed to the fact that the educated Western classes of the twenty-first century have a more relativistic world view or *weltanschauung*. This relativistic world view is epitomised by Jacques Derrida's post-structuralist argument that there are no references to absolutes, implying that nothing is absolutely certain (Derrida, 1972:248). The rigidity of old 'certainties' has been replaced by the inclination to only believe what can be scientifically proven as fact. It is therefore evident that humankind's mythological world view has evolved through the respective mechanistic and decentralised world views of Newton and Darwin to a more scientific, relativistic world view.

Ultimately, the aim of this dissertation is to register transformations of cultural values by studying the expression of literary archetypes in the Classical, Romantic, and contemporary periods, as exemplified by the works of Keats and especially Simmons. The manner in which the culture of the educated classes of the West has changed over the past two centuries as a result of the revolutionary theories described above has naturally altered the use of Classical mythology in literature. This fundamental shift in world view expresses, as will be argued throughout this dissertation, a shift in the collective consciousness. The manner in which this shift in the collective consciousness will be traced is by studying the means by which myth migrates from text to text, that is from Hesiod's Hyperion myth to Keats's *Hyperion* (1818) and *The Fall of Hyperion* (1819), to Simmons's *Hyperion* (1989) and *The Fall of Hyperion* (1990).

In addition to exploring the significance of the Classical allusions and intertextual references by investigating how the archetypes are displaced in the selected literary works, this dissertation furthermore, as a by-product, aims to show that science fiction is the contemporary form of mythology, or rather that science fiction has come to form a new mythology. The mythic structure lingers on in myth, but is displaced by scientific expression. Thus, although the structure of myth essentially remains the same, it is more scientifically expressed.

This view is shared by Claude Lévi-Strauss, for whom myth is not purely a general account about the origin of the world: it is more a deep-seated, elemental classification of the human mind – a classification to which sound and coherent thinking corresponds and which was termed as 'mythic thought' by Lévi-Strauss (Dubuisson, 1993:119). Mythic thought is essentially an early and primitive kind of human thought which later evolved into a more logical and rational thought process for humankind. If, according to Lévi-Strauss, mythic thought is an earlier stage of thought, it must most assuredly have evolved since its conjectural inception. It is thus posited that Lévi-Strauss's 'mythic thought' has evolved into 'scientific thought' as a result of the various scientific theories and technological advancements that have been made, particularly over the past four centuries.

Myth has been sufficiently discussed earlier and thus the focus will now shift to the genre of science fiction. The definition of science fiction is one of the most widely-contested definitions of recent times. Indeed, the very term that is today known as 'science fiction' has undergone several alterations as an expression since the search for a term to define the elusive genre began. The two science fiction pioneers most frequently cited as the fathers of science fiction, Jules Verne and Herbert George Wells (Roberts, 2000:48), initially called the genre as '*voyages extraordinaires*' and 'scientific romance' respectively (Gunn, 2005:vii). Two of science fiction's greatest pioneers and most influential science fiction writers of the twentieth century, Robert Heinlein and Hugo Gernsback, respectively preferred 'speculative fiction' and 'scientifiction' before Gernsback eventually coined the term 'science fiction' in 1926 (Gunn, 2005:ix).

The most relevant definition can be derived from an amalgamation of Robert Heinlein's, Chris Baldick's, and James Gunn's respective definitions of science fiction. For Robert Heinlein (Heinlein, Kornbluth, Bester, and Bloch, 1959:11), science fiction is the 'Realistic speculation about possible future events, based solidly on adequate knowledge of the real world, past and present, and on a thorough understanding of the nature and significance of the scientific method'. Chris Baldick (2008:301) believes that science fiction suggests a hybrid form and 'its statements are normally based either on a possible scientific advance, or on a natural or social change, or on a suspicion that the world is not as it is commonly represented. … [science fiction] challenges readers to decide whether what they are reading are within the bounds of possible'. James Gunn (2005:x) describes science fiction as 'the literature of change' and further asserts that the various definitions of science fiction can be ascribed to the fact that the definitions are merely 'snapshots' of what science fiction looked like *at that specific moment* [Gunn's emphasis] in time. Gunn (2005:5 and 8) adds that science fiction is 'a fantastic event of development considered rationally', and that science fiction may also be seen as the literature of ideas and the literature of anticipation.

Science fiction, perhaps more than other genres, will always be the 'literature of change' because as technology edges closer and closer to what science fiction writing 'predicts'

today, science fiction writers will come up with new ideas and concepts which could only be made possible by the technology of tomorrow. The combined definition provided above will suffice for the purposes of this dissertation because yesterday's 'fantastic event of development considered rationally' is today's ordinary occurrence and consequently the assertion that assigning a single, fixed definition to science fiction is impossible – it is merely possible, to use James Gunn's term, to provide a 'snapshot' of how science fiction looked like at a specific moment in time (Gunn, 2005:x). Thus the most accurate description of science fiction may be phrased as an anticipatory and hybrid genre that realistically and plausibly speculates about the development of fantastical future events, based on a solid understanding of the world and of science.

In moving to the mythological roots of science fiction, Adam Roberts is of the following opinion:

> All surviving Ancient novels involve fantastic elements to one degree or another; and the task of the historian of science fiction is to sketch the fluid borders where SF can usefully be contradistinguished from a more supernatural fantastic. Ancient authors were comfortable with the literary idioms of what today we would call 'fantasy', 'magic realism', 'satire' and even, in a sense, surrealism. … Another vital feature is the trope of odyssey, or *voyage extraordinaire*, which has occupied so central a place in discourses of science fiction, and which finds its origin in Ancient Greek literature. From Homer's *Odyssey* (seventh century BC), through epics, plays, histories, dialogues and later prose romances, Greek culture produced many hundreds of examples of fantastic voyages. Some of these were travellers' tales, based on actual or augmented experience (as, for example, voyages to Africa, India, or over the Atlantic); some were purely fantastical and imaginative (journeys to the lands of the dead or to the heavens). Some 'liberal' critics of SF are content to classify all such *voyages extraordinaires* as early examples of the genre. A more common strategy is to concentrate critical attention on a small group of these narratives which detail journeys into the atmosphere, or journeys to the Moon and solar system.
>
> (Roberts, 2006:22)

It is evident that the popular science fictional narrative of the *voyage extraordinaire* or the extraordinary voyage is none other than the archetypal narrative of the quest myth discussed earlier. Like its mythological predecessors, science fiction employs the quest myth as a prominent theme. Indeed, the quest myth is arguably the most popular theme in science fiction and the fact that it is derived from the Classical structure indicates that the origins of science fiction may be traced back to Ancient Greece.

As far as the approximate date of inception of the science fiction genre is concerned, an answer that will satisfy everyone is highly improbable. Roberts (2006:27) believes that the early Greek writer, Lucian Samosata (after his birthplace, Samos), can be credited with being the first author of science fiction in circa 160 AD. Roberts (2006:28) adds that Lucian is also the Classical author most frequently cited as 'a father of science fiction' and that he wrote two novels between 160 and 180 AD that turned out to be hugely significant for science fiction, namely *Ikaromenippos* (circa 160 AD) and *Alēthēs Historia* (circa 180 AD). *Ikaromenippos* is based on the myth of Icarus and relates how Lucian's character, Menippos, attaches the wings of an eagle and a vulture to his arms and flies to the moon and up to heaven itself to consult Zeus. Lucian's *Alēthēs Historia* details an eventful sea voyage where the crew of the ship comes across 'Vine Women' (women whose upper bodies resembled those of a woman's, but the lower parts were rooted vine trunks). The crew also made a journey to the moon where they were captured by soldiers on three-headed flying horse-vultures (Roberts, 2006:27).

Lucian's writings may not exactly conform to the definition of science fiction as it is constructed today, but the fact that he employs science fictional elements such as interplanetary or space travel, a method of travelling by air (albeit implausible), and creatures that are half man and half animal or half plant indicates that his writings may be seen as one of the primary sources of science fiction. However, irrespective of the evidence substantiating the claim that Lucian's *Ikaromenippos* and *Alēthēs Historia* may be classified as primitive science fiction, Roberts cautions against the outright classification of Lucian's works as science fiction because Lucian intended it to be implausible almost to the point of being satirical (Roberts, 2006:28).

Even though the roots of science fiction, or proto-science fiction, may be traced back to the ancient Greek era, the genre fell into disuse for approximately 1,100 years from the beginning of the Early Middle Ages, also called the Dark Ages,[7] in Western Europe (circa 500-1000 AD), through the High Middle Ages (circa 1000-1300), until the end of the Renaissance (circa 1300-1600) (Roberts, 2006:30). The reason that Roberts (2006:33-34) gives for the genre being neglected for so long, before being reignited by works such

as Giordano Bruno's *On the Infinite Universe and Worlds* (1584), John Wilkins's *Discovery of a World in the Moone* (1638), and Francis Godwin's *The Man in the Moon* (1638), is that the increasing dominance of Christianity in the West since Constantine the Great (Constantine I) signed the Edict of Milan[8] in 313 AD meant that the literature written during this time reflected the more sacramental collective consciousness. However, while some critics see the inception of science fiction starting with Lucian's writings, other critics see the inception of the genre as late as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), while yet others maintain that the works of Edgar Allan Poe sparked the genre in the 1830s (Alkon, 2002:1). Still others see Jules Verne's *A Journey to the Centre of the Earth* (1864), *From the Earth to the Moon* (1865), and *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* (1869) as the start of the genre, while HG Wells's *The Time Machine* (1895), his *The War of the Worlds* (1898), and Hugo Gernsback's *Amazing Stories* (a magazine launched in 1926) are the most modern contenders claiming to be science fiction's instigating force (James, 1994:9).

The inception of the science fiction genre is not one of the central concerns of this dissertation, but the disagreement as to when the genre began reinforces its status as a hybrid genre. As concerns modern impressions of proto-science fictional writings, it would evidently not be very hard for the modern reader to 'imagine' space travel (as in Lucian's writings), or a cyborg (essentially a human being with certain parts of his or her body having been replaced with mechanical components). The simple reason for this is that, owing to the scientific revolution, within the frame of reference of the modern reader, he or she knows that space travel is most certainly possible (as successful expeditions have been sent to the moon and Mars), and that robotics can be used to provide disabled people with fully-functional limbs (Fischman, 2010:35). However, without the knowledge of modern technological and scientific advances, it is evident that it would be much harder for a Classical Greek reader to comprehend interplanetary travel or for a nineteenth-century reader to believe the plausibility of Shelley's monster.

Therefore, due to the advances made in the field of cloning and robotics, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* will seem much more plausible to the modern reader than to the nineteenth-

century reader. The snapshot taken of science fiction in the nineteenth century, during which Shelley's *Frankenstein* was produced, would have been seen as more of a piece of science fiction (had they known the term) to the nineteenth-century reader than to the modern reader. The reason for this is that, due to the technological advances known to the modern reader, a created or constructed being would not seem particularly implausible. The same applies to modern snapshots of science fiction: the current or contemporary snapshot of science fiction will also be outdated in comparison to the science fiction of a century or two from now because, for example, in the next hundred or two hundred years it is, if not likely, certainly plausible that humankind will have invented the technology to make large-scale interplanetary travel possible, and have produced items unimaginable now.

As can be deduced from the various definitions and the prolonged yet unfinished evolution of the science fiction genre, it is evident that a substantial amount of liquidity is to be found in the genre. Science fiction's liquidity may be attributed to the fact that the genre is, to a large extent, dependent on the scientific prowess of the age. The result is that science fiction evolves more or less in tune with scientific and technological advancements and therefore it still retains its variableness. This view is shared by Bruce Franklin, according to whom science fiction is intrinsically linked to:

> … the rise of modern science and technology, growing with these forces, reflecting and expressing them, evaluating them, and relating them meaningfully to the rest of human existence. Because industrial society emerged first in Great Britain, Europe, and the United States, written science fiction has been until very recently purely a 'Western' literacy form, that is, one practiced exclusively by white Europeans and their American descendants, and one utilising the literary and other cultural conventions of these people.
>
> (Franklin, 1995:1)

In moving to how science fiction has come to form a new mythology, Jasper Griffin (1986:12) argues that it may be conjectured that the great vogue for fantasy novels is intimately connected with the apparent absence from a direct expression of myth, which is characteristic of so much modern verse: that gap had to be filled somehow. Thus,

Griffin argues, science fiction is simply myth in scientific guise. Griffin's view is shared by James Beichler, who argues that:

> Science, as an expression of the human perception of nature, is evolving in tandem with the evolving human consciousness. When seen in this context, the notion that modern mythologies are harbingers of a new Scientific Revolution that will change science from its present basis of objective reductionism to a more subjective basis becomes all the more believable.
>
> (Beichler, 2007:155)

As a result, Beichler believes, modern-day mythologies (that is science fiction) 'are metaphors for the continuing evolution of human consciousness' and they 'demonstrate our growing subconscious awareness and perception of our own evolving consciousness' (Beichler, 2007:155). Therefore science fiction, as the literature of change, would seem the natural medium through which the human consciousness is expressed. Beichler further argues that science fiction may be likened to mythology insofar as both explore humankind's deepest emotional and ethical questions, and that science fiction plays the same role in modern culture that traditional mythologies played in older cultures (Beichler, 2007:127). Beichler also maintains that:

> … science explores physical reality and human nature by utilizing reason, establishing a logical and scientific worldview consisting of specific paradigms and beliefs of how physical reality functions with respect to human conscious perception. When science bends the rules of nature it is testing possible alternate or future courses of science and examining how humans might logically interact under different scientific paradigms and worldviews.
>
> (Beichler, 2007:128)

In short, both science and myth are concerned with the articulation and portrayal of a world view. Despite the scientific inclination of the modern collective consciousness, myth still persists, but its function has been taken over by science. Essentially, science is a myth, which means that even though the literary archetypes remain the same, they are scientifically displaced.

Beichler's view concerning myth and science is shared by Claude Lévi-Strauss, who believes that myth and science are comparable because both myth and science can be

used as a means of structuring the universe (Sutton and Sutton, 1969:231). As a result, the scientist fulfils the role of primitive mythmaker as he uses scientific 'myths' to explain facts that are otherwise inexplicable by the collective knowledge of the society at the time (Morford and Lenardon, 2003:6). Thomas and Marilyn Sutton share and extrapolate this view, claiming that:

> Since both myth and science reflect man's irrepressible curiosity about his origins and his destiny, they each can be seen as a particular human means of structuring the universe. … Myth and science emphasize different aspects of the universe-structures they erect. Early myth is typically concerned with the study of origins whereas science generally focuses on the study of destiny. … Both myth and science attempt to provide an overview of existence by bridging inner reality and outer reality.
>
> (Sutton and Sutton, 1969:231-232)

Because myth and science attempt to provide an overview of existence by bridging inner and outer reality, both entities aim to order and explain the universe. Similarly, the science fiction writer can be usefully related to the mythmaker in the light of Morford and Lenardon's (2003:6) assertion that the mythmaker can be perceived as a primitive scientist: the science fiction writer is, to a certain extent, using humankind's existing collective knowledge of science, physics, technology, and the universe to make an educated guess as concerns humankind's future because science fiction looks back from the future in order to reflect on the present. Therefore, unlike a scientific hypothesis, a science fiction story is not formulated primarily to advance technological knowledge; it rather operates on a visionary, mythopoeic level (Sutton and Sutton 1969:235). Therefore the primary function of myth, namely that of ordering and explaining the universe, is also applicable to science fiction.

Furthermore, in his essay *The Roots of Science Fiction*, Robert Scholes maintains that 'new conceptual developments put fictional speculation on an entirely different footing, changing the fabric of man's vision in ways that inevitably led to changes in his fiction' (Scholes, 2005:210). Scholes further adds that this 'changing the fabric of man's vision' was started by the likes of Copernicus, Newton, and Buffon, before being continued by Darwin's theory of evolution and Einstein's theory of relativity. These influential

figures' ideas have 'led to new ways of understanding human time and space-time, as well as to a new sense of the relationship between human systems and the larger systems of the cosmos' (Scholes, 2005:210). Scholes's notion of the 'changing of man's vision' and a new sense of understanding 'the relationship between human systems and the larger systems of the cosmos' can be usefully related to the concept of world view or *weltanschauung* as discussed earlier. As a result of modern humanity's increased scientific knowledge, we have a more cosmic *weltanschauung* and consciousness because we better understand our place within the cosmos.

Because 'new conceptual developments' have 'inevitably led to changes in his [humankind's] fiction' and because it has been shown that science fiction may be read as myth in scientific guise, it may be asserted that myth has evolved to reflect humankind's more cosmic world view and scientific consciousness. However, if myth has evolved, it would imply that humankind's collective consciousness must also have evolved because myth is used to express humankind's collective consciousness. Accordingly, if the world views created by Newton and Darwin are seen in relation to the contemporary relativistic and scientific world view, it would appear as though the collective consciousness has indeed evolved. From the earlier, mythic stage of thought, the collective consciousness of the more educated classes of the West has evolved from Newton's certain, mechanistic universe, to Darwin's decentralised universe in which God, and therefore humankind, have been displaced, to the contemporary relativistic and scientific consciousness in which there are none of the old certainties.

The notion that humankind's collective consciousness is constantly changing and evolving is not my personal conjuration, but is derived from the sometimes contentious work of the French Jesuit priest, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. De Chardin is of the opinion that it is absolute imperative for us to adopt an evolutionary point of view (Huxley, 1959:12). For de Chardin, no event or action is isolated – everything is merely part of a larger process (Huxley, 1959:12-13). According to de Chardin, the universe must necessarily be viewed as part of a larger process of improving itself and attaining new levels of existence or consciousness, or, in other words, the universe must be viewed as

constantly evolving (Huxley, 1959:13). For de Chardin, the constantly evolving universe leads to the continuous evolution of humankind's consciousness because man is the epitome of evolution *at this moment in time* (Huxley, 1959:15). De Chardin consequently formulated the 'Law of Consciousness and Complexity', which according to him means that all matter has a tendency to become more complex over time, while at the same time becoming more conscious (de Chardin, 1959:300-301).

De Chardin uses his Law of Consciousness and Complexity in order to explain evolution from subatomic units to atoms, from atoms to inorganic and later organic molecules, to sub-cellular living units, to cells, to multi-cellular individuals, to cephalised metazoa with brains, to primitive man, and now to civilised societies (Huxley, 1959:15). For de Chardin, evolution happens in five distinct phases: (1) geogenesis (the beginning of the earth), (2) biogenesis (the beginning of life), (3) anthropogenesis (beginning of humanity), (4) noogenesis (the emergence of the mind), and (5) Christogenesis (the evolution of humankind up to the Omega Point) (de Chardin, 1959:181).

De Chardin coined the terms 'noogenesis', which is comprised of the Greek words 'noös' (mind) and 'genos' (birth), and 'noosphere', which is comprised of the Greek words 'noös' (mind) and 'sphaira' (sphere) (de Chardin, 1959:181). Noogenesis began with reflective thought and de Chardin believes that because human beings are self-reflective and self-conscious, they constitute a new sphere of existence, namely the sphere of thought, called the noosphere (de Chardin, 1959:181). De Chardin sees noogenesis and the noosphere as constantly evolving and, imperatively, de Chardin sees it as evolving towards a certain predetermined point in the future, which he calls the 'Omega Point' (de Chardin, 1959:257). De Chardin describes the Omega Point as 'supreme consciousness', which may be defined as the state of maximum organised complexity towards which the universe is evolving (de Chardin, 1959:258). For de Chardin, the Omega Point is essentially the 'collective human *weltanschauung*' towards which the universe is evolving (de Chardin, 1959:259). For de Chardin, 'evolution is an ascent toward consciousness' and the human condition necessarily leads to the psychic unity of humankind (de Chardin, 1959:258).

De Chardin combines both Darwinism, or the evolution of humankind as a whole, and Existentialism, which is the 'revolt, or a series of revolts, against the supposed attempt … to reduce human reality to abstract propositional terms and to embrace the individual in an absolute universal system' (Gill and Sherman, 1973:4). Like Nietzsche, de Chardin believes that man is incomplete and unfinished and must consequently be completed or surpassed at some point in humanity's future (Huxley, 1959:13). As also implied by Darwin, de Chardin's eschatological theory of the Omega Point assumes that time progresses linearly and is as such irreversible. According to de Chardin, humanity is in the fourth stage of evolution and our collective consciousness is evolving towards the fifth stage of evolution, namely that of the Omega Point (de Chardin, 1959:181). While the Omega Point may appear to be a transcendent referent, the fact that it can never be attained makes it an unstable one, and no true referent at all.

It will suffice for the present moment to note that, like de Chardin, Keats 'had grasped the principle that is the foundation of all liberal views,—the belief that there is, through all the sin and sorrow and accident of life, a determining purpose, a forward progress, a developing perfection. This advance is due to an inherent order in the universe, a cosmic harmony' (Shackford, 1925:58). However, Keats's evolutionary convictions will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter on Keats.

For the purposes of this dissertation, it is posited as a premise that de Chardin's orthogenetic evolutionary perspective and his subsequent conception of the Omega Point hold true. It is furthermore posited that after certain scientific breakthroughs, such as Newton's mechanistic laws of motion, Darwin's theory of evolution, and Einstein's theories of relativity, combined with modern notions of space travel, electricity, and advances in the field of robotics, myth has migrated to science fiction in order to reflect the relativistic and scientific collective consciousness. Myth is thus still present, but only in scientific garb. The reason for this, according to Thomas and Marilyn Sutton (1969:235), is that for early mythopoeic man, the transcendental realm was the cosmos with its gods, heroes, planets, and other inexplicable phenomena. However, in the contemporary era of scientific myth, the transcendent referent can no longer be the

cosmos, since scientific research has shown that it is empirically knowable and as a consequence it is no longer entirely transcendent.

It has thus been posited that the collective human consciousness is evolving in tandem with science. Evidence that humankind's collective consciousness is evolving in step with science can be found in the fact that no new stories are being created about the Olympian gods, King Arthur, Thor, Belissama or Rah. Nevertheless, myths about these gods are continuously displaced in a modern context by means of books, comics, movies, and theatre. From a technological point of view, displacement in modern mythmaking is crucial because the myth of William Tell (a father who shoots an apple from his son's head without hurting his son) is not as impressive as it would have been a few centuries ago – today humankind has at its disposal multi-ton missiles that can be launched several thousand kilometres and hit a target with pinpoint accuracy. As a result, mythmaking has become increasingly scientific in order to reflect humanity's scientific and technological prowess. Thus, although the archetypes remain the same, the manner in which they are expressed has been displaced because it has been contextualised and tempered with modern science.

James Beichler agrees that modern mythmaking has become increasingly scientific in order to reflect the current status of the evolving collective consciousness, adding that:

> Science, as an expression of the human perception of nature, is evolving in tandem with the evolving human consciousness. When seen in this context, the notion that modern mythologies [science fiction] are harbingers of a new Scientific Revolution
>
> that will change science from its presence basis of objective reductionism to a more subjective basis becomes all the more believable.
>
> (Beichler, 2007:155)

Accordingly, the modern mythologies (science fiction) 'demonstrate our growing subconscious awareness and perception of our own evolving consciousness' (Beichler, 2007:155). Humankind's evolving consciousness is, according to Beichler (2007:155), rapidly evolving to a higher level of consciousness, which will firstly be revealed as a 'super consciousness', before eventually evolving to reflect a cosmic consciousness.

However, this notion that humankind's collective consciousness is evolving towards a cosmic consciousness will be discussed in greater detail once the focus shifts to a discussion of the primary texts.

In concluding this chapter, a final concept meriting elucidation is the branch of philosophy that is concerned with explaining the fundamental nature of being and the world, namely metaphysics (Geisler, 1999:446). The metaphysical entity can be defined as the entity that is beyond the physical entity, and as such relates to Beichler and de Chardin's premise that humankind's collective consciousness is evolving towards a cosmic consciousness. The evolving collective consciousness is necessarily metaphysical because it transcends the personal consciousness and is representative of a more universal or cosmic consciousness. The prominent metaphysical science fiction author, Julian May, prefers the term 'metapsychic' to psychic (May, 1984:29). Like the metaphysical entity is beyond the physical entity, the metapsychic entity is beyond the psychic entity. As such, it is associated with the cosmic consciousness. However, the cosmic consciousness, the metaphysical, and the metapsychic will be discussed in greater detail when Simmons's novels are discussed in Chapter Three.

---

[1] Charles Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities* is estimated to have sold approximately 200 million copies worldwide (Ash, 2002:27).

[2] It should be noted that even the Bible contains two versions of the creation myth (Achtemeier, 1996:1280).

[3] The Hellenistic period describes the era following the conquests of Alexander the Great and as such pertains to the period from the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BC, to the final conquest of the Greek heartlands by Rome in 146 BC (Green, 2007:xiii). Greek cultural influence and power peaked during this period in Europe and Asia. It is often considered as a period of transition between the brilliance of the Greek Classical Era and the emergence of the Roman Empire (Green, 2007:xii).

[4] Although the Age of Enlightenment was influenced by many prominent figures and theories, it is difficult to assign an exact date to its actual start (Hampson, 1968:15). Like the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment may also be seen to have its origin in the theories of Copernicus (Hampson, 1968:23). However, it should be noted that the Enlightenment is a movement that spans several decades, perhaps centuries, and it is thus difficult to assign a single starting date to it (Hampson, 1968:25).

[5] There is evidence to suggest that Keats was familiar with the works of Georges Buffon as he mentions Buffon's *Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière* (1749-1788) in his letter "To George and Georgiana Keats" (Fairchild, 1949:111).

[6] In his letter "To Charles Cowden Clarke", Keats reveals that he is only too aware of the works of Erasmus Darwin as he anticipates meeting Leigh Hunt. Keats observes that 'it is no mean gratification to become acquainted with Men who in their admiration of Poetry do not jumble together Shakespeare and

Darwin' (Fairchild, 1949:111). The reference could not have been to Charles Darwin as he was only born in 1809, a mere twelve years before Keats's death in 1821.

[7] The medieval Dark Ages are not to be confused with the Greek Dark Ages (circa 1200-800 BC).

[8] The edict of Milan, signed in 313 AD, stated that Christians should be allowed to follow a faith of their choosing (Bowder, 1978:79).

Chapter II: Hesiod's *Titanomachia* and Keats's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*

> We begin our study of archetypes, then, with a world of myth, an abstract or purely literary world of fictional and thematic design, unaffected by canons of plausible adaptation to familiar experience.
>
> (Frye, 1957:136)

A commonly held opinion is that there are primary and secondary literary epics (Baldick, 2008:111). Primary epics would constitute the 'original' or traditional epics, such as Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days* (circa 700 BC), while secondary epics would include epics of which the authors have imitated the 'original' epic form and content and displaced it according to their own personal interpretations, such as Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667) (Baldick, 2008:111). In his *Paradise Lost*, Milton fuses the Judeo-Christian myth of original sin with the Classical epic form, and so his text is a displacement of the original myth. Similarly, Keats's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* can also be considered as secondary epics, as they imitate the primary, Classical epic form and scope of works such as Hesiod's *Titanomachia*, as part of his *Theogony*.

Because Hesiod was the first author to stabilise and consolidate the myth of the *Titanomachia* by writing it down, he consolidates in writing the earlier expressions of the archetypes involved. Thus, Hesiod can be viewed as presenting a standard by means of which the archetypes are expressed. This chapter will firstly focus on the original myth as related by Hesiod, followed by the myth as displaced or transformed by Keats. The expounding of the myth of the *Titanomachia* according to Hesiod and Keats respectively will in each instance be followed by an examination of how the archetypes are displaced. Furthermore, this chapter will identify certain literary archetypal motifs, processes, and situations before determining to what extent the archetypes have been differently displaced in Keats's epic poems. The archetypal motifs, processes, and situations will necessarily be present in Keats's poems by virtue of Keats explicitly structuring his epic poems according to the myth presented by Hesiod (Evert, 1965:228).

Hesiod recounts the events leading up to the battle of the *Titanomachia*, relating how Uranus, the grandfather of Zeus, incurred the wrath of Mother Nature, Gaia, when he imprisoned the Cyclopes (one-eyed giants) and the Hecatoncheires, also called the Hundred-handed Ones, in Tartarus (Hesiod, 1983:34). The Hecatoncheires were giants and it was prophesised by an oracle that Zeus and the Olympians would only defeat the Titans if both the Cyclopes and the Hecatoncheires helped them (Hesiod, 1983:34). With the help of Gaia, Cronus castrated his father, Uranus, and seized power (Hesiod, 1983:34). However, Cronus and his siblings (the other Titans), kept the Cyclopes and the Hecatoncheires imprisoned in Tartarus and turned into the same unjust ruler their father was (Hesiod, 1983:37). Cronus was also afraid that his offspring would overthrow him in the same way that he had deposed his father, and he consequently swallowed his children as they were born (Hesiod, 1983:44).

Bemoaning the fate of her grandchildren, Gaia helped the wife of Cronus, Rhea, to give birth to Zeus on a remote island in Crete after tricking Cronus into swallowing a stone wrapped in a blanket, believing it was Zeus (Hesiod, 1983:57). After his birth, under the cover of night, Rhea hid Zeus in a cave on Mount Aigaion within a thick forest, where he bided his time and grew strong (Hesiod, 1983:58). Once fully grown, Zeus seized the opportune moment at which to attack his father, Cronus, and forced him to spit out Zeus's siblings whom he had swallowed whole (Hesiod, 1983:58). Zeus then freed the imprisoned Hecatoncheires and the Cyclopes, who expressed their gratitude by bestowing the gift of the lightning bolt as a weapon upon Zeus, which he used in the battle of the *Titanomachia* (Hesiod, 1983:60). The Cyclopes also bestowed upon Hades the helmet of invisibility and gave Poseidon the trident as weapon (Hesiod, 1983:60). In anticipation of the imminent battle, the Titans then chose Atlas as their war-leader because of his sheer size and physical strength, while the Olympians were led by Zeus (Hesiod, 1983:61).

The *Titanomachia* is the name given by Hesiod to the battle during which the twelve ruling Titans (Cronus, Hyperion, Oceanus, Atlas, Theia, Phoebe, Dione, Crius, Metis, Cœlus, Themis, Eurymedon, Tethys, and Rhea) were overthrown in a battle which lasted

ten years with the Olympian gods (Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Demeter, Athena, Dionysus, Apollo, Artemis, Ares, Aphrodite, Hephaestus and Hermes), so called because they lived on Mount Olympus after they dethroned the Titans (Hesiod, 1983:70). The *Titanomachia* is essentially the battle during which Zeus came into power and the myths that are known today about Atlas carrying the world on his shoulders or Zeus and his trademark weapon, the thunderbolt, all developed around the battle of the *Titanomachia*. After the *Titanomachia*, Zeus meted out punishment to the Titans. He confined all the Titans, with the exception of Atlas, to Tartarus (Hesiod, 1983:73). Atlas, as the war-leader of the Titans, was burdened to carry the sky on his shoulders forever (Hesiod, 1983:63).

Apart from the *Titanomachia*, the Olympians also fought another significant battle, namely the battle against the Giants, or the *Gigantomachia*, also written by Hesiod. The *Gigantomachia* is the ensuing battle between the newly self-proclaimed deities, the Olympians, and the siblings of the Titans who were confined to Tartarus (Hesiod, 1983:53). Gaia became angry because Zeus had confined the Titans to Tartarus and she produced the Giants so that they could try to seize power from the Olympians and free their siblings from Tartarus (Hesiod, 1983:53). The Giants, numbering twenty four, seized rocks and fire-brands and began hurling them at Mount Olympus from their mountain tops (Hesiod, 1983:54). Thus, the battle of the *Gigantomachia* was between the Giants and the Olympians (while the battle of the *Titanomachia* was between the Titans and the Olympians). However, for the purposes of this dissertation, the focus will fall more prominently on the *Titanomachia* as Keats's *Hyperion* is set in the immediate aftermath of this battle.

The first and most pivotal literary archetype that is identified from Hesiod's presentation of the Hyperion myth is that of the quintessential quest myth. The Olympians' battle to gain supreme power, the twelve tasks or labours of Heracles, Jason and the Argonauts' mission to obtain and bring back the Golden Fleece, Theseus' quest of killing the Minotaur, and Odysseus' mission of returning home after the Trojan War are some of the best-known examples of the quest myth in ancient Greek mythology. The quest myth is pivotal because it is the overarching archetypal narrative in which the subsequent

archetypal motifs, processes, and situations are expressed as they are constituent elements of the quest narrative. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, the quest myth provides a continuous metaphor for humanity's yearning for spiritual fulfilment (Campbell 1972:19).

In moving to the psychological sphere of the quest myth, the hero's struggles on his quest may be likened to and include the individual's struggle with his ego. Only once the hero has managed to suppress and surpass his narcissistic nature is he able to recognise and appreciate the harmony in the cosmos (Campbell, 1972:40). As already mentioned in Chapter One, the attainment of the Jungian stage of individuation may be seen as the definitive purpose of the archetypal narrative of the quest myth. In completing his quest, the hero or protagonist is presented with certain problematic archetypal situations which he needs to overcome in order to attain individuation.

As previously mentioned, a fundamental expression of the Jungian quest for individuation in psychological terms is the Freudian construct of the Oedipal struggle between son and father, during which the child struggles to assume and exceed the role of the parent (Wollheim, 1971:121). If the child succeeds in 'conquering' the parent, he achieves a psychological 'rebirth' to a consciousness no longer dominated by neurosis. In a proto-Freudian manner, Hesiod describes the archetypal process of the offspring dominating and assuming the role of the parents as the 'succession myth' (Hesiod, 1983:37). The succession myth necessarily leads to a confrontation or a war between parent and progeny, and the war ultimately leads to the overthrown being outcast or exiled. For the victor, the triumph constitutes a rebirth or resurrection, which is symbolic of transcendence to a higher consciousness. In turn, transcendence to a higher consciousness is symbolic of the successful quest.

In moving to how the archetypal quest myth and the constituent archetypal situations and processes are presented in Hesiod's *Titanomachia*, it should be noted that it would be a more manageable task to deal with the different archetypes in relation to each individual character, instead of dealing with all the characters in relation to each archetype. Due to

the fact that Hesiod's *Titanomachia* essentially concerns the Olympians, led by Zeus, struggling to dominate their parents, the Titans, the Oedipal struggle between parent and progeny and the archetypal narrative of the succession of the offspring dominate the narrative. The archetypal narrative of the succession of the offspring is expressed by Zeus and the Olympians struggling to establish a new world order by dethroning their parents. It is this battle between parent and progeny, as well as the concomitant struggle of clinging to power, that are central in Hesiod's *Titanomachia*.

Zeus is called to his quest by a prophecy made by the oracle, which foresees Zeus freeing his swallowed siblings before successfully leading them in a battle against the Titans (Hesiod, 1983:34). Therefore, the first archetypal situation which Zeus faces on his quest is the psychological aspect of the Oedipal complex. Both Zeus and his father, Cronus, know that Zeus is destined to succeed Cronus (courtesy of the oracle's prophecy), yet Cronus is not willing to accept that he will be succeeded by his offspring and therefore he initially tries to cling to power by swallowing his offspring. Because Cronus is, according to the oracle, fated to be succeeded by his offspring (Hesiod, 1983:35), he is intimately associated with the old world order. The fact that Cronus does not heed the oracle's prophecy (Hesiod, 1983:36) indicates that he does not possess the elementary mental capacity to accept the fact that he and the other Titans are destined to be replaced by a new world order.

Zeus, on the other hand, as part of the new world order, possesses a superior mental capacity and can perceive that he is destined to replace his father as ruler. Zeus's superior mental capacity is also signified by the fact that he heeds the oracle's later prophecy (that the Olympians will only be victorious if they employ the help of the imprisoned Cyclopes and Hecatoncheires). Zeus's obedience to the oracle's prophecies symbolises his superior mental capacity as part of the new world order because it shows that he heeds advice, while Cronus, as part of the old world order, shuns it. Zeus is ultimately rewarded for his adherence to the oracle's prophecies because he emerges victorious from the battle of the *Titanomachia*. He emerges victorious because he embraces change and he stands in stark contrast to Cronus, who rejects change and is consequently

defeated. Thus, Hesiod essentially contrasts the old world order as resisting change, while the new world order is depicted as embracing it.

In narrative terms, the theme of rebirth symbolically represents the resurrection of the hero and even though the theme of rebirth may be expressed by means of a physical rebirth, it is the symbolical, psychological rebirth of the hero into a higher sphere of consciousness that is truly significant. Thus, in Hesiod's *Titanomachia*, in succeeding in dominating and consequently assuming the role of his father, Zeus manages to gain a higher consciousness, which signifies a psychological rebirth for him. Zeus's attainment of a higher consciousness ultimately signifies the successful completion of his quest. As already mentioned, the Jungian attainment of individuation concerns the transcendence of an individual's consciousness to a consciousness that is detached from the world. This is also a proto-de Chardinian evolution of the consciousness towards the Omega Point, or supreme consciousness, which will be discussed in greater detail when Keats's displacement of the Hyperion myth is examined later on in this chapter.

Having identified and related the archetypes as related by Hesiod, the focus will now shift to Romanticism, John Keats and his representation of the *Titanomachia*. Romanticism emerged in the 1790s in Britain and Germany, where it was also called the Romantic Movement or the Romantic Revival because it emphasised individual self-expression in literature by means of sincerity, spontaneity, and originality (Baldick, 2008:294). The Romantic Movement sought to replace the decorous imitation of the Classics that was favoured by neoclassicism and the Enlightenment (the eighteenth century era in which reason was viewed as supremely important in civilised Western culture), because it was regarded as impersonal, artificial, and mechanical (Baldick, 2008:294). Increasingly free of the declining system of aristocratic patronage, the Romantics turned their attention towards the exploration of emotional directness and intensity, personal experience, and to the boundlessness of individual imagination (Baldick, 2008:294).

Nevertheless, despite the inclination to move away from neoclassicism, the works of the ancient poets were becoming increasingly accessible to the mercantile middle class towards the end of the eighteenth century (Coombs, 1978:81). The middle classes sent their sons to be educated in grammar schools, where the rigid curriculum predominantly consisted of the translated works of John Dryden (1631-1700) and Alexander Pope (1688-1744) (Coombs, 1978:82). Indeed, Dryden had translated 'the whole of Virgil, and sections of Ovid, Homer, Horace, and Juvenal' by the end of the seventeenth century (Coombs, 1978:82), while Pope had translated the whole of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* by the first quarter of eighteenth century (Rogers, 2007:5). However, Dryden and Pope are but two of the many translators of Classical works prior to the Romantic period. Consequently, a substantial number of works by the Classical poets were readily available during the Romantic period (Coombs, 1978:82).

With regards to Keats's schooling, it is common knowledge that he attended Enfield Academy, where he befriended Charles Cowden Clarke, the son of the schoolmaster, John Clarke (Hewlett, 1938:30). Charles Cowden Clarke also introduced Keats to literature, and in particular Classical literature and the works of Homer, and from the time he was an adolescent Keats immersed himself in classical mythology, his favourites being Joseph Spence's *Polymetis* (1747), Andrew Tooke's *Pantheon* (1698), John Lemprière's *Classical Dictionary* (1788), and George Sandy's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1632) (Hewlett, 1938:30).[1] Stephen Hebron is furthermore adamant that Keats finished his translation of Virgil's *Æneid* while working as a medical apprentice (Hebron, 2002:13).

There is also ample evidence that Keats extensively read Chapman's translations of the works of Homer (Landrum, 1927:987),[2] with no evidence being more conclusive than the fact that he wrote poems entitled "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer" and "To Homer". There is a great deal more information available on Keats's influences, but for the purpose of this dissertation it will suffice to know that Keats developed a particular love for Greek mythology and that he read extensively on the topic (Hebron, 2002:11).

With regards to the prominence of mythological characters in Keats's works, Heather Coombs (1978:137-138) reminds us that numerous poems by Keats, such as *Endymion* (1818), *Hyperion* (1819), *The Fall of Hyperion* (1819), *Ode to Psyche* (1819), and *Lamia* (1820) 'exhibit the kind of detailed knowledge of mythological characters which Keats had assiduously gleaned since his school days' and that myth 'seems to have been particularly attractive to Keats, perhaps because it is so often a condensation into the form of a particular story of a general truth about human nature, human experience or human history'.

All the great Romantic poets, including the likes of Percy Shelley, William Wordsworth, Lord Byron, and William Blake, aspired to write epic poetry (Bohm, 2007:7). Keats himself was deeply influenced by the works of John Milton and Keats tried to imitate and challenge Milton's epic *Paradise Lost* (1667) (Hirsch, 2001:vii). However, Keats eventually gave up on his *Hyperion* because 'it had too many Miltonic inversions in it' (Scudder, 1899:408). It is therefore evident that Keats too wanted to try his hand at the epic, which he himself called 'the king, / Round, vast, and spanning all like Saturn's ring' as indicated by his letter 'To Charles Cowden Clarke' (Shackford, 1925:66-67). For Keats, the epic poem was the form in which he sought to immortalise himself amongst the great English poets (Shackford, 1925:53).

As concerns Keats's use of Classical mythology in his *Hyperion* poems, Martha Shackford is of the following opinion:

> *Hyperion* in its incompleteness has something of the awe-inspiring power of a survival from antiquity. Its grandeur is sustained and austere. No other English poem of the nineteenth century can compare with *Hyperion* in faithfulness to classical tradition or in power of vitalizing the primitive world of Greek legend. … *Hyperion* is as fully and consistently classical as *Endymion* is not. With very few exceptions the allusions, the imagery, the tone, the diction, the flow of the verse are suited to interpret the primitive epoch of pre-historic mythology.
>
> (Shackford, 1925:48)

As already stated in the previous chapter, the notion of intertextuality is based on the presumption that the act of reading plunges the reader into a network of textual relations

and consequently, in order to interpret a text and derive at its true meaning, the reader has to move between the texts and trace those relations (Allen, 2000:1). The act of moving between the texts is the reason literary archetypes have such an appeal for intertextual studies: the literary archetypes form the core of all the texts concerned and thus the manner in which they are displaced in the different texts provides a concrete point of reference from which to move between the texts.

It is undeniable that Keats's *Hyperion* poems have been moulded in the Classical style and were deeply influenced by Classical mythology. In Keats's *Hyperion*, 'There is no reference to the war between successive dynasties of gods, but Saturn would not have been in exile had there been no such war, and Keats certainly knew that there had been one' (Evert, 1965:228). Thus Keats simply focuses on later events in the narrative. It is furthermore evident from Keats's *Hyperion* that Keats, for all his detailed knowledge, was confused in his own mind about the battles of the *Titanomachia* and the *Gigantomachia* (Evert, 1965:229). However, in spite of Keats's confusion there can be 'no objection on the score of its allusion to a different conflict than that treated in *Hyperion*' (Evert, 1965:228).

Accordingly, Keats's two unfinished poems, *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*, are undoubtedly epic poems with their roots firmly anchored in Classical antiquity and the sources of Keats's *Hyperion* were Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days* (Shackford, 1925:53).[3] Keats's *Hyperion* concerns the aftermath of the *Titanomachia* and, like Hesiod's version of the myth, Keats's epic concerns the twelve Titans, who ruled the mythological world, and their progeny, the Olympians. However, Keats's version starts only after the battle against their offspring, the Olympian gods (Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Demeter, Athena, Dionysus, Apollo, Artemis, Ares, Aphrodite, Hephaestus and Hermes). The Titans have already lost the battle and they are contemplating their next move. Shackford acknowledges both Keats's indebtedness and the differences with expressions of the myth in Classical antiquity, all of which combined to:

> … furnish inspiration for representing the lofty tone of classical legend, [and] enabled him [Keats] to create deities, to make them partake of the primitive character of the

> early powers of nature, – earth, sea, sky, and to attribute to them mental processes understandable by men and yet beyond men in intensity and splendor of powerful mood. The symbolism in the poem is rather general, for Keats was trying to express in the terms of Greek antiquity his conception of the organic laws of Being: – the aggression of fresh aspiring youth upon the old and outworn; nature's continual advance from physical might and material strength to 'purer forms' dominated by thought and feeling. Keats had seen the struggle of the Greek gods as the eternal conflict between rule by age and priority and rule by youth and energy of spirit; between the accustomed, habitual, and the new, untried.
>
> (Shackford, 1925:53)

The manner in which Keats portrays 'the aggression of fresh aspiring youth upon the old and outworn; nature's continual advance from physical might and material strength to "purer forms" dominated by thought and feeling' is expressed by Oceanus, who laments:

> So on our heels a fresh perfection treads,
> A power more strong in beauty, born of us
> And *fated* [emphasis mine] to excel us…
>
> (*Hyperion*, Book II, lines 212-214)[4]

Evidently, Keats expresses his own personal proto-Freudian constructs of the struggle between father and son and the manifestation of the Jungian notion of individuation in his two *Hyperion* poems. Keats's personal ideology of the inevitability of the younger and purer or more sensitive generation deposing the older generation, who relied on physical might and material strength, becomes apparent in his *Hyperion* poems. It would seem natural that the older generation would eventually be unseated by the younger generation, but for Keats the removal from power is not only due to the younger generation being more vigorous – it is the younger generation's inherent ability to gain a higher consciousness. The notion that the old world order (the Titans) must necessarily be replaced by a newer, more advanced race (the Olympians) is shared by Maureen Roberts, who asserts that:

> In *Hyperion* Keats depicts the succession of the Greek gods with an evolutionary scheme in which the collective growth of consciousness … progresses from a primitive condition of chaos, through the division into opposites, toward the higher beauty of the Olympian gods who displace Saturn and the Titans by personifying the 'fresh perfection' of greater enlightenment. In *The Fall of Hyperion* this ascending

> pattern of transformation becomes an autobiographic dream as Keats, using the first person narrative, progresses toward the vision of a unified Apollonian self.
>
> (Roberts, 1993:112)

Roberts captures the essence of Keats's *Hyperion* in a proto-de Chardinian manner as she correctly infers that the Olympians must rule in lieu of the fact that their 'collective growth of consciousness' surpasses the collective growth of the Titans' consciousness. Roberts furthermore recognises the fact that the expansion of the Olympians' collective consciousness becomes a sustained 'autobiographic dream of Keats' in *The Fall of Hyperion*. Therefore, in his *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*, Keats uses the archetypal narrative of the succession of the offspring in a proto-Freudian manner as a sustained metaphor for the evolution of the collective consciousness towards a higher form of consciousness in a proto-de Chardinian fashion. Thus, Keats's two epics ultimately concern transcendence to a higher consciousness.

Accordingly, Maureen Roberts implicitly reconciles de Chardin's concept of the Omega Point with Jungian psychology and Romanticism, asserting that:

> … at the heart of both [Jungian psychology and Romanticism] is the lived dynamic of the human psyche, the transitional and changing self moving towards an ideal goal that inevitably eludes logic. Romantic poetry in general — its sense of moving toward an elusive goal — involves a progressive tension and resolution between opposites which moves toward an individuated state of wholeness. This movement of becoming, in which the self is an unfolding process rather than a fixed identity, reveals the creative imagination to be synonymous with self-creation.
>
> (Roberts, 1997:1-2)

Because Keats's proto-de Chardinian outlook will later be discussed in greater detail in relation to his poems, it will suffice for the present moment simply to note Jung, de Chardin, and Keats's concurring views with regards to the human consciousness evolving towards an ideal state at some point in the future.

In moving to an elucidation of the two poems concerned, it may be noted that from the outset of *Hyperion*, the reader is confronted with the subdued and dejected tone of the poem. The first book of *Hyperion* concerns the fallen ruler of the gods, Saturn (the

Roman equivalent of the Greek god Cronus – Keats partly uses Roman nomenclature), and his siblings who are utterly defeated and dejected after the battle against the Olympians. The listlessness and defeatism that shrouds the Titans are emphasised by regular references to their woe:

> Meanwhile in other realms big tears were shed,
> More sorrow like to this, and such like woe,
> Too huge for mortal tongue or pen of scribe:
> The Titans fierce, self-hid or prison-bound
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:158-161)

The portrayal of the Titans as defeated and dejected emphasises the fact that they are part of the old world order. As part of the older, more primitive order, the god of war, Enceladus, is a prominent character in *Hyperion* because he tries to rouse the gods into action. Enceladus is ready and willing to take the direct approach of confronting and fighting the Olympians. He still firmly believes that 'Victory, might be lost, or might be won' (*Hyperion*, II:342) and that the Titans' best chance of regaining their lost reverence is to do battle. Enceladus's character functions as a warrior as he believes that the answer to the Titans' dilemma is yet more violence. Enceladus also wants revenge as he wants to launch 'thunderbolt on thunderbolt, till all / That rebel Jove's [Zeus's] whole armoury were [is] spent' (*Hyperion*, II:311-312). Enceladus's reasoning reveals his violent, primitive nature and emphasises that he and the Titans form part of the old, more primitive world order.

In contrast to the fiery Enceladus, the other Titans, and Saturn in particular, are depicted as lethargic and beaten. Book I primarily concerns the Titans coming to terms with their fate and consolidating their perceptions about their own sovereignty with the reality which has unfolded after the battle against the Olympians. In the opening stanza, words and phrases like 'sadness', 'quiet as a stone', 'cloud on cloud', 'deadened' and 'fallen divinity' (I:1-12) are used to describe Saturn and set the tone for much of the first book. Saturn is further portrayed as fragile, weak, and in a word, mortal. He is seen lying:

> Upon the sodden ground
> His old right hand lay nerveless, listless, dead,

> Unsceptred; and his realmless eyes were closed;
> While his bow'd head seem'd list'ning to the Earth,
> His ancient mother, for some comfort yet.
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:17-21)

Saturn is hardly depicted as one would expect the immortal ruler of the mythological world to be represented under normal conditions: he is depicted as the exact opposite of what an eternal supreme deity should be. Instead of being in control, unflinching, majestic, and confident, he is portrayed as conquered, his spirit has been broken, his self-confidence has withered, and he is in need of comfort. Furthermore, it is made evident that he will not reassume his elevated position.

Saturn, however, is not the only Titan who is struggling to cope with the aftermath of the battle. The sun god Hyperion's wife, Thea, is the next Titan to be portrayed as a shadow of her former self. As with Saturn, the decline of Thea's imposing physical presence is stressed as 'By her in stature the tall Amazon / Had stood a pigmy's height' (I:27-28). She had also previously been able to take 'Achilles by the hair and bent [bend] his neck; / Or with a finger stay'd [stay] Ixion's wheel' (*Hyperion*, I:29-30).

Significantly, Thea's loss of power is intricately linked to her loss of beauty as Keats stresses the fact that she is not beautiful in the way she was before – her beauty is now due to the sorrow on her face:

> Her face was large as that of Memphian sphinx,
> Pedestal'd haply in a palace court,
> When sages looked to Egypt for their lore.
> But oh! how unlike marble was that face:
> How beautiful if sorrow had not made
> Sorrow more beautiful than Beauty's self.
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:31-36)

Marble does not erode with time (at least not in conventional poetic usage) and as such represents timelessness. However, having lost the marble-like quality of timelessness, Thea, like Saturn, appears mortal. As shown in the above quotations, Keats also stresses

the fact that Thea was once enormous and exceedingly strong, but that physical strength and size do not matter when one's most important attribute, that is beauty according to Keats, is now lost. Thea also cries bitterly (I:88), revealing that like Saturn, she too has lost much of her divinity. Hence beauty and divinity are closely associated with each other.

Furthermore, many of the other Titans are 'self-hid or prison-bound' (I:161), while the eponymous character of Keats's poem, the sun-god Hyperion, bemoans his own fate:

> O dreams of day and night!
> O monstrous forms! O effigies of pain!
> O spectres busy in a cold, cold gloom!
> O lank-ear'd Phantoms of black-weeded pools!
> Why do I know ye? why have I seen ye? Why
> Is my eternal essence thus distraught
> To see and to behold these horrors new?
> Saturn is fallen, am I too to fall?
> Am I to leave this haven of my rest,
> This cradle of my glory, this soft clime,
> This calm luxuriance of blissful light,
> These crystalline pavilions, and pure fanes,
> Of all my lucent empire?
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:227-239)

Hyperion is evidently also in a state of shock and disbelief as he tries to come to terms with the new reality that he is presented with. The recurrent emotive utterance 'O' emphasises in stylised choric form that he is struggling to come to terms with the Titans' fall from prosperity and that the horrifying idea of the Titans having been toppled from power is simply too much for him to accept. The long vowel sound of the numerous utterances of 'O' prevents the rhythm from settling into a continuous, consistent rhythm. Keats uses no less than five exclamation marks and five question marks condensed into the thirteen lines of Hyperion's short speech. Hyperion's brief, exclamatory utterances and his short, rhetorical questions result in an interrupted rhythm manifesting itself in his speech. This stop-start rhythm symbolises the indecision and self-doubt that the Titans, and especially Hyperion, are experiencing because all of their old certainties (prior to the

battle) have been nullified. The plosive ‘p’ sounds of ‘pavilions’, ‘pure’, and ‘empire’ that are found in the two closing lines of Hyperion’s above-quoted speech are reflective of his explosive nature and his short temper. Evidently, Hyperion is portrayed as brash, arrogant, and not in control of his emotions and psyche.

Whereas Saturn and Hyperion’s wife, Thea, appear to have already accepted their fate, Hyperion himself is as yet unwilling to admit defeat and he decides to exercise his right over his domain. Even though it is in the middle of the night, he tries to pull the sun into the sky with his chariot:

> … full six dewy hours
> Before the dawn in season due should blush,
> He breath’d fierce breath against the sleepy portals,
> Clear’d them of heavy vapours, burst them wide
> Suddenly on the ocean’s chilly streams.
> The planet orb of fire, whereon he rode
> Each day from east to west the heavens through,
> Spun round in sable curtaining of clouds
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:264-271)

Hyperion’s irrational attempt of pulling the sun into the sky at night and his quick temper reveal that he is part of the older, more irrational world order. Everything Hyperion does seems to go against the natural order in which events normally take place, which signifies that Hyperion and the Titans are no longer in harmony with nature and the cosmos.

Just as Hyperion is about to command his winged horses to start pulling the sun into the sky, he realises that the eternal laws of the seasons and day and night may not be disobeyed and that:

> He might not: – No, though a primeval God
> The sacred seasons might not be disturb’d.
> Therefore the operations of the dawn
> Stay’d in their birth, even as here ’tis told.
> Those silver wings expanded sisterly,

> Eager to sail their orb; the porches wide
> Open'd upon the dusk demesnes of night;
> And the bright Titan, phrenzied with new woes
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:292-299)

Keats's use of the shortened spelling of several words, such as disturb'd, stay'd, 'tis, open'd, and unus'd, lends a pronounced energy to the rhythm of the extract and it mirrors the ever-shortening time that Hyperion has left to rule over the sun. The alliteration of the d-sound as in 'Open'd upon the dusk demesnes' also serves to emphasise the gathering momentum of the rhythm of the extract. The rhythm becomes faster and faster until it culminates in the lines 'Open'd upon the dusk demesnes of night; / And the bright Titan, phrenzied with new woes', after which there follows a denouement:

> Unus'd to bend, by hard compulsion bent
> His spirit to the sorrow of the time;
> And all along a dismal rack of clouds,
> Upon the boundaries of day and night,
> He stretch'd himself in grief and radiance faint.
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:300-304)

This petering out of the energy of the rhythm previously associated with Hyperion signifies a change in the direction of the narrative as his rage drastically recedes and the passage ends on an anticlimax, with Hyperion accepting his dethronement. At the end of the first book, Hyperion dejectedly departs to where the other Titans are hiding.

Book II of *Hyperion* concerns the Titans coming to terms with the fact that they have indeed been removed from power. The disbelief displayed by Saturn in Book I is replaced by the Titans' general despondence and depression in Book II, which depicts the council meeting of the Titans where they contemplate their next move. An overview is given of who is present and the dejected and sad tone of the first book is continued. Reference is once more made to the mortal characteristics that the Titans display:

> As with us mortal men, the laden heart
> Is persecuted more, and fever'd more,

> where it is nighing to the mournful house
> Where other hearts are sick of the same bruise

(*Hyperion*, II:101-104)

Saturn then walks into the council, but it is evident that he is unsure of himself and his ability to rouse the Titans to take action, asking them 'O Titans, shall I say "Arise!" – Ye groan: / Shall I say "Crouch!" Ye groan. What can I then?' (II:157-158). Seeing Saturn's diminished stature, Enceladus realises that the Titans' only hope of being reinstated to their former glory now rests with Hyperion. Accordingly, Enceladus tries to rouse the other Titans into action. As the god of war, he argues that:

> Victory, might be lost, or might be won.
> And be ye mindful that Hyperion,
> Our brightest brother, still is undisgraced –
> Hyperion, lo! his radiance is here!

(*Hyperion*, II:342-345)

Unbeknown to Enceladus and the Titans, Hyperion has already accepted defeat. Just as Enceladus's moving speech seems to be rousing the Titans, Hyperion makes his appearance and it is revealed that he is no longer as bright, powerful, or majestic as he once was:

> It was Hyperion: – a granite peak
> His bright feet touch'd, and there he stay'd to view
> The misery his brilliance had betray'd
> To the most hateful seeing of itself.
> Golden his hair of short Numidian curl,
> Regal his shape majestic, a vast shade
> In midst of his own brightness, like the bulk
> Of Memnon's image at the set of sun
> To one who travels from the dusking East:
> Sighs, too, as mournful as that Memnon's harp
> He utter'd, while his hands contemplative
> He press'd together, and in silence stood.
> Despondence seiz'd again the fallen Gods
> At sight of the dejected King of Day

(*Hyperion*, II:367-380)

Evidently, Hyperion's ability to radiate light is shown to be a vice rather than a quality for him: instead of revealing how colossal and powerful he is, light is depicted as the sun-god's enemy because it reveals his despondence. Keats's paradoxical description of Hyperion in the line 'The misery his brilliance had betray'd' confirms that what was once his greatest strength, namely his ability to radiate light, is now the source of his greatest mortification because it reveals that he has been completely and utterly defeated. His previous domain, namely light and the sun, is no longer under his command and it is he who is now subjugated to his former subject.

Other paradoxical phrases, such as 'Regal his shape majestic, a vast shade / In midst of his own brightness', emphasise that Hyperion has not only been defeated, but that he must suffer the indignity of being a shining beacon of the Titans' defeat. The fact that there is 'a vast shade / In midst of his own brightness' symbolises that Hyperion has been replaced by the younger god, Apollo, because a shade only appears if there is something or someone between the sun and the shade. Hyperion is thus symbolically depicted as standing in the shadow of Apollo, because Apollo has replaced Hyperion as the sun-god and is far brighter than he.

This portrayal of Hyperion confirms that the Titans have been completely defeated and they have no hope in regaining their lost power. After beholding the disheartening sight of the dejected Hyperion, 'Despondence seiz'd again the fallen Gods' (II:379). Accordingly, Book II ends with the Titans calling on Saturn and imploring him to give them purpose and direction, yet it is evident that Saturn has already accepted their fate. Therefore the reader is prepared for the inevitability of Apollo's deification in Book III.

In contrast to the crudeness and primitive nature of the Titans depicted in Book II, Apollo is depicted in Book III as a sophisticated, peaceful character, who 'touch[es] piously the Delphic harp' (III:10) and who that morning wandered 'Beside the osiers of a rivulet, / Full ankle-deep in lilies of the vale' (III:33-35). By associating peaceful imagery with

Apollo's speeches, Keats depicts him as more serene and psychically whole than his more primitive predecessor:

> Sure I have heard those vestments sweeping o'er
> The fallen leaves, when I have sat alone
> In cool mid-forest. Surely I have traced
> The rustle of those ample skirts about
> These grassy solitudes, and seen the flowers
> Lift up their heads, as still the whisper pass'd.
>
> (*Hyperion*, III:53-58)

Keats's use of the words 'sure' and 'surely' serves to assign an air of self-assurance and confidence to Apollo. The rhythm employed by Keats for Apollo's speeches is very lucid and fluid. In contrast to Hyperion's earlier-quoted speech, in which Keats makes excessive use of exclamation and question marks to break up the rhythm, he uses the minimum amount of punctuation for Apollo's above-quoted speech. The result is that Apollo's speech flows effortlessly, which represents his rational and well-reasoned eloquence. Apollo's linguistic fluency stands in contrast to Hyperion's shorter, less eloquent utterances. Apollo is furthermore described as more sensitive and he indulges in the more sophisticated pastime of playing musical instruments. Thus, Keats emphasises that Apollo, as part of the new world order, is more advanced than his predecessor, Hyperion, who is part of the old world order.

Keats furthermore stresses that the narrative concerning the Titans plays out on earth, while the action concerning Apollo is not limited to the earth. By not limiting Apollo's movements to the earth, Keats consigns a consciousness to Apollo that is already more in touch with the universe. Apollo realises and appreciates the beauty and the brilliance of the cosmos and he is intimately aware of the existence of other stars, the sun, and the moon. He also reveals a self-reflective mode of thought, asking:

> What are the stars? There is the sun, the sun!
> And the most patient brilliance of the moon!
> And stars by thousands! Point me out the way
> To any one particular beauteous star,

> And I will flit into it with my lyre,
> And make its silvery splendour pant with bliss.
>
> (*Hyperion*, III:97-102)

Apollo understands that the earth is not the centre of the universe and that there are also ‘thousands’ of other stars in the cosmos. By stating that he ‘will flit into’ any ‘one particular beauteous star’, Apollo is in fact suggesting that he can fit the cosmos into his lyre. Keats stresses the ease with which Apollo can traverse the cosmos, seeing that he is able to ‘flit’ to any star in the cosmos. In turn, Apollo’s claim of fitting the cosmos into his lyre reveals Keats’s effort of trying to fit the cosmos into his poetry. Evidently, Apollo is more aware of, and in harmony with, the cosmos than his predecessor, Hyperion. Keats’s portrayal of Apollo as more cosmically aware once more reinforces and justifies the fact that Apollo, as part of a more cosmic consciousness, should succeed the more narrow-minded and primitive Hyperion.

In mythology, Apollo is the god of poetry and the nine muses. The significance of the character of Apollo is due to the fact that in the myth as presented by Hesiod, it is Zeus, not Apollo, who is appointed as the new ruler of the gods, thus Keats intentionally deviates from the original myth. This deviation is a mythopoeic displacement. In making Apollo, the god of poetry, Saturn’s successor, Keats is emphasising the supreme importance of poetry. Due to the fact that Apollo is reborn and consequently immortalised as the new supreme deity, poetry is symbolically immortalised at the apex of the mythological world. As shown in the previous few paragraphs, Keats deliberately depicts Apollo as thoughtful, sensitive, and imaginative. Furthermore, with regards to the Olympians and the new world order, Keats also almost exclusively focuses on Apollo. Of the other Olympians, Zeus and Poseidon are merely mentioned, but Apollo is the only one singled out to be individually focused on. The fact that Apollo (significantly the god of poetry) is singled out demonstrates that the Romantic notion of the importance of the individual is emphasised. Thus, a new moral order, with Apollo at the pinnacle, is established in which the Romantic ideals of the importance of the individual and the imagination are immortalised as supremely important.

The unfinished Book III of *Hyperion* further sees the Titans finally accepting their fate before a prelude steers the narrative towards Apollo's rebirth and deification. Apollo then meets Mnemosyne, the goddess of memory, or re-meets her as she tells him that she looks and sounds so familiar to him because he has dreamed of her:

> Goddess! I have beheld those eyes before,
> And their eternal calm, and all that face,
> Or I have dreamed.' – 'Yes,' said the supreme shape,
> 'Thou hast dream'd of me…'
>
> (*Hyperion*, III:59-62)

This extract is crucial in the context of Keats's poem because the motif of dreaming is mentioned here for the first time. Seemingly insignificant in *Hyperion*, the motif of dreaming will form an integral part in *The Fall of Hyperion*. The motif of dreaming is important because it signifies prior knowledge of events because the unconscious reproduces conscious observations in the form of dreams. In *Hyperion*, the motif of dreaming is reinforced when Apollo laments 'Mnemosyne! / Thy name is on my tongue, I know not how', emphasising that Apollo has dreamt of her (III:82-83). Due to the fact that dreams signify prior knowledge, it is revealed that Apollo has been made consciously aware of Mnemosyne prior to their meeting. However, the motif of dreaming and the significance of the character of Mnemosyne will be more fully expounded upon in the later section on Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion*.

With regards to Keats's displacement of the archetypal process of the succession of the offspring in *Hyperion*, Hyperion's father, Cœlus (the Roman equivalent of the Greek god Uranus), identifies the cause of the *Titanomachia*: 'There is sad feud among ye, and rebellion / Of son against his sire' (I:321-322). However, Keats sees the archetypal process of the offspring succeeding the parents (the succession myth) as natural and inevitable because, in a proto-Darwinian manner, Keats aims 'to represent historical change as … continuous, inevitable, and on the most universal level grand, for it is Progress—the survival of the fittest, the best, the most beautiful and the quintessentially human' (Butler, 1982:153). Martha Shackford (1925:57) is of the same opinion, adding that 'Keats, in the hour when the doctrine of evolution [by means of the theories of

Charles Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus Darwin] was becoming a dominant idea, perceived the significance of eternal progress'.

Accordingly, Keats's philosophy is ultimately evolutionary as he logically assumes that change is inevitable, continuous, and that it favours the survival of the fittest. Moreover, for Keats, the survival of the fittest naturally leads to the prevailing of the most beautiful, because the more beautiful something is, the closer it is to the Platonic ideal of the transcendental world of forms (Butler, 1982:153). Keats believes, like Plato, that there exists a perfect, transcendental world of ideas (Leitch *et al*, 2001:33). This perfect Platonic world may be entered into by means of the imagination, which is stimulated by beauty (Hirsch, 2001:489). For Keats, the imagination is intellectual apperception and beauty stimulates the imagination so that it may perceive truth (Jones, 1969:117), therefore 'What the imagination seizes as Beauty must be truth', as indicated in his letter to "Bailey" (Hirsch, 2001:489). By stimulating the imagination to perceive truth, the perception of beauty by the mind allows it to rise to the Platonic world of ideas. When truth is perceived, it signifies that the perceiver has been elevated to a higher order of reality. Thus, when Keats asserts that 'Beauty is truth, truth beauty, – that is all / ye know on earth, and all ye need to know' (*Ode on a Grecian Urn*, 49-50), it is not to be taken literally as meaning that beauty equates directly to truth, but rather that beauty stimulates the imagination to such an extent that it may perceive truth and thus enter the transcendental world of ideas, which represents perfection. Perfection, being perfect, is necessarily also beautiful, thus 'Beauty is truth [and thus also], truth [is] beauty'.

For Keats, superior beauty represents a higher consciousness, which indicates evolutionary superiority in a proto-Darwinist manner. Keats's perspective concerning beauty is expressed in *Hyperion* by Oceanus (the old god of the seas), who understands 'That first in beauty should be first in might' (*Hyperion*, II:229). Oceanus consequently admits that it was:

> With such a glow of beauty in his [Poseidon, the young usurping god's] eyes,
> that it enforced me to bid sad farewell
> to all my empire …
>
> (*Hyperion*, II:237-239)

Keats's philosophical view of beauty allows him to posit that those more beautiful must rule solely because of the superior degree of truth and perfection they embody:

> We are such forest-trees, and our fair boughs
> Have bred forth, not pale solitary doves,
> But eagles golden-feather'd, who do tower
> Above us in their beauty, and must reign
> In right thereof, for 'tis the eternal law
> That first in beauty should be first in might;
> Yea, by that law, another race may drive
> Our conquerors to mourn as we do now.
>
> (*Hyperion*, II:224-231)

These qualities of beauty, perfection, and truth mean that the Olympians are implicitly inhabitants of Plato's transcendental realm of forms. The Olympians represent the ideal or true gods. However, in a proto-Darwinist fashion, Oceanus is fully aware that in the same way that Apollo and the Olympians deposed the Titans, so too will the Olympians eventually be deposed by an evolutionarily superior, more beautiful race. He has the insight to understand that 'Yea, by that law [that first in beauty should be first in might, with beauty signifying evolutionary superiority], another race may drive / Our conquerors to mourn as we do now' (*Hyperion*, II:230-231). Oceanus fundamentally grasps that evolution is an ongoing and never-ending process, which is revealed when he tells Saturn:

> as thou [Saturn] wast not the first of powers,
> So art thou not the last; it cannot be:
> Thou art not the beginning nor the end'
>
> (*Hyperion*, II:188-190)

It is in this sense that Keats presents the inevitability of the rise and fall of power: the newer, evolutionarily superior race will inevitably depose the old world order because they are implicitly representative of a higher degree of truth and perfection. However, in time, even the most evolved race will also be forced to make way for a newer, even more evolved race (and so forth). The Titans are doomed and they ultimately accept their doom as part of an evolutionary process. This ultimately gives their defeat meaning as

they come to understand that they are part of a larger, evolutionary process in a proto-de Chardinian fashion.

In addition to subscribing to an evolutionary world view, Keats also believes that there is 'an inherent order in the universe, a cosmic harmony' (Shackford, 1925:58). Keats's notion of the universe evolving towards 'cosmic harmony' distinctly echoes de Chardin's conception of humankind's collective consciousness evolving towards supreme consciousness, or the Omega Point. This notion of Keats is expressed through the character of Apollo, who is fully aware that in order to be raised to a higher consciousness of divinity, his present consciousness must be fused with a more divine or cosmic consciousness in order for him to transcend his previous self and enter into the Platonic world of perfection. His present consciousness will be enriched by its fusion with a more cosmic consciousness:

> Knowledge enormous makes a God of me.
> Names, deeds, gray legends, dire events, rebellions,
> Majesties, sovran voices, agonies,
> Creations and destroyings, all at once
> Pour into the wide hollows of my brain,
> And deify me, as if some blithe wine
> Or bright elixir peerless I had drunk,
> And so become immortal. …
>
> (*Hyperion*, III:113-120)

Importantly, the new knowledge of 'Names, deeds, gray legends, dire events, rebellions, / Majesties, sovran voices, agonies, Creations and destroyings' does not replace Apollo's previous, more primitive consciousness, but is merely added to it to create a consciousness that is permeated with a greater, external body of knowledge. Apollo pertinently states that it is the above-mentioned knowledge that pours into his brain which deifies him. The knowledge that pours into Apollo's brain may be seen as an external factor that Apollo was lacking prior to his rebirth. Apollo compares the influx of all the information that is being synthesised into his brain to the sensation of being drunk due to the foreign sensation, yet he knows that this 'synthesis' he is undergoing is necessary in order to prepare him for his rebirth to a higher consciousness.

The notion of synthesis is derived from the Hegelian Dialectic and is usually presented as comprising of three dialectical stages of development, namely (1) the thesis, which gives rise to its reaction; (2) an antithesis, which contradicts or negates the thesis; and (3) the reconciliation of the thesis and the antithesis by means of a synthesis (Kauffman, 1966:37). Hegel uses the term *Aufhebung*, which has (sometimes contentiously) been translated as 'sublation', to explain what happens when a thesis and an antithesis interact (Spencer and Krauze, 1996:73). Thus *Aufhebung* is the synthesis or fusion between the thesis and the antithesis, but with the prerequisite that the synthesis should contain the most desirable or best elements from both the thesis and the antithesis. A higher order of being is thus created. While there is no evidence of Keats being familiar with Hegel's work, there are striking parallels between the two ideas of synthesis.

The notion of a higher, synthesised consciousness is central in Keats's poetry and Maureen Roberts notes that:

> Keats's poetry develops in terms of a basic pattern of transformation – common to Platonism, myth, alchemy and Gnosticism – in which an initial unity is divided, then re-collected as a "higher" unity through a growth in consciousness. Enacted as the mythic pattern of descent and reascent, which occurs in Keats's longest poem, *Endymion*, as well as in the later *Hyperion* poems, this pattern of division and reunification effects the reformation of an antecedent wholeness as the goal of psychic growth, a goal which as a holistic mode of knowledge and existence expresses itself through Keats's imagination as the uniting symbol, as well as through the divine self, Apollo, and in Beauty and Truth as metonymic of the oneness of knowing and being.
>
> (Roberts, 1993:107)

Thus, for Roberts, the re-collection of a divided unity that results in a growth in consciousness is essentially synthesis between the two entities. She adds that 'From an archetypal perspective, the poetic process is not restricted by conscious intent, rather the autonomy of the imagination, yielding to the creative impetus from the unconscious, [and] synthesises the opposites of individual and universal' (1997:2). However, the synthesis between individual and universal will be more fully examined when Apollo's rebirth is discussed later.

Two kinds of synthesis can be distinguished in Keats's *Hyperion*. The first is the more general synthesis between the older, more primitive world order of the Titans and the new world order embodied by the Olympians. The second is the specific synthesis that is embodied by the character of Apollo. As concerns the first, more general synthesis, it has already been established that Saturn, Hyperion, and the other Titans are representative of the existing old world order which has to be absorbed and transcended in order for progression to be made and synthesis to be achieved. The Titans represent the thesis; the younger, more beautiful and more vigorous Olympians represent the antithesis; and synthesis is ultimately achieved through the Olympians succeeding in dominating their parents and gaining a higher consciousness. However, it should be noted that due to the fact that the Olympians are the Titans' offspring, the Titans (as the Olympians' progenitors) are necessarily part of the Olympians. Thus, the desirable elements of the Titans are implicitly present in the Olympians and hence the synthesis that is achieved between Titan and Olympian does not discount the Titans completely.

Furthermore, the synthesis that is achieved through the fusion between Titan and Olympian represents a change for the greater good. This view is shared by Helen Haworth (1970:637), who calls the Titans' fall a 'fortunate fall' because it brings a higher good to the entire world. She parallels the fall of the Titans to that of Adam and Eve, as well as Satan, in Milton's *Paradise Lost* because she sees the fortunate fall of the Titans as making way for a means of rule that will benefit the entire mythological world. Furthermore, according to Haworth (1970:640), the Titans 'are caught in a vast evolutionary process; their "fall" from heaven to earth, their loss of divinity, their human suffering and pain, are necessary in order that both heaven and earth may progress to a higher level'. Accordingly, the synthesis that is achieved between the Titans and the Olympians represents a higher level of consciousness.

The fortunate fall that leads to the synthesis between Titan and Olympian is epitomised by Apollo. The synthesis that is achieved through his character concerns the pre-reborn and post-reborn Apollo. The pre-reborn Apollo may be regarded as the thesis, the knowledge which pours into his brain during the rebirth process presents the antithesis

(because it is completely foreign to Apollo), and finally synthesis is achieved when Apollo's consciousness is fused with the external knowledge that floods his brain, which essentially makes him fully conscious or psychically whole. Thus, Apollo embodies the fusion between the older world order and the new world order, signifying a newer, more superior, and optimally synthesised race. The knowledge that pours into Apollo's brain is not limited to the 'Names, deeds, gray legends, dire events, rebellions, Majesties, sovran voices, [and] agonies' of a specified time. It also includes knowledge of 'Creations and destroyings', which symbolises a more universal knowledge of the beginning and the end. Thus, the knowledge that pours into Apollo's brain is universal rather than specific, which signifies that Apollo gains a universal consciousness.

After the process of having his consciousness synthesised into a more universal consciousness, Apollo is reborn and deified under the direction of Mnemosyne:

> Trembling with light upon Mnemosyne.
> Soon wild commotions shook him, and made flush
> All the immortal fairness of his limbs;
> Most like the struggle at the gate of death;
> Or liker still to one who should take leave
> Of pale immortal death, and with a pang
> As hot as death's is chill, with fierce convulse
> Die into life: so young Apollo anguish'd
> His very hair, his golden tresses famed
> Kept undulation round his eager neck.
> During the pain Mnemosyne upheld
> Her arms as one who prophesied. – At length
> Apollo shriek'd; – and lo!
>
> (*Hyperion*, III:123-135)

The visual similarity of the letter 'o' in the line 'Soon wild commotions shook him' emphasises that, like a ball or wheel that gathers momentum as it is going downhill, an irreversible process has been started that is picking up speed. This is reflected in the energy of the rapidly increasing rhythm of the extract: by using punctuation marks circumspectly, Keats allows the rhythm to become faster and faster until it reaches a climax with Apollo dying into life.

The oxymoronic notion of ‘dying into life’ epitomises the actual transcendence to a higher consciousness because Apollo does not physically die, yet the image of dying into life signifies that Apollo must undergo a psychological rebirth in order for his consciousness to be raised to that of the divine. According to Richard Benton (1966:40), by dying into life, Keats interprets ‘the loss of personal identity is [as] a kind of dying, but it is a dying into life when we discover the immortal Self within us. … Our immortality does not consist in our retention of personal identity but in the loss of such identity altogether’. This reaffirms that through his rebirth, Apollo rises above his own personal consciousness to a universal consciousness. The universal consciousness that Apollo attains symbolises the transcendental realm of truth because of the vast amount of knowledge contained within it. As a result, Apollo does not struggle against the process of rebirth because he understands that he must endure the pain and suffering in order to transcend to a higher, universal consciousness.

In contrast to the linear narrative used by Keats in *Hyperion*, *The Fall of Hyperion* abandons the chronological narrative and instead employs a dreamlike structure in which time and action do not always progress linearly, which essentially lends Keats’s poem its element of magical realism. The dreamlike structure builds on the motif of dreaming introduced by Apollo in *Hyperion*. However, despite the fact that the narrative in *The Fall of Hyperion* starts to progress in a linear way as it does in *Hyperion*, the dreamlike structure employed by Keats allows the action to later move diachronically by means of the dreamer, who is allowed to travel back in time to see for himself the events that have led to the fall of the Titans.

The poet or the dreamer is a pivotal character in Keats’s *The Fall of Hyperion* as all the action is divulged to the reader by means of the poet relating what he has dreamed. The dreamer fulfils an absolutely crucial role in relating the events that have taken place to the reader and therefore the poet is portrayed as a source of information by Keats. The dreamer is also representative of imaginative self-transcendence because he does not actually experience the wonderful array of events he relates to the reader, but merely dreams of the events. Therefore most of the action in *The Fall of Hyperion* may only be a

figment of the imagination of the dreamer and it is in this sense that the dreamer represents imaginative self-transcendence: he is able to captivate the reader not by relating the actual action, but by presenting the reader with a representation of the action ordered according to his imagination.

Within the poem itself, the dreamer at first finds himself in a forest where he comes across a banquet of fruit. He feasts on the fruit, which makes him thirsty. After drinking a toast to poetry, the poet quickly becomes intoxicated and, against his will, falls asleep:

> Upon the grass, I struggled hard against
> The domineering potion; but in vain:
> The cloudy swoon came on, and down I sank
> Like a Silenus on an antique vase.
> How long I slumber'd 'tis a chance to guess.
> When sense of life return'd, I started up
> As if with wings; but the fair trees were gone
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:53-59)[5]

The invocation of the mythological character Silenus is aptly suited because in mythology, the old satyr Silenus is depicted as perpetually drunk and thus he has difficulty in distinguishing between dream and reality (Graves, 1992:132). After drinking his toast, the poet sleeps for a prolonged period of time and when he awakes (or when he seems to think he awakes), the scenery has changed completely as the poet notices that the ruins in which he finds himself are so old that he 'remember'd none / The like upon the earth' (I:65-66). The poet then sees an altar aloft, with two lengthy staircases on either side of it in the distance. As he makes his way towards the stairs, he hears the voice of Moneta, the Roman equivalent of the Greek goddess of memory, Mnemosyne (Grimal, 1991:279-280). Moneta challenges the poet to ascend the staircase, yet she also presents him with a threat:

> 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.
> The sands of thy short life are spent this hour,
> And no hand in the universe can turn
> Thy hourglass, if these gummed leaves be burnt
> Ere thou canst mount up these immortal steps.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:107-117)

As the poet starts making his way towards the staircase, he starts dying, but as soon as he sets his foot on the first stair of the staircase he is reborn. The seemingly insurmountable staircase is symbolical of the pain which the poet must endure in order to gain a higher consciousness. Metaphorically, before the poet starts ascending the staircase, he finds himself in the physical, mundane world. The staircase represents the medium through which he can gain entry into the transcendental world of the Platonic ideal, thus the top of the staircase implicitly signifies the actual transcendental Platonic world. However, the Platonic world is not accessible to everyone and thus the poet has to pass a test (ascend the staircase) in order to gain access to the Platonic world. The poet furthermore realises that his imagination and sensitivity will expire if he remains captured in the mundane world, and he starts dying to his old self on his way to begin with his attempt to attain a higher consciousness:

> Struck from the pavèd level up my limbs,
> And was ascending quick to put cold grasp
> Upon those streams that pulse beside the throat.
> I shriek'd, and the sharp anguish of my shriek
> Stung my own ears; I strove hard to escape
> The numbness, strove to gain the lowest step.
> Slow, heavy, deadly was my pace: the cold
> Grew stifling, suffocating, at the heart;
> And when I clasp'd my hands I felt them not.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:123-131)

As soon as the poet reaches the first step, he immediately feels invigorated:

> One minute before death, my iced foot touch'd
> The lowest stair; and as it touch'd, life seem'd
> To pour in at the toes: I mounted up
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:132-134)

The near death of the poet signifies the suffocation that the imagination and one's sensitivity suffer in the mundane physical world, and unless one makes an attempt to transcend this mundane world to the ideal Platonic world, one's imagination and sensitivity will expire.

For the reason that the poet realises that his imagination is dying and because he attempts to stop it, he is rewarded with the opportunity of trying to gain a higher consciousness. As the poet makes his way slowly up the staircase, which leads to a transcended consciousness, Moneta tells him that he has been granted a second chance at life because he is one of 'those to whom the miseries of the world / Are misery' (I:148-149). As a poet, the dreamer is capable of being imaginative and sensitive and thus he can see and embrace the miseries of the world for what they truly are: the opportunity to transcend the miserable and mundane world to enter the Platonic ideal. Thus the dreamer, as a poet, is able to perceive the truth of misery due to his superior imagination and sensitivity. Moneta also tells the poet that in order for him to become a worthy and true poet, he must seek out and endure pain and suffering as he must be different from all the false and unworthy poets (I:150-160).

Moneta reveals to the poet that she is tormented by images of the Titans' pain and suffering: 'Still swooning vivid through my globed brain / With an electral changing misery' (I:245-246). As the goddess of memory, Moneta is unable to forget the battle of the *Titanomachia* and must relive the pain of the Titans' defeat through her vivid memory. The poet then begs Moneta to 'Let me [him] behold, according as thou [Moneta] saidst, / What in thy [her] brain so ferments to and fro' (I:289-290). Subsequently, 'No sooner had this conjuration pass'd / My [the poet's] devout lips' (I:291-292), than the poet finds himself standing side by side with Moneta in Saturn's temple.

As previously mentioned, the opening lines of Keats's *Hyperion* are quoted verbatim by Moneta in *The Fall of Hyperion* (I:294-295). By quoting these lines from *Hyperion*, the mournful essence of the poem is instantly recaptured in *The Fall of Hyperion*,

emphasising Moneta's grief and despair. In addition to showing that Moneta has an accurate recollection of the events depicted in *Hyperion*, the lines quoted from *Hyperion* emphasise that *The Fall of Hyperion* follows *Hyperion* chronologically. These direct quotations allow the poet to see and experience the events related in *Hyperion* first hand, with the contextualising commentary of Moneta to inform him of precisely what he is seeing as the events unfold and play out before him. Therefore *The Fall of Hyperion* can be seen as the sequel to *Hyperion*.

Apart from being the goddess of memory, Moneta is also the mint in Juno's temple and we derive our words for 'money' and 'mint' from her (Smith, 1952:194). By virtue of being associated with the Roman mint, Moneta is intimately associated with currency. This association is significant because Moneta acts as a currency or go-between between Keats's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*: it is through her 'exchange' with the poet that the reader is informed of the events that have taken place in *Hyperion*, and thus she is the bridge or medium of exchange between the two poems. By means of her memory of the events in *Hyperion*, Moneta is the common denominator between the two poems. Symbolically, Moneta (memory) is the currency with which immortality is bought (by means of the continuous recollection of the events of the *Titanomachia*).

Like Mnemosyne, Moneta is portrayed as a guardian figure because she is the 'Sole priestess of this desolation' (II:227). As befits her role, she is depicted as a powerful figure who has power over both time and space and can traverse both of these at will because she can travel with the dreamer in order for him to see the events depicted in *Hyperion* (II:292-293). Moneta's duty is to preserve an accurate account of the battle of the *Titanomachia* as portrayed in Keats's *Hyperion*. Accordingly, Moneta is not allowed to vary from the detail of the battle as described in *Hyperion*, thus she is able to show the dreamer the following:

> This temple, sad and lone,
> Is all spar'd from the thunder of a war
> Foughten long since by giant hierarchy
> Against rebellion: this old image here,

> Whose carved features wrinkled as he fell,
> Is Saturn's; I Moneta, left supreme
> Sole priestess of this desolation.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:221-227)

Moneta furthermore has to simplify her language so that the poet can understand it: 'Mortal, that thou mayst understand aright, / I humanize my sayings to thine ear' (II:1-2). Moneta's normal elevated, complex language reveals the power of her intellect and imagination, in turn indicating that divinity cannot be reduced to human comprehension. Due to the fact that Moneta has to simplify her language, she demonstrates her superior metalinguistic ability, which indicates that she is part of some kind of future or more advanced race because her language has evolved further than that of the poet's. It would also appear as though Moneta has the ability both to control and travel in space and time in order to serve her role of guardian as she is able to whisk the dreamer away to another time and place:

> Let me behold, according as thou sadist,
> What in thy brain so ferments to and fro!
> No sooner had this conjuration past
> My devout lips, than side by side we stood
> (Like a stunt bramble by a solemn pine)
> Deep in the shady sadness of a vale [the first line of *Hyperion*]
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:289-294)

The place and time Moneta whisks the dreamer away to are in fact the place and time where the narrative in *Hyperion* starts. While this ability or 'power' that Moneta has is of great value to the dreamer, it is to her a source of great suffering as she is forced to relive the Titans' defeat through her memory of it:

> My power, which to me is still a curse,
> Shall be to thee a wonder; for the scenes
> Still swooning vivid through my globed brain,
> With an electral changing misery
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, I:243-247)

As the currency through which immortality is bought, Moneta (memory) has to pay the price of reliving painful memories, indicating that memories are not always pleasant – they can be painful too.

When we consider Keats's displacement of the literary archetypes, we note that like Hesiod's presentation of the Hyperion myth, the archetypes that are displaced by Keats stem from the quintessential quest myth. In Keats's poems, the Olympian gods were on an evidently successful quest to overthrow their parents. In *The Fall of Hyperion*, the poet is one who is called to quest by Moneta, who challenges him to ascend the seemingly impossibly high flight of stairs. As already mentioned, the staircase represents the test that the poet must pass in order for him to transcend from his present mundane, physical world to the Platonic world of ideas and perfection. The staircase is essentially the link between the mundane and Platonic worlds, and as such is a symbol of the ascendance to the divine.

By virtue of representing the connection between the mundane and Platonic worlds, Keats's staircase may be likened to the Biblical Jacob's ladder. According to the Bible, Jacob 'had a dream in which he saw a stairway resting on the earth, with its top reaching to heaven, and the angels of God were ascending and descending on it' (Genesis 28:12, New International Version). Significantly, Jacob has his dream while sleeping in a wasteland, thus representing the mundane world. He then dreams of a link – a ladder – between this mundane world and heaven (the perfect world envisaged by Plato). The Jungian writer Laurens van der Post (1975:5) views Jacob's dream of the ladder connecting heaven and earth as an archetypal expression of the interpretation of the immortal and the divine. For van der Post (1975:12), Jacob's dream is 'the progenitor of all other dreams, visionary material, and mythological and allegorical activity that were to follow'. Thus, Keats's staircase is an archetypal expression of his interpretation of the ascension from the mortal and earthly to the immortal and the divine.

In moving to Keats's treatment of the archetypal succession myth, it should be noted that there is a fundamental difference between the two versions presented by Keats and

Hesiod. While Hesiod's original presentation of the myth concerns the physical suffering of the Titans and the endurance of physical pain, Keats's poems instead depict the mental suffering of the Titans. Keats seems more concerned with the psychological effects of the succession myth and the change in the individual psyches of the Titans. As will presently be shown, Keats meticulously describes the psychological state of the Titans, and particularly Hyperion and Saturn, in the first book of *Hyperion*. It is as though Keats is insisting that mental or psychological suffering is as difficult, if not more so, to endure than physical suffering. Crucially, by focusing on the psychological effects of the Titans' removal from power, Keats gives his epic a human dimension to which the reader can relate.

The psychologically depicted manner in which Keats describes the Titans' reaction to their loss of sovereignty is underlined in that it correlates to the five stages of grief posited by Elisabeth Kübler-Ross in her book, *On Death and Dying* (1969). The Titans' expression of grief consequently humanises them, making the transition from abstract narrative to a depiction of the human condition. Elisabeth Kübler-Ross (1969:45-60) identifies five stages of grief when dealing with a terminal illness or catastrophic loss as: (1) denial, (2) anger, (3) bargaining, (4) depression, and (5) acceptance. The Titans are seen moving between the stages of acceptance as they firstly deny that they have been overthrown:

> Search, Thea, search! and tell me if thou seest
> A certain shape or shadow, making way
> With wings or chariot fierce to repossess
> A heaven he lost erewhile: it must
> Be of ripe progress – Saturn must be King!
> Yes, there must be golden victory.
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:121-126)

Saturn has clearly not yet accepted the fact that he has been overthrown and he is unrealistically still claiming that he must be king. His denial is further emphasised by his belief that Hyperion will 'repossess / A heaven he lost erewhile' (*Hyperion*, I:124-125).

The Titans also reveal anger, the second stage of dealing with grief. Hyperion is predominantly the Titan who embodies anger as:

> He enter't, but he enter'd full of wrath;
> His flaming robes streamed out beyond his heels,
> And gave a roar, as if of earthly fire.
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:213-215)

Hyperion further expresses extreme anger as he resolutely refuses to:

> Fall! – No, by Tellus and her briny robes
> Over the fiery frontier of my realms
> I [he] will advance a terrible right arm [and]
> Shall scare that infant thunderer, Rebel Jove [the Roman equivalent of Zeus]
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:246-249)

Hyperion is evidently livid about the fact that the Titans have been deposed and he is furiously making plans to avenge their dishonour.

Saturn is then consequently seen embodying the third stage of dealing with grief, namely that of bargaining and reasoning about the fate of the Titans. Saturn seeks another Chaos from which to fashion forth another universe, asking:

> But cannot I create?
> Cannot I form? Cannot I fashion forth
> Another world, another universe?
>
> (*Hyperion*, I:141-143)

Saturn reasons that if he was once able to create a universe out of chaos, he should be able to do it again, given that he is provided with another chaos. However, the initiative has been taken away from Saturn and he is depicted as passively waiting for another chaos, as opposed to proactively seeking one.

The fourth stage, namely that of depression, is depicted in the Titans' council where all the Titans are represented as being completely and utterly dejected. The location of the Titans' council is referred to as:

> … that sad place
> Where Cybele and the bruised Titans mourn'd.
> It was a den where no insulting light
> Could glimmer on their tears …
>
> (*Hyperion*, II:3-6)

Evidently, the Titans are so overcome with grief that they actually cry: Thea weeps at Saturn's feet (*Hyperion*, I:71) and the Titans' council is held in obscurity so that their tears will not glisten in the light (*Hyperion*, II:5-6). Their pain is intensified due to the fact that they are feeding off each other's grief:

> As with us mortal men, the laden heart
> Is persecuted more, and fever'd more,
> When it is nighing to the mournful house
> Where other hearts are sick of the same bruise
>
> (*Hyperion*, II: 101-106)

In the Titans' case, misery certainly does love company as the Titans seek solitude in each other's company. However, while companionship fulfils their yearning not to be alone, it also has the effect of compounding their grief because all the Titans are huddled together, trying to come to terms with their grief.

The Titans finally accept the fact that they have been overthrown because they realise that the Olympians are fated to succeed them due to their evolutionary superiority. By means of depicting how the Titans deal with the fifth stage of grief, namely that of acceptance, Keats explicitly alludes to the inevitability of the succession of the offspring. Thus the Titans are finally prepared and willing to accept their fate because they realise

that they are part of an evolutionary process. Oceanus is the first to realise and accept that:

> So on our [their] heels a fresh perfection treads,
> A power more strong in beauty, born of us [them]
> And *fated* [emphasis mine] to excel us [them]
>
> (*Hyperion*, II:212-214)

By assuming the role of their parents, the Olympians are one step closer to achieving individuation. However, in order to achieve individuation, the Olympians need to gain a higher consciousness before they can be psychologically reborn into a higher realm of consciousness. The characters need to transcend mortality through their attainment of higher perception in order to gain immortality. Apollo rises to a higher order of reality because he 'Die[s] into life' (*Hyperion*, III:130), which represents his transition from mortality to immortality. As already mentioned earlier, by dying into life, Keats depicts the loss of personal identity as a kind of dying, but it is a dying into life because Apollo discovers the immortal self within him, even while keeping his own self (Benton, 1966:40).

It would seem only logical that if one order of characters attains immortality by overthrowing another order of characters, the other order must become mortal. It is evident that the Olympians attain immortality, while the Titans' immortality is invalidated in the process. Therefore, as previously mentioned, it is the supposedly immortal Titans who are perceived as being weak and fragile as Thea weeps at Saturn's feet (*Hyperion*, I:71) and the Titans meet under the cover of darkness so that their tears are not revealed (*Hyperion*, II:5-6). It is Hyperion's father, Cœlus, who recognises the fact that the Titans have in fact become 'most unlike gods' (I:328). To this end, Walter Evert argues that Keats conversely stresses a thematic point of his own in *Hyperion*, namely 'that the loss of godhead *defines the condition of manhood* [emphasis mine]. What a wretchedly limited creature undeified deity becomes is simply what mortal man has always been' (Evert, 1965:230).

More important, however, is Apollo's transcendence of the human condition through the powers of the imagination, stimulated by beauty to perceive and attain truth. By attaining and perceiving truth, Apollo enters the transcendental realm symbolised by immortality. Ultimately, Apollo is reborn into the Platonic world of truth, guided by memory (Mnemosyne). Symbolically, Apollo is immortalised by memory, which defeats and defies time because every time the memory of someone is invoked, that person lives on through the memory of the one remembering and is thus immortalised. Mnemosyne, as the personification of memory, represents timelessness because she is not bound by time: she can move backwards and forwards in time. She thus defeats time and, as mentioned earlier, she needs to relive painful memories in order to defeat time, revealing that memories are not always pleasant – they can also be painful. As the guardian of the memory of the painful events that took place in *Hyperion*, Mnemosyne has the truth of the *Titanomachia* and is therefore implicitly part of the transcendental realm of immortality.

In summation, the truth that is associated with the transcendence to the realm of immortality by means of psychological rebirth necessarily leads to the attainment of individuation. The enlightenment that Apollo experiences when he is reborn into a higher consciousness generates the ability to perceive the truth contained within the transcendental realm described by Plato. The truth that Apollo is able to perceive after being reborn leads to his individuation. As mentioned earlier, the process of individuation firstly signifies the hero's successful completion of the quest, and secondly results in the fullest possible consciousness for him, meaning that he is able to perceive all the truth that he is capable of perceiving (Storr, 1973:81). As a result, by means of achieving individuation, Apollo presents a newer and more advanced race of beings that have transcended to a higher realm of consciousness and Apollo and the Olympians must accordingly have greater power and rule.

[1] Towards the end of his school years, Keats would rather immerse himself in Virgil's *Æneid* than playing sports outside and the work fascinated Keats so much that by the time he left school he had translated a

considerable portion of it voluntarily – so much so that he was awarded the prize given by John Clarke for the student who did the greatest amount of voluntary schoolwork (Hewlett, 1938:30).

[2] Grace Landrum (1927:987) dates Keats's first exposure to Chapman as either October 1815 or after the summer holiday of 1816, but irrespective of the two dates provided it was early enough to influence his entire writing career.

[3] With his *Hyperion*, Keats tried to imitate and challenge Milton's epic *Paradise Lost* (1667) (Hirsch, 2001:vii), so much so that one of the reasons Keats gave up on the unfinished epic was that 'it had too many Miltonic inversions in it' (Scudder, 1899:408).

[4] Because Keats's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* are respectively divided into books and cantos, references to the two poems will forthwith only list the title, the book or canto, and the lines quoted.

[5] Due to the fact that Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion* is divided into three cantos, references to this poem will appear in the same format as references to *Hyperion*.

Chapter III: Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*

Dan Simmons is one of the more prominent science fiction writers. He is most widely known for his Hugo Award-winning tetralogy called the *Hyperion Cantos*. The *Hyperion Cantos* consist of *Hyperion* (1989), *The Fall of Hyperion* (1990), *Endymion* (1996), and *The Rise of Endymion* (1997). Simmons's *Hyperion* received the Hugo Award for best novel in 1990 and *The Fall of Hyperion* was nominated for the Nebula Award for best novel in 1990. The Hugo Awards are given every year for the best science fiction or fantasy works of the previous year and it is arguably the most sought-after award for science fiction writers (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:259). The awards are named after Hugo Gernsback, who founded the pioneering science fiction magazine *Amazing Stories* in 1926, and have been presented every year since 1955 (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:259). The Nebula Award is an award given each year by the Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers of America (SFWA) for the best science fiction or fantasy fiction published in the United States of America during the two previous years (Knight, 2002:1). Three of the *Hyperion Cantos* novels (*Hyperion*, *The Fall of Hyperion* and *The Rise of Endymion*) have also received Locus Awards. The Locus Awards were established in 1971 and are presented to winners of *Locus Magazine's* annual readers' poll. Simmons's *Carrion Comfort* (1989), *Entropy's Bed at Midnight* (1990) *Summer of Night* (1991), *Children of the Night* (1992), *Fires of Eden* (1995), and *Ilium* (2003) have also won Locus Awards, thus enhancing his stature as a writer.

The two novels that have been selected for this dissertation are the first two novels of the *Hyperion Cantos*, namely *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*. The reason for only focussing on the first two novels is that, apart from its being too ambitious a research project to examine all four, the narrative begun in *Hyperion* is completed in *The Fall of Hyperion*. Even though certain characters reappear in *Endymion* and *The Rise of Endymion*, the plot, time, and setting are different from that of *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*. Furthermore, even though Keats wrote an epic entitled *Endymion*, he never wrote a work entitled *The Rise of Endymion*. As a result, there is a more prominent

parallel to be drawn between the respective versions of Keats's and Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*, but not between Keats's and Simmons's *Endymion*.

Apart from falling under the umbrella term of science fiction, Dan Simmons's *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* are further classified as what is known as 'space opera' (Hartwell, 2006:311). According to Hartwell and Cramer (2005:264), space opera is today perceived to mean:

> … colorful, dramatic, large-scale science fiction adventure, competently and sometimes beautifully written, usually focused on a sympathetic, heroic central character, and plot action (this bit is what separates it from other literary postmodernisms) and usually set in the relatively distant future and in space or on other worlds, characteristically optimistic in tone. What is centrally important is that this permits a writer to embark on a science-fiction project that is ambitious in both commercial and literary terms.
>
> (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:264)

Space opera was originally the name that was given to all hack science fiction writing and was derived from the terms 'soap opera' and 'horse opera' – the horse opera was the name given to popular Western stories prevalent during the 1940s when the term 'space opera' was coined by Wilson Tucker (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:260). However, works referred to by the term gradually grew in stature from the 1970s, when Lester Del Rey reissued the works of Leigh Brackett, one of the most respected science fiction writers of the 1970s, and praised them as 'space opera' (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:262). It took nearly ten years for the reassigned meaning of the term to become popularised, but by the 1980s the alteration of the perceived meaning of the term 'space opera' had been accomplished and by the mid-1980s the term 'space opera' was used by marketers to denote popular best-selling science fiction (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:263).

Donald Lawler says the following of space opera:

> Space opera is a form of the fantasy SF story that treats heroic if not superman adventure on an interplanetary or intergalactic scale. Improbable action is the stock and trade of space opera. The exploits of its characters are both exaggerated and implausible as judged by ordinary standards of human capability. However, in the hyper-realities of the space opera adventure, characters achieve the normally

> unattainable and perform the impossible through sheer inventiveness, ingenuity, courage, and will power. To this degree, the *space opera shares certain qualities with its remote epic ancestors* [emphasis mine].
>
> (Lawler, 1978:99)

This definition certainly applies to mythology as well since 'improbable action' is common in mythology. Almost all of the action in mythology, and particularly in Hesiod's *Titanomachia*, is improbable, such as the blood that dropped onto the earth after Uranus was castrated, bringing forth the birth of the three Erinnyes, and Zeus throwing Mount Etna onto the monster Typhon after the *Gigantomachia* (Hesiod, 1983:34-80). It is also evident that the exploits of the gods are 'exaggerated and implausible as judged by ordinary standards of human capability', but they are divine and not mortal after all. There is evidently a valid case to be made for space opera, in its entirety, being a mythological theme. Furthermore, from 1982 to 2002, the Hugo Award has generally been awarded to space opera novels (Hartwell and Cramer, 2005:259), thus the fact that space opera novels are being awarded the highest honours science fiction has to offer is testimony to the prominence of the space opera sub-genre.

In moving to a synopsis of Simmons's novels, it is noticeable that although set in approximately 2732 AD, the narrative of Simmons's *Hyperion* closely resembles that of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (circa 1386) (Hartwell, 2006:311). In *Hyperion*, humankind has dispersed across the entire universe following the 'Big Mistake' during which the earth was obliterated. The seven pilgrims in Simmons's *Hyperion* have been selected by the Shrike Church, also called the Church of Final Atonement, to make the journey to the planet of Hyperion in order to monitor the imminent opening of the Time Tombs. The Time Tombs are monumental, temple-like structures that were built at an unspecified date in the future, from which they are moving *back* in time to the present. Should they open, the Shrike will be released into the 'web' of planets ruled by the Hegemony of Man (the governing body of the universe).

The Shrike is essentially Simmons's monster and is depicted as a tall, powerful figure with four arms, and its whole body is covered in razor-sharp steel spikes. It is called the

Shrike because, like the butcherbird from which its name is derived, it impales its victims. Specifically, it has a steel tree with steel thorns which serve as an instrument of impalement, and his victims are fated to suffer on it. The Shrike's steel tree, however, exists in some sort of parallel universe as the sufferers wriggle on the tree, yet they are also depicted in a coma-like state within the Time Tombs with a wire that connects their brains to the Shrike's steel tree. Consequently, the Shrike's victims are in fact merely dreaming that they are suffering. The Shrike also has the ability to control time, meaning that it can move backward and forward in time and it has the ability to make time pass apparently extremely slowly while it, in reality, still moves at normal speed, allowing it to attack and kill its victims with ease. The Shrike is also intricately associated with the Time Tombs.

The Shrike is furthermore depicted as some kind of demi-god as it has its own group of religious followers who believe it is the 'Angel of Final Atonement, come from a place beyond time to announce the end of the human race' (*Hyperion*, p223). The Shrike's followers see it as an avatar of retribution and believe that everyone must face it at some point in their life, after which the Shrike will decide whether the person lives or dies. It is also one of the characters that represents timelessness in Simmons's novels and can thus be seen as a symbol of humankind in relation to time, and consequently as man in relation to mortality and fate. The Shrike signifies the final destination of the pilgrims' quest for individuation. Significantly, it does not kill all the people it comes across, which reinforces the idea that it represents fate because it 'decides' who lives and who dies. When one of the seven pilgrims, Martin Silenus, sees the Shrike for the first time, he describes how he did not so much actually see it but rather that it 'impinge[d] on my [his] consciousness' (*Hyperion*, p231), consolidating the Shrike's portrayal as the master of time.

The seven pilgrims who make the journey to Hyperion are Sol Weintraub and his infant daughter, Rachel (who is not counted as one of the pilgrims), Het Masteen, Colonel Fedmahn Kassad, Brawne Lamia, Martin Silenus, the Consul, and Father Lenar Hoyt. Like in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, each of the seven pilgrims gets a turn to tell his or

her life story as they make their way to Hyperion on a spaceship. When the pilgrims reach Hyperion, they find that the capital city, Keats, is in complete disarray. The disarray is the result of an ever-increasing number of Shrike killings and the population is trying desperately to flee Hyperion out of fear of becoming its next victim. The seven pilgrims only briefly land in Keats, because they are in fact going to the Time Tombs in another part of Hyperion. They cannot land close to the Time Tombs due to the entropic fields surrounding it (entropy being a measure of how evenly energy is distributed in any given system – Simmons evidently uses entropy as a means of adding to the mysterious aura of the Time Tombs). One of the central narratives in *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* concerns the opening of the Time Tombs, which coincides with several other events in the novels.

It is not only the Hegemony who has a vested interest in Hyperion and the Time Tombs. Following the Big Mistake (during which the earth was destroyed), a faction of humans split off from the Hegemony of Man and set up their own colonies on distant planets not under Hegemony rule. This faction is called the 'Ousters' and they too have a great interest in Hyperion and the Time Tombs. The interest in Hyperion and the Time Tombs is also shared by the TechnoCore, a body of artificial intelligence beings. The TechnoCore is divided into three factions, namely the 'Stables', the 'Volatiles', and the 'Ultimates'. As indicated by their name, the Stables are content to support the *status quo*. However, the Ultimates support the TechnoCore's ultimate intelligence initiative, but the ultimate intelligence initiative would require resources currently used by the Stables and hence the Stables would have to be 'killed'. However, the Stables do not wish to die and hence they oppose the TechnoCore's ultimate intelligence project. Furthermore, the TechnoCore operates in three spheres, namely the smaller datasphere (essentially an advanced version of the Internet, yet limited to one planet), the larger megasphere (which contains a number of dataspheres), and the all-encompassing metasphere (which is effectively infinite, from a data-storing perspective, and encompasses all the knowledge and information that humanity and the TechnoCore have acquired to date).

The TechnoCore is also responsible for the correct functioning of the ‘farcasters’, which are essentially Simmons’s term for teleports, and by stepping through one of them one can be teleported to a preselected destination across the entire universe if a farcaster had already been built there. However, Hyperion is an outback world, meaning that there are no farcasters connecting it to the web of planets controlled by the Hegemony. The Hegemony has deliberately not placed farcasters on Hyperion because they could potentially allow the Shrike entry into its entire realm. Humans have become reliant on farcasters as a means of interplanetary transport and thus they have become reliant on the TechnoCore. The TechnoCore is only too happy to play the part of the obedient servant, but unknown to the Hegemony, the TechnoCore is in fact trying to realise their ultimate intelligence initiative. It plans on using billions of human minds throughout the web of Hegemony planets in the farcaster network in order to construct one enormous computer, with each human mind acting as an electrode within a larger network. This essentially accounts for the TechnoCore’s interest in Hyperion, the Time Tombs, and especially the Shrike: the TechnoCore wants the pilgrims’ quest to fail because the Shrike will then be released into the web of Hegemony planets. The TechnoCore intends to employ the Shrike as their ‘harvester’ of human brains for their ultimate intelligence initiative. Crucially, the Shrike’s victims merely dream that they are impaled on its steel tree of suffering, because in reality their bodies remain unharmed inside the Time Tombs. Here their brains are connected with electrical cables to a larger network, which is presumably the TechnoCore’s envisaged network of human minds. However, to use the human brains, they have to be alive and they are therefore placed in an induced dreamlike state.

The Hegemony, the Ousters, and the TechnoCore all have an interest in Hyperion because of the Shrike and the Time Tombs, and as such are all interested in the seven pilgrims’ mission. The Hegemony, unlike the TechnoCore, wants the pilgrims to succeed because if they are there when the Time Tombs open, the Shrike will be prevented from entering the entire web of Hegemony planets. The Ousters also want control over Hyperion because of the Time Tombs: they might not have figured out the exact significance of the Time Tombs, but they have identified it as strategically important and thus they are monitoring the situation on Hyperion. Hyperion may consequently be seen

as holding the fate of humankind because it contains the Time Tombs, which will allow humanity the opportunity to travel forward in time and contain the Shrike, but only if the pilgrims can reach the Time Tombs before they open. Thus, if the pilgrims do not reach the Time Tombs in time, humankind will lose control over Hyperion and with it the chance of containing the Shrike.

The Time Tombs are intimately associated with Sol Weintraub's daughter, Rachel, as it is revealed through his tale that she has contracted 'Merlin Disease' (a disease which causes her to age backwards) on a previous visit to Hyperion. The moment at which Rachel will cease to exist seems to coincide with the predicted opening of the Time Tombs. The source of Simmons's inspiration for Rachel's Merlin Disease is found in the myth concerning the old, drunk satyr, Silenus. According to the myth, the drunken Silenus was found by the gardeners of king Midas and brought before the king. Silenus then told king Midas wonderful stories of the myth of Atlantis, and amongst the wonders of this magical continent was a frightening whirlpool with two streams close by (Graves, 1992:281). On the banks of these two rivers grew two very distinct trees: the fruit of the trees on the one bank causes those who eat it to weep, groan and pine away (Graves, 1992:281). However, the fruit on the trees on the second bank is said to renew the eater's youth – to such an extent where people who eat the fruit will start ageing backwards, through the life phases of middle age, young adulthood, adolescence, childhood, the toddler phase, and infancy before finally disappearing (Graves, 1992:281). By making Martin Silenus one of the seven pilgrims, Simmons is acknowledging his indebtedness to the Classical myth for inspiring his conception of Rachel's Merlin Disease. However, the character of Martin Silenus will be more fully discussed when the problematic distinction between dream and reality is dealt with at a later stage. For the present moment, is it sufficient to note that Rachel will evidently play a crucial part in determining humankind's fate in Simmons's novels, yet her role remains unarticulated in *Hyperion*. The first novel simply ends with the pilgrims walking off into the sunset towards the Time Tombs, thus leaving many questions unanswered.

The Fall of Hyperion picks up where *Hyperion* left off, but with the addition of a few more characters and a more intricate plot as it is revealed how the seven pilgrims are split up and how and under which circumstances each of them meets the Shrike. Moreover, because the Hyperion holds the fate of humankind, *The Fall of Hyperion* depicts the fall of the Hegemony of Man (as orchestrated by the TechnoCore) and the subsequent establishment of a new world order. In *The Fall of Hyperion*, the narrative concerns the imminent opening of the Time Tombs and the attack of the Ousters. The seven pilgrims have lost all contact with the Hegemony and thus the Hegemony has no way of tracking the whereabouts of the seven pilgrims.

A cybrid reincarnation of John Keats has the ability to dream whatever is happening to the seven pilgrims. The John Keats cybrid is an artificial intelligence life form that was created by accurately applying technology to create the most probable persona of John Keats. The letters and poems written by and to John Keats were used to construct the artificial intelligence Keats persona. A cybrid is one of the concepts that have been popularised by science fiction and it is in essence a bionic man, or part man and part machine. A cybrid is different from a cyborg because a cyborg is essentially a human with mechanical parts (a human becoming a machine), while a cybrid is a machine to which human elements, such as artificial and emotional intelligence, are added (machine becoming human) (Fischman, 2010:35). The etymological derivation of the word 'bionic' comes from bi (life) and onics (short for electronics), which is the study of mechanical systems that function like living organisms or parts of living organisms (Fischman, 2010:35). The word 'cybrid' signifies a hybrid or evolutionary state in which artificial intelligence (robots or machines) is drawing nearer and nearer to simulating human life. The Keats cybrid is essentially the fusion between man and machine. However, this fusion that the Keats cybrid represents will be more fully discussed at a later stage.

The Keats cybrid's ability to dream about the events as experienced by the pilgrims as they are happening is extremely important to the Chief Executive Officer and leader of the Hegemony, Meina Gladstone. As in Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion*,[1] the reader is

informed by having the action related to him by means of the recounting of one of the characters' dreams. However, the TechnoCore does not want the Keats cybrid to have contact with the Hegemony because as part of the TechnoCore, it has access to the megasphere and can thus reveal the TechnoCore's plans to the Hegemony. Because the TechnoCore controls the farcasters, it is able to orchestrate the deliberate 'malfunctioning' of a farcaster used by the Keats cybrid. The designed 'malfunction' results in the Keats cybrid being sent to a deserted planet called 'Old Earth', which is in fact revealed to be the actual preserved earth. On Old Earth, the Keats cybrid starts to show the symptoms of tuberculosis and it is revealed that 'he'[2] is fated to suffer and die in the same way and location in which John Keats did historically. Much of this second novel describes the isolation and death of the Keats cybrid on Old Earth at the hands of the TechnoCore.

It is furthermore revealed that the Ousters have attacked Hyperion in their quest to gain control over Hyperion and the Time Tombs. The Hegemony did not anticipate the attack because Hyperion is an outback world, meaning that it would take the Ousters years to reach Hyperion by 'normal' space travel. However, the Ousters launched their attack several years ago and thus they manage to surprise the Hegemony. As soon as Hyperion is attacked, several other planets under Hegemony control also come under attack. At first, the Hegemony logically assumes that it too must be the work of the Ousters.

The Keats cybrid realises that, because he is part of the TechnoCore, he should be able to access the megasphere, even though he is isolated and imprisoned on Old Earth. Whilst in the megasphere, he meets the TechnoCore deity, Ummon,[3] who reveals that it is in fact the TechnoCore, and not the Ousters, which is attacking the other Hegemony planets. The Keats cybrid further learns from Ummon that the TechnoCore plans on releasing the Shrike into the web of Hegemony planets so that the TechnoCore can use the billions of humans brains (while they are suffering in a dreamlike state on the Shrike's tree) to realise their ultimate intelligence initiative. Ummon also reveals that the TechnoCore resides within the farcaster network and thus already have a substantial network within which to operate (lacking physical form, the TechnoCore was initially reliant on

humankind to build farcasters across the web of Hegemony planets, thus providing the TechnoCore with a physical 'host'). After gaining access to the higher megasphere, the Keats cybrid reveals to Meina Gladstone all the information he has obtained whilst in the megasphere.

The information divulged by the Keats cybrid allows Meina Gladstone to give orders to the Hegemony's military wing, the FORCE, to blow up the entire farcaster network, and the menacing aspect of the TechnoCore, namely the Ultimates, along with it. Almost immediately after the Keats cybrid has communicated with Meina Gladstone, he dies of consumption in number 26 Piazza di Spagna, Rome, on the preserved Old Earth. Crucially, it is only the physical body of the Keats cybrid that expires on Old Earth – his consciousness remains alive in the megasphere. *The Fall of Hyperion* concludes with Rachel being handed over to the Shrike, the opening of the Time Tombs, the detonation of the network of farcasters, and crucially, the rebirth of the Keats cybrid into the metasphere.

With regards to the criticism that is available on the works of Dan Simmons, it should be noted that not much has been written about either him or his works. There are no books on either Simmons or any of his works and it will therefore have to suffice to refer to the few articles that have indeed been written on his most popular works. To this end, Christopher Palmer rather vaguely remarks that:

> [S]everal of the names of characters in the *Hyperion* novels are drawn from names associated with Keats: Moneta, Joseph Severn (Keats's friend and deathbed companion), Brawne Lamia (a hybrid of the poet's beloved and a personage from one of his poems). There are quotations, casual references, passages of pastiched romantic poetry. The novels' details connect with a definable literary culture as well as with the common constituents of sf [science fiction], to an effect of richness, even overload, along with some elements of jarring pastiche. But there is not a lot to be gained from tracing detailed parallels between Simmons's narrative and the Keats story…
>
> (Palmer, 1991:76)

Palmer neither elaborates on the Keatsian references he has recognised in Simmons's novels, nor does he attempt to explain the explicit reworking of Keats's poems into

Simmons's novel in any detail whatsoever. Furthermore, Palmer argues that Simmons's novels should be seen as an allegory of multiculturalism and a response to 'the decadent consumerism of the 1980s' (in reference to Simmons's excessive invention of houses with portals for rooms so that each room can be on a different planet). In contradistinction to Teilhard de Chardin's metaphysics (as previously dealt with), Palmer insists on interpreting Simmons's *Hyperion* novels as social commentary, reasoning that it is the science fictional aspect rather than the Keatsian or mythological aspects that deserve the majority of the critic's attention.

Palmer also appears to have misread Simmons's novels, and in particular the function of the Shrike's character within the novels. As has been argued previously, the Shrike signifies the final destination of the pilgrims' quest for individuation, and is therefore symbolical of the final test that must be overcome before individuation is attained. Consequently, because the Shrike is the 'Angel of Final Atonement' (*Hyperion*, p223), the pilgrims seek out the Shrike for profound personal and philosophical reasons, not for perverse personal reasons as claimed by Palmer (1991:80). For the pilgrims, the Shrike does indeed represent the final atonement: each one of the pilgrims was destined to meet the Shrike, who will essentially provide them with the answers they were seeking in their psychic quest and will decide whether they live or die. Martin Silenus seeks out the Shrike because he is inspired (by all the Shrike's killings) to write his own version of the *Hyperion Cantos,* yet he does not die at the hands of the Shrike. Sol Weintraub wants closure from the Shrike with regards to Rachel's mysterious illness. Colonel Fedmahn Kassad knows that his romantic interest, Moneta, is somehow related to the Shrike and believes it is his destiny to fight it. Brawne Lamia needs to find answers from the Shrike with regards to the Keats cybrid. Father Lenar Hoyt has a parasitical crucifix attached to his chest, which he knows can only be removed by the Shrike. The Consul seeks confirmation that he has not wasted his life in service of the Hegemony. Thus all the pilgrims are driven by deep-seated desires to fulfil their respective quests. The quest of all the pilgrims is the same, that is to find and confront the Shrike, yet that which they hope to gain from their respective meetings with it is different.

The fact that only one of the seven pilgrims, namely Colonel Fedmahn Kassad, actually dies at the hands of the Shrike (Het Masteen also dies, but not at the hands of the Shrike), supports the claim that Palmer does not seem to have genuinely immersed himself in, or properly acquainted himself with, the narrative in Simmons's two *Hyperion* novels. The result is that Palmer misinterprets, and consequently undervalues, the significance of the Classical and Keatsian allusions, which in turn affects his drawing of inaccurate conclusions, such as that 'there is not a lot to be gained from tracing detailed parallels between Simmons's narrative and the Keats story' (Palmer, 1991:76).

In spite of Palmer's misinterpretations, he does usefully note that 'the parallels with Keats set up an artificial structure' (Palmer, 1991:76). Palmer's postulation of 'an artificial structure' that is created by the correlation to Keats's poems supports the claim made in Chapter One, namely that there are two structures present in works in which literary references and allusions are widespread: the primary structure (where the meaning of the writing is taken at face value and assumes no hidden meaning in the text), and the secondary structure (in which literary references and allusions are identified and meaning is assigned to them) (Baldick, 2008:217). The intertext arises from this second structure, and thus Simmons's two novels become the intertext because they contain literary references and allusions.

Palmer also stresses the theme of the succession of the offspring where the progeny is destined to succeed and exceed the ability of the parent as he mentions that it was the humans (symbolically the parent) who created the TechnoCore (symbolically the offspring and hence identified with the Olympians), yet it is the offspring who has in fact grown more powerful and is threatening to overthrow the supremacy of the parents. However, even though it looks as though the TechnoCore might succeed in deposing the Hegemony and establish a new world order, the end result of the battle between parent and progeny is a synthesis between the two. The synthesis is achieved by means of the Keats cybrid as he is representative of the most desirable elements of both the human race and the TechnoCore. However, the Keats cybrid's actual transition to a higher consciousness will be discussed at a later stage.

In addition to identifying the crucial motif of the succession of the offspring, Palmer also accurately observes that ‘A post-modernizing of the galactic-empire novel [space opera] —most obvious in the way these novels emulate and exceed other sf—*ends up expressing the anxieties of the postmodern condition* [emphasis mine]’ (Palmer, 1991:88). However, Palmer does not delve deeper into how the ‘anxieties of the postmodern condition’ are expressed. As has already been established in Chapter One, the expression of the postmodern condition may be related to the expression of the collective consciousness, which in turn relates to de Chardin’s notion of the Omega Point. It should be remembered that science fiction is set in the future in order to reflect on the present: thus, in Simmons’s novels, the reader is confronted with the problem of what it is to be human, relative to the existence of cybrids. Simmons’s novels essentially concern the postmodern human condition, or at least the evolution towards it in a quasi-de Chardinian manner. The postmodern condition is expressed through the Keats cybrid, who represents the synthesis between human and machine in the form of a fused being. Significantly, for the science fiction writer and critic, Isaac Asimov, the succession myth is not only central to the progression of science fiction, but also the fulfilment of an evolutionary pattern (in a proto-Darwinian fashion), projected long ago in Greek mythology with the overthrow of Uranus by Cronus (Sutton and Sutton, 1969:236). Simmons’s portrayal of the succession of the offspring as inevitable echoes Keats’s evolutionary world view and relates to Asimov’s hypothesis that it is an evolutionary and inevitable pattern.

Accordingly, in Simmons’s novels, the archetypal process of the succession of the offspring primarily relates to the establishment of a new world order. This establishment of a new world order in Simmons’s novels manifests itself by means of the TechnoCore and the Ousters trying to overthrow humankind as the ruling entity in the universe. Neither the TechnoCore nor the Ousters manage to succeed, but their attempts do bring about the constitution of a new world order where humanity continues to rule the universe, but with the newly learnt lessons from the TechnoCore’s attempted usurpation and only the most desirable elements of it being incorporated into the Hegemony’s new governing approach. In Simmons’s novels, the reader is presented with the thesis or

status quo, namely that of universal Hegemony rule. The TechnoCore and the Ousters constitute the antithesis to the Hegemony. Following the destruction of the farcaster network, and with it the undesirable element of the TechnoCore, synthesis is achieved between the Hegemony's previously totalitarian world view and the TechnoCore's intended total domination of humanity. Even though the Hegemony is not actually overthrown, a new world order is still established because the Hegemony retains the most useful and desirable elements of the TechnoCore and enters into a partnership of mutual understanding with the Ousters, meaning that a new, enhanced, and superior Hegemony will forthwith govern the universe. Thus, the improved Hegemony is representative of the new world order because it is a synthesis between the old way of Hegemony rule that has been fused with the advantageous elements of the TechnoCore.

As already explained earlier, the quintessential quest myth is the overarching archetypal narrative which contains the archetypal themes, processes, characters, and situations. The archetypal motifs, processes, and situations that have been identified include those of the Freudian conception of the Oedipal complex (where the offspring struggles to dominate and assume the role of the parents) the resultant confrontation or war between parent and progeny, the consequent succession myth (where the offspring succeeds in dominating the parent), the psychological rebirth of the protagonist and his personal transition to a higher state of consciousness to the ideal Platonic world, and the ultimate attainment of individuation. In Simmons's novels, the attainment of individuation (which signifies the successful completion of the quest myth) may be likened to de Chardin's notion of the Omega Point. The ideal Platonic world and the Omega Point are basically the same as they converge in the novels: the successful completion of the pilgrims' quests (leading to individuation and a rebirth into the ideal Platonic world) coincides with the actual final stage of evolution to the Omega Point (supreme consciousness).

Even though the ideal Platonic world and the Omega Point converge in Simmons's novels, it is not necessarily always the case and these two realms must not always be viewed as directly interchangeable, the reason being that the Omega Point is mystical and ontological (because it is impossible to ascertain whether the Omega Point does indeed

exist or not), while the ideal Platonic world is epistemological (because it is concerns the limitations of human knowledge and perceptions). Furthermore, because the Omega Point is the pinnacle of the evolving collective consciousness, it will necessarily only occur once, and not during every successful quest. Thus, the transcendence to the ideal Platonic world is causal (always attained through a rebirth brought about by the successful quest), whereas the Omega Point is evolutionary (many different episodes contribute towards the evolution towards it, but it is only attained right at the end of the evolutionary process and can thus evolve no further, therefore it is called the *Omega* Point).

Due to the fact that the archetypes that have been identified in Chapter One are displaced and contained within the overarching archetypal narrative of the quest myth, it would be a more manageable task to deal with the different archetypes in relation to each individual character, instead of dealing with all the characters in relation to each archetype. Owing to the fact that certain prominent characters in Simmons's novels are not directly significant from a mythological or Keatsian perspective as they have no literary progenitors, their respective characters and roles will not be expounded upon. The most significant characters in *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion* are the Shrike, Moneta, the seven pilgrims (Sol Weintraub and his baby daughter, Rachel, who is not counted as one of the pilgrims, Het Masteen, Colonel Fedmahn Kassad, Brawne Lamia, Martin Silenus, the Consul, and Father Lenar Hoyt), the John Keats cybrid, the Joseph Severn cybrid, Leigh Hunt, and the TechnoCore deity, Ummon. Key concepts and places, such as Merlin's Disease, the Hegemony, the Shrike's steel tree of suffering, the TechnoCore, the datasphere, the megasphere, and the metasphere that are referred to in the novels will also be related and elucidated where required.

As already mentioned, the Shrike is the master of time and its character signifies the final test that the pilgrims have to surmount in order to complete their quest and attain individuation. In addition to signifying fate, the 'punishment' that the Shrike metes out in its role of the 'Angel of Final Atonement' denotes that it is inherently associated with the Freudian parental figure which the child needs to overpower and dominate in order to

assume the role of the parent.[4] The seven pilgrims know that they need to firstly find, and secondly defeat, the Shrike in order to complete their quest. As a result, the pilgrims collectively signify the child figure who seeks to dominate the parental figure and establish a new world order, while the Shrike fulfils the role of the parent in the Freudian struggle between child and parent. As stated earlier, the struggle between the parent and the offspring necessarily leads to a confrontation or a battle, and that is essentially why the pilgrims are on a quest to confront the Shrike: they know that they have to confront and dominate the Shrike in order to complete their quest and achieve individuation.

Not all the pilgrims are 'fated' to complete their respective quests: only Brawne Lamia, Sol and Rachel Weintraub, and Martin Silenus manage to do so. Thus, despite being part of the group of pilgrims, Colonel Fedmahn Kassad, Het Masteen, Father Lenar Hoyt, and the Consul are not guaranteed of successful quests. At this point it is crucial to note that the characters stand in different relationships with one another. As a result, characters may be identified with the parental figure in their relationship with one character, but with the child figure in their relationship with another character. A case in point is the character of Sol Weintraub: as one of the seven pilgrims, he is identified as forming part of the child figure struggling to dominate the parent figure (the Shrike). However, when Sol Weintraub's relationship with Rachel is studied, it is observed that Sol is now in fact the parental figure, while Rachel has assumed the role of the child figure. Another example is that of the TechnoCore as it has been identified as the child figure trying to dominate the parent (humanity). However, in the TechnoCore's relationship with the Keats cybrid, it is the Keats cybrid that assumes the role of the child figure, while the TechnoCore assumes the parental role as the Keats cybrid's progenitor. This accounts for the occasional seemingly contradictory identification of a character as part of the old world order (the parent) *and* as part of the new world order (the child).

Sol Weintraub's character is not an important one, save for the function he fulfils in escorting his infant daughter to the Time Tombs. However, as Rachel's father, Sol Weintraub also represents the old world order. It is revealed by Sol Weintraub's story in *Hyperion* that Rachel had grown up to be a young woman of approximately twenty-five

years old when she went on an earlier journey to the Time Tombs on Hyperion as part of her studies. While she was inside the Time Tombs, something inexplicable happened and she contracted Merlin Disease. As a result, she grew younger and younger until she was a baby once again. The opening of the Time Tombs at the end of *The Fall of Hyperion* coincides with the moment at which Rachel will cease to exist. Rachel is therefore identified as the child figure.

Rachel is also the future Moneta, the woman who has limited control over the Shrike. From the novel's perspective, Rachel is the name used to refer to her in the past as the daughter of Sol Weintraub, while Moneta is the name given to her for all events relating to the Shrike, Colonel Fedmahn Kassad, and the future. Moneta is also called 'the daughter of memory' and 'Mnemosyne'[5] (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p430 and p501). This concurs with the myth as recounted by Hesiod because Mnemosyne represents the skill of memorisation that was required to preserve the stories of myth before writing was invented (Hesiod, 1983:36). Like in Keats's poems, Moneta's character also fulfils the role of guardian or 'custodian' in Simmons's novels as she is given the role of keeping the Shrike in check. Moneta, as the child figure, has limited control over the parental figure of the Shrike (time and fate), and her moving back in time would seem to indicate this. Thus, memory (Moneta) keeps time and fate (the Shrike) in check, and as a result memory partly defeats time. Moneta tells her father that 'It is my role, Dad. My duty. They give me means to keep the Shrike in check. And only I was … prepared' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p501). However, although memory keeps time in check, memories are not always happy – they can be painful too. As a result, like Moneta's power (in Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion*), 'which to me [her] is still a curse' (I:243),[6] Moneta (in Simmons's *The Fall of Hyperion*) is burdened with the pain of memory as she is 'sorry for the pain of memory' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p501). Thus, keeping time in check can be equally as painful for Simmons's Moneta as it was for Keats's Mnemosyne.

Significantly, Moneta is referred to as 'Mnemosyne' by both Keats (*Hyperion*, III:82) and Simmons (*Hyperion*, p163 and *The Fall of Hyperion*, p501). According to the Classical myth presented by Hesiod (1983:35), Mnemosyne coupled with Zeus for nine

nights to conceive the nine muses and consequently she is the mother of the muses. In Simmons's *Hyperion*, Martin Silenus calls the Shrike his 'muse' (*Hyperion*, p231), thus likening her to the mythological character of Calliope, the muse of poetry (Grimal, 1991:277). In mythology, Mnemosyne is the mother of Calliope, thus it is insinuated in Simmons's novels that Mnemosyne, or Moneta, is a mother figure to the Shrike (because in mythology Mnemosyne is the mother of the muses). This would explain why Simmons chose Moneta to have power over the Shrike: a mother would obviously hold some power over her offspring.

Because Moneta is intimately associated with money in mythology, she may metaphorically be identified as the currency around which Simmons's two novels revolve. As time is running out for Rachel (the infant Moneta), Sol ultimately realises that he has no option left but to hand Rachel over to the Shrike at the Time Tombs, which he does only moments before she ceases to exist. Thus, even though the farcasters may be seen as the basis of the economy (as the cheapest and quickest means of interplanetary travel), the infant Rachel is the true currency of the novels because she is offered as an 'exchange' to the Shrike so that the Time Tombs may open.

Rachel is also seen as the Biblical sacrificial lamb because her father, Sol, has a recurring dream in which he plays the role of Abraham, who is commanded to offer his child.[7] In Sol's dream, God tells him 'Sol. Take your daughter, your only daughter Rachel, whom you love, and go to the world called Hyperion and offer her there as a burnt offering at one of the places of which I shall tell you' (*Hyperion*, p269). Thus, Rachel is the sacrificial lamb that must be sacrificed for the greater good of humankind. The moment at which Rachel is handed to the Shrike, the Keats cybrid is able to view the infant Rachel being handed over to the Shrike. Yet he knows that he must not interfere and he admits that 'I [he] would not if I [he] were [was] able. Worlds beyond reason depend upon this act [of Rachel being 'sacrificed']' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p495).

Symbolically, memory (Moneta, as the future Rachel) is offered to conquer fate (the Shrike). However, once completed, this sacrifice (for that is what Sol's act of handing

Rachel over to the Shrike is) becomes obsolete because timelessness (immortality) has been achieved: by being sacrificed, Rachel becomes the future Moneta, who is not bound by time because memory defeats time. Thus, Rachel's sacrifice leads to her achieving timelessness. Timelessness relates to the de Chardinian notion of the Omega Point, which in itself signifies the timelessness of supreme consciousness. Timelessness, or immortality, can be achieved by means of the continued recollection of memories about someone or something. Monuments such as the Egyptian pyramids, the Taj Mahal, and countless cathedrals and statues all aspire to immortalise the people they were built to honour. However, it is not physical structures that immortalise people – it is the repeated invocation of the memory of the person that the structure is dedicated to that does. Thus, symbolically, memory (Moneta) is the currency with which immortality is bought. The same is true of Keats: every time we read his poetry, we are in fact invoking the memory of him and it is in this sense that he too has attained immortality.

Rachel's Merlin Disease relates to the archetypal narrative of the succession of the offspring, where a younger and stronger generation is fated to depose the older generation. Rachel is already part of the younger generation because she is the daughter of Sol Weintraub, and she grows even younger after contracting the Merlin Disease. This is representative of the fact that while the younger generation will inevitably be more powerful than the older generation, the younger generation who grows even younger will be even stronger. This claim is supported by the fact that Moneta has power over the Shrike. Moneta also comes from the future where the older generation has already been overthrown by a younger and more advanced race. By the time Rachel travels to Hyperion with her father, she is evidently too young to know or care that she is on a quest. Her father, Sol, is part of the old world order and, like the Titans in Keats's *Hyperion*, Sol is portrayed as old, fragile, and weak. Sol is called an 'old man' and he is almost one hundred years old by the time *Hyperion* commences (*Hyperion*, p14 and p274). In contrast, Rachel represents youth and vigour, which is emphasised by the fact that she grows ever younger as the novels progress.

Rachel's quest concerns her arriving at the Time Tombs, where she is destined to be handed over to the Shrike so that they may open. In this regard, Rachel does not play an active part as she is at the mercy of her father's judgement. However, once she is handed over to the Shrike mere moments before she will cease to exist, she becomes the future Moneta, who has a quest of her own. Moneta's quest consists of her dominating the Shrike, not only temporarily but continuously. Moneta, or memory, tries to explain her role of keeping the Shrike in check and the imminent difficulty of time not progressing linearly to the other pilgrims:

> "Colonel Kassad knew you as Moneta," said Martin Silenus.
> "*Will* know me as Moneta," said Rachel, her eyes clouding. "… I have not truly met him yet." She looked down to the valley of the Crystal Monolith. "*Moneta*," she mused. "It means 'Admonisher' in Latin. Appropriate. I will let him choose between that and Mnemosyne—'memory'—for my name."
> Sol had not released his daughter's hand. He did not do so now. "You're traveling *back* in time with the [Time] Tombs? Why? How?"
> Rachel lifted her head, and reflected light from the far cliffs painted her face in warmth. "It is my role, Dad. My duty. … And only I was … prepared." …
> "Prepared," said Sol. "You mean the Merlin sickness?"
> "Yes," said Rachel.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p501)

She exceeds and assumes the role of her father by completing her quest of being handed over to the Shrike because by the simple act of being handed over to the Shrike, she succeeds in opening the Time Tombs, which neither her father nor the Hegemony could accomplish. The moment at which the Time Tombs open signifies the moment of Rachel's psychological rebirth because she then becomes the future Moneta, who is necessarily part of the new world order. By becoming the future Moneta, Rachel gains entry into a higher sphere of consciousness and a future world that is 'full of many wonderful things' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p501). Moneta's ascension to a higher consciousness is expressed by the fact that like Keats's Moneta has to 'humanize my [her] sayings to thine [the dreamer's] ear' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, II:1-2), Simmons's Moneta also has to simplify her language so that her present-day listeners may understand her. Simmons's Moneta and the other humans of the future also communicate by means of a more complex and advanced language (p385). As in Keats's poem, Moneta's normal elevated, complex language reveals the power of her intellect and

imagination, which indicates that divinity cannot be reduced to human comprehension. Due to the fact that Moneta has to simplify her language, she demonstrates her superior metalinguistic ability, which indicates that she is part of the new world order and must have greater power because of it.

Moneta's character is intricately associated with the character of Colonel Fedmahn Kassad. Colonel Fedmahn Kassad is a soldier by occupation and he has gone to Hyperion with the objective of seeking out and destroying the Shrike. His approach to defeating the Shrike is to use brute force by employing the latest technology and weapons that he has brought with him to Hyperion. When Kassad finishes his tale, he reveals his quest: 'I will ask nothing of them [the Shrike and Moneta]. When I meet them this time, I will kill them' (*Hyperion*, p175). Due to his fight-fire-with-fire approach, Kassad's character may also be related to the characters of Oceanus and Enceladus in Keats's *Hyperion* and thus he represents the old, dying world order (which is doomed to failure). Like in Keats's poems, it is evident that physical strength and a predisposition towards war are not enough to succeed and therefore Kassad ultimately dies at the 'hands' of the Shrike.

Out of the seven pilgrims, it is only Colonel Fedmahn Kassad and Het Masteen, who die (only Kassad dies at the hands of the Shrike – Het Masteen's death is not fully explained). They are also the only two pilgrims who do not attain individuation, thus making them representative of the unfulfilled quest. While Colonel Fedmahn Kassad did indeed complete his initial objective of fighting against the Shrike, he dies in the process and thus he does not achieve individuation. Due to the fact Kassad has been identified as constituting the old world order because of his narrow-minded and violent approach to solving problems, it is no great surprise that he dies.

Similarly, Het Masteen also does not complete his quest. The race from which he comes is known to fly enormous 'Muir' trees, which are propelled by 'ergs' (essentially some kind of highly-concentrated, contained energy field). It would seem as though, in collusion with the TechnoCore, Het Masteen had previously agreed to fly the Shrike's steel tree of suffering through the universe, picking up human victims and storing them

in the ‘treeship’ for the purposes of the TechnoCore’s ultimate intelligence initiative (after the Time Tombs had opened and allowed the Shrike entry into the web of Hegemony planets). However, ‘seeing the Shrike and the tree of torment, Masteen had not been able to fulfill the contract. And so he died…’ (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p495). Thus, Het Masteen also symbolises the unfulfilled quest because he could not complete what he set out to do, that is, fly the Shrike’s steel tree of suffering. Due to the fact that Het Masteen could not complete his quest he, like Kassad, symbolises the old, dying world order, and must therefore necessarily die in order to make way for the stronger, younger generation.

In addition to representing the old, dying order in Simmons’s novels, Colonel Fedmahn Kassad’s character echoes the difficulty in Keats’s poem of distinguishing between dream and reality because he significantly meets Moneta in a dreamlike simulation and he does not meet her in the ‘real’ world until he gets to the planet of Hyperion. This is significant from a Keatsian perspective because after abandoning *Hyperion* in April 1819, Keats restarted it a few months later under a new title, namely *The Fall of Hyperion: A Dream*. The title of the revised work is noteworthy because Keats could have chosen merely to call it *The Fall of Hyperion*. However, the fact that he added the subtitle, ‘A Dream’, reveals the importance Keats attached to the narrative being presented as a dream that is being retold. In Keats’s epic, the poet dreams that he is in a forest with the remains of a divine feast, of which he eats, while in Simmons’s novel, the Keats cybrid dreams the events of the seven pilgrims as they happen. Both Keats and Simmons use Moneta as a character and notably both only as a character in a dream: Moneta appears in Keats’s ‘dream’ epic, while in Simmons’s *The Fall of Hyperion* Moneta appears only in Colonel Fedmahn Kassad’s dreams or while he is in an induced dreamlike state for the purpose of his military training. Kassad has ‘dreamed of *her* [Moneta] with dreams that were more—and less—than dreams’ (*Hyperion*, p144).

Colonel Fedmahn Kassad ‘meets’ Moneta in an extremely accurate and realistic re-enactment simulation of the Battle of Agincourt. However, try as he might he cannot find her by himself afterwards – she always appears in one of the FORCE (the Hegemony’s

military wing) simulation programs (the OCS:HTN simulation). The expert that Kassad consults as to how exactly the OCS:HTN simulation functions explains that:

> "The HTN stuff doesn't simulate," whined Cadet Radinski, the best AI [Artificial Intelligence] expert Kassad could find and bribe to explain, "it dreams, dreams with the best historical accuracy in the Web—way beyond the sum of its parts 'cause it plugs in holistic insight as well as facts—and when it dreams, it lets us dream with it."
>
> (*Hyperion*, p131-132)

Later, Kassad is able to make contact with Moneta while he is dreaming, much like the Keats cybrid's communication with the seven pilgrims and Meina Gladstone. Kassad also recalls that 'the feeling that he was in a dream persisted' (*Hyperion*, p163) and that he 'felt that he was finally awaking from a long dream' (*Hyperion*, p167).

Simmons is evidently emphasising that Kassad meets Moneta in his dreams prior to meeting her in the 'real' world. This alludes to Apollo's meeting with Moneta in Keats's *Hyperion* as Apollo says to Moneta:

> Goddess! I have beheld those eyes before,
> And their eternal calm, and all that face,
> Or I have dream'd. – 'Yes,' said the supreme shape
>
> (Keats's *Hyperion*, III:59-61)

In addition to alluding to Keats's poem, the motif of dreaming is extremely important because, as already stated earlier, all the events taking place on Hyperion with the pilgrims are related by means of the Keats cybrid's dreams. Thus the dreamer in Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion* fulfils the same role as the Keats cybrid in Simmons's novel, namely to relate the action and inform the reader. However, the difference between the old world order of dreaming as represented by Kassad and that of the Keats cybrid, is that the latter distinguishes between dream and reality. As part of the old, dying world order, Kassad desperately clings to his dreams and seeks to live through his dreams, while the Keats cybrid, as part of the new world order, consciously employs dreaming as a means of obtaining information. Kassad is a passive spectator to his dreams and

relationship with Moneta because she can unilaterally cut and initiate contact as she chooses. It is revealed that Kassad can do nothing to initiate contact and has to wait for Moneta to come to him: 'He [Kassad] was sure that he would never see her [Moneta] again. He was wrong' (*Hyperion*, p133), and 'all the while he [Kassad] waited. And then she came again' (*Hyperion*, p131).

In contrast to Kassad, Meina Gladstone suggests to the Keats cybrid that 'Perhaps you no longer need to sleep to dream' (*Hyperion*, p253). He duly heeds the advice and is able to dream of the pilgrims by simply closing his eyes (without sleeping). The fact that he is able to control and dominate his personal sub-consciousness, which is responsible for our dreams, reaffirms his superiority as part of the new world order. Furthermore, the dreaming Keats cybrid represents a step towards the de Chardinian notion of the evolving collective consciousness towards the Platonic ideal. Because he is able to tap into a universal consciousness (and thus reality) in order to relate what is happening to the pilgrims on Hyperion, the Keats cybrid is one step closer to evolving towards the Omega Point and supreme consciousness. It should be noted that the Keats cybrid's dreams are constantly evolving throughout *The Fall of Hyperion* and they are thus not yet perfect. However, the actual discussion of the Keats cybrid's transcendence to a higher consciousness will be discussed in the later section on the Keats cybrid.

The problematic distinction between dream and reality furthermore manifests itself in Simmons's novels by means of the character of Martin Silenus. Martin Silenus's surname has a mythological resonance and it complements the mythological foundation of Simmons's novels. The meaning of the name 'Silenus' is 'moon-man' (Graves, 1992:778), which is an allusion to Apollo's tribute to 'the most patient brilliance of the moon' (Keats's *Hyperion*, III:98). Silenus is further depicted as the father of the satyrs, who were conventional comic characters in the Attic drama (Graves, 1992:66). Simmons's Silenus also had himself surgically altered in order to look like a satyr (*Hyperion*, p216). The mythological Silenus was also always drunk and had difficulty in distinguishing between dream and reality (Graves, 1992:132). When Silenus eventually meets the Shrike, he is impaled on its steel thorn tree. However, he is in fact only

dreaming that he is suffering and that he is impaled on the Shrike's steel tree because his body is really unharmed inside the Time Tombs.

The dreaming Silenus may consequently be likened to the dreamer or poet in Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion*. In Keats's poem, the poet must overcome the desire not to suffer and he must endure and embrace pain and suffering in order to find self-transcendence:

> … Thou art a dreaming thing,
> A fever of thyself: think of the earth;
> What bliss, even in hope, is there for thee?
> What haven? every creature hath its home
> Every sole man hath days of joy and pain,
> Whether his labours be sublime or low –
> The pain alone, the joy alone, distinct:
> Only the dreamer venoms all his days,
> Bearing more woe than all his sins deserve.
>
> (Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion*, I:168-176)

For Keats, suffering, irrespective of whether it is circumstantial or through the pain of conscious growth, is not 'an "evil" consequence of "sin," but rather the amoral paradox of necessary evil, the cathartic potential of which transforms the individual through erasing the Gnostic sin of ignorance as the unenlightened self' (Roberts, 1993:107). Thus, according to Keats, suffering is necessary in order to achieve individuation because it signifies what beauty and perfection are not (beauty and perfection are defined in antithesis to suffering). Suffering thus stands in antithesis to beauty and perfection, yet the poet must endure suffering because without enduring suffering the poet cannot gain a higher personal consciousness. This belief is mentioned by Keats in his letter to "George and Georgiana Keats", in which he writes that 'The common cognomen of this world among the misguided and superstitious is "a vale of tears" from which we are to be redeemed by a certain arbitrary interposition of God and taken to Heaven' (Hirsch, 2001:505).

This 'misguided' view that suffering must be endured in order to be rewarded is echoed by the poet in Simmons's novels, Martin Silenus, who understands that the poet must

suffer in order to become great. Silenus quotes the exact same lines quoted above from Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion* while he is suffering on the Shrike tree of torment (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p256). While he is suffering on the Shrike's tree, Silenus comes to understand 'that the pain has been with him since birth—the universe's gift to a poet. It is a physical reflection of the pain he has felt and futilely tried to set to verse, to pin down with prose, all those useless years of life. It is worse than pain; it is unhappiness because the universe offers pain to all' (p257). Silenus's suffering on the Shrike's tree of torment symbolises the process of his rebirth because he gains a higher consciousness by means of his suffering. Silenus is only reborn after he suffers on the Shrike's steel tree and it may be noted that the archetypal theme of rebirth also features prominently in the myths concerning him.[8] When Brawne Lamia finds him, he is wired to a central repository that is in turn connected to the Shrike's thorn tree. When Silenus is subsequently freed from his suffering by Brawne Lamia, he emerges as a man reborn and with a consciousness that has risen to that of the Platonic ideal, which essentially means he has attained a more evolved consciousness in the de Chardinian sense.

Moreover, Silenus is the main source of Keatsian allusions in Simmons's novels. He may thus be seen as the old Keats, which accordingly allows him to write his own *Hyperion Cantos*. Silenus had started several years ago to write the *Hyperion Cantos*, which started as a parody of Keats's poems but which turned into an epic account of the *Titanomachia*, where the Hegemony supports the Titans' cause and the TechnoCore takes the part of the Olympians. Silenus's *Hyperion Cantos* thus displaces Keats's Hyperion myth as the archetypal struggle between parent and offspring and the resultant succession myth are expressed in contemporary form (within the context of the novels). After Silenus's *Hyperion Cantos* becomes a bestseller, he starts to live a life of self-indulgence. However, after several years he realises that his muse has abandoned him and that his *Hyperion Cantos* is still unfinished. Martin Silenus then goes to Hyperion under the sponsorship of his benefactor and greatest admirer of his *Hyperion Cantos*, Sad King Billy, in order to finish his epic work. In the City of Poets he starts working on his *Hyperion Cantos* again because he ultimately comes to the conclusion that the Shrike is his muse.

Because Silenus has been identified as the old Keats, his *Hyperion Cantos* is a form of memory in itself (seeing that he could remember Keats's two *Hyperion* poems). By virtue of being the *Hyperion Cantos*, Silenus's work is classified as art. As shown earlier, memory can partly defeat time, but art can shape memory into an ideal structure so that time is more completely transcended. Thus, because Silenus's *Hyperion Cantos* is a form of memory, it defeats time, and thus necessarily also the Shrike. Silenus realises that somehow his *Hyperion Cantos* 'had summoned the Shrike. … I [he] had summoned it by beginning my [his] epic poem about it' (*Hyperion*, p224). Thus, in this sense, Silenus is the creator of the art (his *Hyperion Cantos*), and he consequently defeats the entity that he has 'created' (the Shrike).

Evidently, Martin Silenus is Simmons's poet. Simmons goes to great lengths to emphasise the poetic qualities of Silenus's character because, as previously mentioned, most of the allusions to Keats are made by Silenus. Simmons also uses Silenus to allude to the Platonic notion that the transcendental realm of truth may be accessed by the poet in his madness through poetic discourse and the imagination (as discussed in Chapter One):

> The twentieth century's most honored writer, William Gass, once said in an interview: "Words are the supreme objects. They are minded things."
>
> And so they are. As pure and transcendent as any Idea which ever cast a shadow into Plato's dark cave of our perceptions. …
>
> The poet John Keats once wrote to a friend of his named Bailey: "I am certain of nothing but the holiness of the Heart's affection and the truth of the Imagination—What the imagination seizes as Beauty must be truth—whether it existed before or not."
>
> The Chinese poet George Wu … [said] "Poets are the mad midwives to reality. They see not what is, nor what can be, but what *must become*. … Words are the only bullets in truth's bandolier. And poets are the snipers." …
>
> To be a poet, I [Silenus] realized, a true poet, was [is] to become the Avatar of humanity incarnate; to accept the mantle of poet is to carry the cross of the Son of Man, to suffer the birth pangs of the Soul Mother of Humanity. …
>
> Poetry is only secondarily about words. Primarily, it is about *truth*.
>
> (*Hyperion*, p191-193)

Simmons thus uses Silenus to express his own personal endorsement of Keats's conception that the truth contained in the perfect, transcendental Platonic world may be

revealed by the poet's imagination. The quotation also alludes to Plato's opinion that the poet is a madman, who, in his mad state, can reveal the truth contained in the transcendental realm. By emphasising that poetry must reveal the truth, Simmons is alluding to the Keatsian notion (as discussed in Chapter Two) that beauty stimulates the imagination so that it may perceive truth. Moreover, Silenus's realisation that to be a true poet is to become 'the Avatar of humanity incarnate' is essentially the first indication that the Keats cybrid, evidently a true poet, will ultimately evolve towards de Chardin's Omega Point. However, because Simmons's novels culminate in the Omega Point, it will only be discussed in the later section on the Keats cybrid.

In moving to the function of the TechnoCore in Simmons's novels, it should be remembered that the TechnoCore stands in two different relationships with the humans and the Keats cybrid. As the brainchild of humanity, the TechnoCore is identified as the child figure who is trying to dominate the parent (humanity). However, in the TechnoCore's relationship with the Keats cybrid, it is the Keats cybrid that assumes the role of the child figure, while the TechnoCore assumes the parental role as the Keats cybrid's progenitor. Thus, the TechnoCore is representative of the old world order in its relationship with the Keats cybrid and is consequently instrumental in relating how the archetypal processes of the succession of the offspring and the struggle between parent and progeny are represented. Yet the TechnoCore, which can be seen as an extremely advanced version of the modern-day Internet, also had its roots in a far inferior technology and it is merely the improvement of that technology (much like the Titans proved to be an improved version of their parents, but who were in turn revealed to be inferior to *their* offspring). Similarly, the TechnoCore was already an improvement on the technology on which it was built, yet it is still threatened by what it instinctively knows will possess superior qualities, that is the Keats cybrid, even though the Keats cybrid is a product of the TechnoCore. The TechnoCore knows that its 'progeny' will bring about its destruction and therefore it tries to kill the Keats cybrid before it can destroy the TechnoCore. However, the superior Keats cybrid outmanoeuvres its 'parent' and manages to bring it down.

As already mentioned, the TechnoCore is divided into three factions, namely the ‘Stables’, the ‘Volatiles’, and the ‘Ultimates’. The Ultimates support the TechnoCore’s ultimate intelligence (henceforth UI) initiative, but it would require resources currently used by the Stables, and hence the Stables would have to be ‘killed’. Not surprisingly, they oppose the TechnoCore’s UI initiative. In Martin Silenus’s *Hyperion Cantos*, the Stables are identified with the Titans, who do not want to relinquish their power to the younger generation.

The UI initiative, as the embodiment of Teilhard de Chardin’s relentless quest for self-improvement, is also representative of the younger human generation’s insatiable desire for knowledge and technological innovation. The unwillingness of the Stables to support the greater cause for the benefit of the TechnoCore, to which they belong, is also representative of the older generation’s inclination to resist change, especially where new technology is concerned. One way in which the older human generation resists change in our present reality is seen by means of an older person refusing to use e-mail because he or she ‘prefers’ the personal touch of a handwritten letter. However, the real reason is that the older generation is intimidated by new technology. Yet the rise of electronic ways of communicating is inevitable due to the convenience, cost, and time benefits it offers.

Accordingly, the process of the struggle between progeny and parent prepares the way for the archetypal process of the succession of the offspring as it is inevitable that the younger, faster, stronger generation will not accept the rule of their parents forever because they will then not achieve individuation. In Simmons’s novels, the Stables represent the older, slower basis of the information network. In contrast, through means of the UI project, the Ultimates will achieve individuation. Yet they can only do so by overthrowing their ‘parents’, the Stables. Therefore, in Simmons’s novels, the archetypal processes of the struggle between progeny and parent, as well as that of the succession myth, are definitively presented as inevitable because, should it not happen, it would prevent the offspring from progressing and ultimately achieving individuation.

The TechnoCore's 'offspring', that is the Keats cybrid, is romantically connected with Brawne Lamia, the only woman amongst the seven pilgrims. She is a private detective and she is depicted as independent, strong and loyal. She is physically very strong, courtesy of growing up on the planet Lusus, where the gravitational force is 1.3 times stronger than the gravitational force which is experienced on earth. Because she is intricately linked to the Keats cybrid — the harbinger of the future in which humankind will exceed itself — Brawne Lamia is lauded as 'the mother of our [the people of the Shrike Church's] salvation' (*Hyperion*, p410) by the followers of the Shrike Church.

The Keatsian allusion in Brawne Lamia's name is undeniable as her name is made up of the surname of Keats's historical fiancée (Fanny Brawne) and one of Keats's most famous poems, *Lamia* (1819). In his poem, Keats represents Lamia as a seductress that is trapped in the form of a serpent, who is returned to human form by Hermes after doing him a favour (Grimal, 1991:236). However, in Simmons's version, she is the lover of the Keats cybrid and towards the end of *Hyperion* it is divulged that she is pregnant with the Keats cybrid's child. While the significance of Brawne Lamia's pregnancy is downplayed in *Hyperion* and for a large part of *The Fall of Hyperion*, it is revealed right at the end of the second novel that Brawne Lamia's unborn child is in fact the ultimate 'junction of human spirit and AI [artificial intelligence] logic which Ummon and the [Techno]Core sought for so long and died not understanding' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p515).

Brawne Lamia also represents virgin birth because she falls pregnant with the Keats cybrid's offspring at the end of *Hyperion* (p410). However, if one refers to the definition of a cybrid as formulated in Chapter One, namely that of a being created by using human elements and artificial intelligence, then it would seem impossible that a cybrid could impregnate a human (because the Keats cybrid was equipped with the persona or personality of the historical John Keats, but his body was essentially a highly sophisticated robot). Even with the mind-boggling technology available to humankind today, it remains difficult to imagine that humankind will ever be able to produce a robot so technologically profound that it can impregnate a woman. It would appear that

Brawne Lamia has been impregnated inexplicably and while she is evidently not a virgin in the novel, she will for all intents and purposes give virgin birth as no sexual relations with another human being led to her impregnation. Her 'virginity' is stressed when the Keats cybrid calls her 'Thou still unravished bride of quietness, / Thou foster-child of silence and slow time' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p514). In a sense, the Keats cybrid and Brawne Lamia's child is the fulfilment that the mortal Keats was denied.

In moving to the discussion of the Keats cybrid, it should be noted that there are two Keats cybrids in *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*. The first Keats cybrid is the one introduced in Brawne Lamia's tale related in *Hyperion*. However, this Keats cybrid is killed in a shootout with the FORCE when he and Brawne Lamia attempt to reach the refuge of the Shrike Church. However, the Keats cybrid has previously had a 'Schrön loop' implanted in Brawne Lamia's brain. A Schrön loop is a tiny device that is capable of storing immense amounts of data and just before the first Keats cybrid dies, he transfers his entire consciousness to Brawne Lamia by means of the Schrön loop. This first Keats cybrid is revived in *The Fall of Hyperion*. However, only his persona and consciousness are revived as he physically looks like Joseph Severn. This reincarnation of the Keats cybrid is fated to die in the exact same way as Keats died historically because towards the end of *The Fall of Hyperion*, this second Keats cybrid also physically dies of consumption (tuberculosis), in the exact same location as Keats did historically (26 Piazza di Spagna, Rome, Italy).

The significance of making the second Keats cybrid look like Joseph Severn lies in the fact that the historical Joseph Severn may be seen as Keats's true inheritor – not in terms of monetary wealth, but rather in terms of Keats's frail health. Joseph Severn unselfishly cared for Keats and put the requirements of making Keats comfortable above his own personal and professional needs because Keats was almost a complete invalid by the time of his death. Joseph Severn took it upon himself to look after all of Keats's needs: dressing him, washing him, feeding him, reading to him, and corresponding with his family (Hewlett, 1938:67). Therefore, it is only fitting in Simmons's novels that Joseph

Severn is chosen as the inheritor of the Keats cybrid's consciousness and persona, and have someone look after him in the same way that he had looked after Keats.

The Keats cybrid's persona is revived a third time, but not in any physical incarnation because he is alive in the metasphere (the sphere of perception where the TechnoCore resides and it includes the datasphere and the megasphere). This Keats cybrid is nevertheless able to communicate with Brawne Lamia through the Schrön loop. Despite the fact that there are in actual fact two physical cybrids that have the Keats persona, they never exist simultaneously and the persona stays the same in both cybrids. Consequently, there will only be referred to collectively as the Keats cybrid, even though the term may refer to the first cybrid that was killed towards the end of *Hyperion* (with the physical appearance of John Keats), or the cybrid which reappears in *The Fall of Hyperion* (with the physical appearance of Joseph Severn but still with the persona of John Keats).

In addition to the two Keats cybrids, one must also distinguish between the different versions of Keats in relation to de Chardin's notion of evolving towards the Omega Point. There are three stages of evolution which the various versions of Keats must undergo in order to evolve towards the Omega Point. The first stage is represented by the historical John Keats, who died in 1821. The second stage is represented by the two reincarnated Keats cybrids that are introduced in *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*. The third and final stage — the disembodied Keats intelligence — represents the actual evolution towards the Omega Point that takes place at the close of *The Fall of Hyperion*. The greater part of the discussion of Keats's evolution will focus on his reincarnation in the form of the two cybrids, collectively termed the Keats cybrid.

This second stage of the Keats cybrid's evolution towards the Omega Point includes all the physical, but not the disembodied, 'versions' of the Keats cybrid as he develops to the Omega Point. One of his functions in this stage of evolution directly correlates to that of the dreamer's in Keats's *The Fall of Hyperion* as both characters play a role in informing the reader about events that have already taken place that the reader would not otherwise have known. For the greater part of *The Fall of Hyperion*, the Keats cybrid

dreams of an imperfect reality. In *The Fall of Hyperion*, this reality is the human world of the seven pilgrims, and the Keats cybrid himself is isolated in the preserved, but isolated and deserted, world of Old Earth (a replica made of the earth after it had been destroyed).

Here he is accompanied by Meina Gladstone's aide, Leigh Hunt. Simmons's conscious use of Leigh Hunt as one of the characters is another prominent Keatsian allusion because Leigh Hunt was a contemporary of John Keats and they were introduced to each other by the son of Keats's schoolmaster, Charles Cowden Clarke (Hebron, 2002:111). At the insistence of Cowden Clarke, Hunt read some of Keats's poetry and was truly impressed with what he had read (Hebron, 2002:111). Leigh Hunt was the editor of the radical journal *The Examiner* and it was in Hunt's magazine that Keats's first published poem appeared (Hewlett, 1938:62). Thus, Leigh Hunt effectively nurtured Keats's poetry. In the replicated Old Earth, Leigh Hunt once more plays a nurturing role as he looks after the dying Keats cybrid.

In Simmons's novel, the Keats cybrid and Leigh Hunt have been isolated on Old Earth by the TechnoCore (the TechnoCore controls the farcasters and it tricked the Keats cybrid and Leigh Hunt into thinking they would be farcasted to another destination). However, the Keats cybrid is able to move to a broader sphere of consciousness — the megasphere — from his isolated position on Old Earth in order to communicate with Meina Gladstone and tell her that the TechnoCore is the instigating force behind the war that is currently being waged. This entrance to a higher consciousness and the concern shown to humanity indicate a definite development of being in the second stage of the Keats cybrid's evolution towards the Omega Point.

The process of the Keats cybrid's second stage of evolution furthermore manifests itself with regards to his quest: when he is introduced to the reader in Brawne Lamia's tale, it would seem as though his quest is merely to find out who killed his previous persona as he 'would want you [Brawne Lamia] to investigate a murder' (*Hyperion*, p328). However, as the novels progress and the more he evolves, the true magnitude of his quest becomes apparent. While still evolving towards a broader sphere of consciousness, the

Keats cybrid realises that ‘Hyperion is the key mystery of our age — physical and poetic — and it is quite probable that he… that I was born, died, and was born again to explore it’ (*Hyperion*, p385). Thus, the Keats cybrid’s character evolves from being a secondary or supportive character in *Hyperion* as part of Brawne Lamia’s tale, to being the central character and narrator in *The Fall of Hyperion*. As the prominence of the Keats cybrid’s character evolves throughout the course of the novels, so too does the extent of his quest evolve. But only right at the end of *The Fall of Hyperion* does the Keats cybrid fully comprehend what the nature of his quest is and what he must do in order to complete it. At this moment, he realises that he is the central threat to the TechnoCore’s plan for universal domination and understands that he has to access the megasphere in order to divulge his knowledge (that the TechnoCore, and not the Ousters, is attacking the Hegemony planets) to the Hegemony in order to foil the TechnoCore’s plans of assuming universal power at the cost of Hegemony rule. As Leigh Hunt tells him, ‘They [the TechnoCore] don’t want you talking to her [Meina Gladstone]. You know something that the [Techno]Core can’t risk her learning’ (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p329).

In his second stage of evolving towards the Omega Point, the Keats cybrid is evidently still very much a work in progress. Although he is on a steep learning curve because of all the TechnoCore’s secrets he is learning, he is still uncertain about his exact role within the context of the novels. However, this does not trouble him and as such he attains what Keats calls a mindset of negative capability. According to Keats’s theory of negative capability, individuals with great minds may attain a mindset of negative capability ‘when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason’ (Hirst, 1981:41). Thus, for Keats, negative capability is the supreme capacity for accepting uncertainty and the unresolved. The Keats cybrid attains a mindset of negative capability because he knows that there are certain things that he does not know and that he cannot explain. For example, when he is isolated on Old Earth with Leigh Hunt and is asked how they can get back into the network of Hegemony planets, he simply replies that ‘My [his] guess is that we [they] don’t get out of [t]here’ (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p329). It is not only what he says that is significant, but his entire demeanour as he nonchalantly accepts his fate while chewing

on a ‘stalk of grass’ (p329). Thus, the Keats cybrid attains a consciousness of negative capability because he is at ease with accepting the uncertainty of his situation ‘without any irritable reaching after fact and reason’. The uncertainty or negative capability that he experiences is reflective of his second, intermediary stage of his evolution towards a higher form of consciousness, and is thus appropriate.

Because he is still only in the second stage of his evolution, the Keats cybrid knows that he must undergo the ritual of rebirth in order to gain a higher and more detached consciousness. The Keats cybrid replies that he knows what is going on and that he must endure the suffering that Keats had to endure: ‘Accuracy. Verisimilitude. Ontogeny recapitulating phylogeny’ (p345). The Keats cybrid is essentially saying that what is happening to him is an accurate representation of what happened to the real Keats and that the situation in which he finds himself is reflective of the transcendence that the poet had to undergo in Keats’s *The Fall of Hyperion*. Furthermore, by having the Keats cybrid being reborn (ontogeny) and by recapitulating the evolution (phylogeny) of the Keats cybrid, Simmons is emphasising the Darwinian superiority of the new world order, which the Keats cybrid represents. The Keats cybrid’s realisation that he must undergo a rebirth in order to transcend to a higher consciousness makes him stand in contrast to the character of Leigh Hunt, who forms part of the old world order and does not comprehend the significance of the Keats cybrid’s death.

Furthermore, the TechnoCore deity, Ummon, also tells the Keats cybrid: ‘You have refused this godhood twice Keats’, now he must ‘Go and die to live’ (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p426). As mentioned earlier, the Keats cybrid is killed several times by the Technocore. The final time he is killed by the Technocore, he does accept ‘godhood’ because he chooses to remain as an entity detached from the world and from a physical body. This “refusal” of godhood refers to the two times he chose to make use of a physical body after being assassinated by the TechnoCore (once looking like John Keats and once looking like Joseph Severn). However, when the Keats cybrid contacts Ummon via the megasphere while he is suffering on Old Earth, Ummon urges him to go and ‘die

to live', meaning that he must endure the suffering of dying and rebirth in order to transcend to a higher order of reality that is detached from the world.

In moving to the third and final stage of the Keats cybrid's evolution to a higher form of consciousness, it is finally revealed at the end of *The Fall of Hyperion* that, after dying Keats's death, he has achieved a consciousness that is detached from the world:

> I escape the Web datasphere just before escape ceases to be an option. It is incredible and oddly disturbing, the sight of the megasphere swallowing itself. Brawn Lamia's view of the megasphere as an organic thing, a semisentient organism more analogous to an ecology than a city, was essentially correct. Now, as the farcaster links cease to be and the world inside those avenues folds and collapses upon itself, the tent suddenly without poles, wires, guys, or stakes, the living megasphere devours itself like some ravenous predator gone mad—chewing its own tail, belly, entrails, forepaws, and heart—until only the mindless jaws are left, snapping on emptiness. [However,] The metasphere remains.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p489)

When the Hegemony's FORCE destroys the farcaster network, it destroys the datasphere and the megasphere along with it, but the metasphere remains because it is not physically located anywhere. Before the Keats cybrid dies on the replicated Old Earth, he is part of the datasphere and the megasphere. Yet he is initially 'terrified of entering the megasphere [let alone the metasphere], of losing myself [himself] in there' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p344).

In attaining a consciousness that is detached from the world, the Keats cybrid does not yet achieve the full evolution towards the Omega Point. Instead, by gaining a consciousness that is detached from the world, the Keats cybrid discovers 'that I [he] am [is] not the chosen vessel for the human UI [ultimate intelligence], not the joining of AI [artificial intelligence] and the human spirit, not the chosen one at all' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p427). He comes to understand that he is merely 'the One Who Comes Before. I [He] prepare[s] the way for the One Who Teaches' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p515). Thus he realises that while he is not the supremely fused consciousness between human beings and artificial intelligence, his own offspring will come to form the supreme consciousness of de Chardin's Omega Point. Crucially, the Keats cybrid comprehends

that he is part of a greater process of psychic evolution and that he has evolved as far as he possibly could have. He thus achieves individuation (psychic wholeness) not by evolving to the Omega Point, for he fails in this regard, but by fundamentally grasping that he was not destined to do so and that he has played his part in the evolutionary process of reaching the Omega Point.

The Keats cybrid transcends his physical body in the physical world to a metaphysical consciousness by detaching his consciousness from his physical body. His consciousness also transcends to a metapsychic consciousness because he manages to communicate with Brawne Lamia on a psychic level:

> He was waiting in the garden, where the light did not quite touch and the monitor cameras did not quite cover.
>
> "Johnny!" gasped Brawne and took a quick step forward on the path of stones. …
>
> She reached out to touch him, and her hand passed through him, although there was none of the flicker or fuzz of a holo.
>
> "This place is still rich in the metasphere fields," he said. …
>
> He reached out to touch her stomach again, and she imagined that she could feel the pressure from his palm. He whispered, "Thou still unravished bride of quietness, / Thou foster-child of silence and slow time …" He looked up at Brawne. "Certainly the mother of the One Who Teaches can exercise some prerogatives," he said.
>
> "The mother of …" Brawne suddenly had to sit down and found a bench just in time. She had never been awkward before in her life, but now, at seven months [pregnant], there was no graceful way she could manage sitting. She thought, irrelevantly, of the dirigible coming in for mooring that morning.
>
> "The One Who Teaches." repeated Keats. … "The junction of human spirit and AI [artificial intelligence] logic which Ummon and the Core sought for so long and died not understanding," he said.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p514-515)

Once the Keats cybrid realises the full extent of his quest, namely preparing the way for the supremely fused consciousness between human beings and artificial intelligence, he realises that he must die so that he can be reborn into a higher sphere of consciousness. At first, namely during the second phase of his evolution, the Keats cybrid struggles to dominate the father figure (the TechnoCore). In his struggle to assume the role of the father, the Keats cybrid becomes a threat to his father, which manifests itself by means of the TechnoCore's attempts to isolate and dispose of him. However, by overcoming the TechnoCore's attempts to isolate him and by averting the threats made on his life, the

Keats cybrid moves closer to achieving individuation. Finally, and this is the instance the Keats cybrid moves to the third and final stage of his evolution, the Keats cybrid undergoes a psychological and spiritual rebirth into a higher consciousness and thus he achieves individuation.

It has thus been established that the Keats cybrid does not actually evolve to the Omega Point. The passage quoted above reveals that the baby Brawne Lamia is pregnant with, the one conceived by the Keats cybrid during his second stage of evolution, will develop to attain supreme consciousness, 'The junction of human spirit and AI [artificial intelligence] logic' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p515). The manner in which this child of Brawne Lamia and the Keats cybrid comes to represent the synthesis between man and machine (artificial intelligence) is through the merging of Brawne Lamia (human thesis), hailed by the Shrike Church as 'the mother of our salvation' (*Hyperion*, p410), with the Keats cybrid in his second stage of evolution (artificial intelligence antithesis). However, significantly, the narrative of *The Fall of Hyperion* does not extend to the actual birth of the Keats cybrid and Brawne Lamia's ultimate, supremely conscious, man-and-machine-fused child. This is symbolical of two universal truths: (1) irrespective of how far the parental figure evolves, the child will always surpass the parent, and (2) irrespective of how far humankind (and artificial intelligence) evolves, evolution is never complete and even the supremely conscious child of Brawne Lamia and the Keats cybrid must necessarily evolve further as we grow towards true divinity. This hypothesis is echoed by the Keats cybrid even after he has evolved to the third and final stage of his evolution. He knows that evolution is continuous as his last words aptly conclude *The Fall of Hyperion* in a final tribute to Keats: 'On he flared…' (p517).

As finally concerns the Keats cybrid, it should be noted that although the Keats cybrid is able to produce offspring, his poetic imagination is sterile: while he can recite endless lines from Keats's poems, he cannot produce new poetry in the unique style of John Keats. Cybrids have no true creativity. However, it is understood that the more evolved child of the Keats cybrid may inherit his original "father's" genius.

When moving to the topic of the influence of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's philosophy on Simmons's novel, it can be seen that the character of Father Lenar Hoyt is significant insofar as he relates the story of another Jesuit, Father Paul Duré. When it is Father Lenar Hoyt's turn to tell his story, he tells the story of Father Paul Duré instead. Father Paul Duré was exiled to Hyperion and therefore he had visited the planet of Hyperion several years prior to the pilgrims' expedition. Accordingly, Father Paul Duré sets himself the objective of finding the lost tribe of the Bikura. Legend has it that the Bikura is in fact a group of seventy air crash survivors who are living in a remote part of Hyperion. Father Paul Duré duly finds the Bikura, who allow him to become one of their tribe after implanting a parasitical 'cruciform' onto his chest. In the context of the novel, a cruciform is a living organism which attaches itself to a living creature and then uses the creature as host. The cruciform then acts as an instrument of immortality, refusing to let the host body die by reviving the host's body and forcing it to live again every time it expires.

Father Paul Duré is elected as Pope towards the end of *The Fall of Hyperion* and, significantly, he selects as his regnal name that of 'Teilhard I' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p464). The only possible reason for Simmons to refer to Teilhard de Chardin is that he wants to allude to de Chardin's philosophy. As mentioned in Chapter One, the philosophy of de Chardin sees humankind as incomplete and its collective consciousness as evolving towards a predetermined point in the future, which he termed the Omega Point. The Omega Point is essentially 'supreme consciousness' or the 'collective human *weltanschauung*' towards which the universe is evolving and the human condition necessarily leads to the psychic unity of humankind (de Chardin, 1959:258). Evidently, by consciously alluding to de Chardin, Simmons is invoking the motif of continuous evolution and the transcendence to a more cosmic consciousness. Evidence can be found in Simmons's novels of these de Chardinian constructs in the future race that Moneta is part of. The time in the future from which Moneta has come and in which the Time Tombs are built represents the moment closest to the Omega Point that the novels can imagine. The reader is merely given a glimpse of what this world entails, but it involves

in essence an advanced human race that shares a collective consciousness, and people who are able to communicate without speaking through some means of cosmic telepathy.

Crucially, for de Chardin, the succession myth or the archetypal process of the succession of the offspring is pivotal throughout the course of history and he asserts that 'We find imbrication and replacement rather than continuity and prolongation: the law of succession once again dominates history. *I can thus easily picture the new-comer as the scion of an autonomous line of evolution, long hidden though secretly active—to emerge triumphantly one fine day* [emphasis mine]…' (de Chardin, 1959:200). The latter part of de Chardin's statement perfectly describes the TechnoCore's tactics, as it has been 'long hidden though secretly active' with the objective of emerging 'triumphantly one fine day'. De Chardin's opinion that the 'newcomer' (or offspring) will inevitably depose and assume the role of the 'master' (or parent) is shared by Keats and his evolutionary world view. Supporting the Romantic 'rebellion' against the autonomy of industrial progress, Keats saw the industrial prowess of his own age, specifically in the United States of America, as standing in stark contrast to his perception of beauty (as discussed earlier). In his letter to "George and Georgiana Keats", Keats expressed his belief that 'the humanity of the United States [of America] can never reach the sublime' because of their growing culture of consumerism (Hirsch, 2001:505). Keats saw the industrial revolution in America as an age of 'iconoclasm, of destruction, of fierceness of competition *where the machine made by Man to be his servant has widely become his master* [emphasis mine]' (Gorell, 1970:25). Thus, in a proto-Simmons fashion, Keats foresaw the danger that humankind's over-dependence on machines could lead to. Ultimately, like de Chardin, Keats identified the inversion of the roles between man and machine, and thus also the inversion of the succession myth.

Accordingly, de Chardin's and Keats's views with regards to the narrative of the succession of the offspring are compatible. However, as already mentioned in the previous chapter, Keats's perceptions with regards to the displacement of the succession of the offspring and the struggle between parent and progeny are divulged by means of the hypothesis articulated by Oceanus in Keats's *Hyperion*: 'the first in beauty should be

first in might' (*Hyperion*, II:229). Moreover, Simmons quotes no less than 56 lines from Book II of Keats's *Hyperion* verbatim by means of the TechnoCore deity, Ummon, who ends the excerpt:

> We are such forest-trees, and our fair boughs
> Have bred forth, not pale solitary doves,
> But eagles golden-feather'd, who do tower
> Above us in their beauty, and must reign
> In right thereof, for 'tis the eternal law
> That first in beauty should be first in might
>
> (Simmons's *The Fall of Hyperion*, p423)

The importance of the fact 'that first in beauty should be first in might' is not lost on Simmons as he ends the long excerpt from Keats's *Hyperion* with the same line, which emphasises the importance of the sentiments expressed. Ummon also states that the reason why the TechnoCore decided to use the John Keats persona for their cybrid is that in addition to having 'an imagination which can span space and time', Keats also had a 'consciousness as near divine as humankind has offered in thirty generations' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p425).

This is because, for Keats, 'Beauty is truth, truth beauty, – that is all ye know on earth, and all ye need to know' (*Ode on a Grecian Urn*, lines 59-50). Beauty is supremely important to Keats and Simmons is acutely aware of the importance Keats places on beauty. However, as mentioned earlier, Keats sees beauty as acting as a stimulant to the imagination, stirring it so that it may perceive the truth that is contained within the higher order of reality. Thus, for Keats, superior beauty is indicative of evolutionary superiority in a proto-Darwinist manner. By portraying Keats's persona as 'near divine as humankind has offered in thirty generations' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p425), Simmons is in actual fact emphasising the profundity of the poetic imagination, which according to Keats can lead to the Platonic world of perfection. Thus, for Keats, beauty is not so much manifested by means of physical appearances – he is more concerned with the evolutionary superiority which greater beauty signifies from a proto-evolutionary point of view. Indeed, the beauty of spirit is a property of evolutionary superiority.

Nevertheless, Keats's insistence that 'first in beauty should be first in might' is certainly not lost on Simmons, who makes a point of reiterating the beauty of a few of the seven pilgrims. Fedmahn Kassad is the first to think that Moneta is 'perhaps the most beautiful woman he had ever seen: bone structure so perfect that chin and cheekbones were shaped without being too sharp, large eyes glowing with life and intelligence, a gentle mouth with a soft underlip' (*Hyperion*, p128). Simmons goes to great lengths to describe the physical beauty of Moneta as he also attributes 'perfect breasts' (p129) to her and likens her hair to 'copper threads' (p130). Naturally, the physical beauty reflects an inner beauty, itself resonant of truth and a higher order of being.

Brawne Lamia's first encounter with the Keats cybrid also left her in awe of his beauty. She remarks to herself no less than three times how beautiful the Keats cybrid is. The moment she meets him, she thinks to herself, rather bathetically, 'Shit, this guy's beautiful' (*Hyperion*, p327). She furthermore emphasises his physical beauty when she says 'God, he was beautiful' (p328), that 'his hands were exquisite' (p329), and that 'There was something about his face that I found incredibly attractive—a sort of masculine strength combined with a feminine sense of awareness' (p337). Thus, because their superior beauty implies evolutionary superiority, the more beautiful characters of Rachel (Moneta) and the Keats cybrid represent the new world order, who possess a more evolved consciousness (courtesy of their beauty) and must triumph because thereof.

Moreover, it is not only the physical form that beauty takes that Simmons emphasises in *The Fall of Hyperion*: the spiritual beauty of the Keats cybrid becomes more and more evident as the novels progress. While he is suffering the exact same, horrible fate as Keats did, the Keats cybrid discovers his humanity and so the reader becomes sympathetic towards him. The Keats cybrid discovering his humanity in Simmons's novel serves the same purpose as the Titans being depicted as all too humanly vulnerable in Keats's *Hyperion*: it allows the reader to identify and empathise with the supposed non-human characters who have embraced their human side. The Keats cybrid embraces the very human emotions of grief and depression that have been transferred to his consciousness: 'My [the Keats cybrid's] transplanted memories surged to the surface,

almost overwhelming me with their sense of loss and looming mortality. So far from friends, so far from Fanny, his one eternal love' (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p344).

Even when Leigh Hunt is angry with the Keats cybrid in his delusional state, he does not take it personally, but he rather sees the beauty of assonance in Leigh Hunt's rant when the Keats cybrid tells him they have arrived at the Spanish Steps in Rome:

> "It's not far, Hunt. There is our destination."
> Gladstone's aide turns his scowl toward the statue. "And what is there? Why are we stopping there? What awaits us there?"
> I cannot help but smile at this least poetic of men's unconscious use of assonance. I suddenly imagine us sitting up long nights in that dark hulk of a building as I teach him how to pair such technique with masculine or feminine caesura, or the joys of alternating iambic foot with unstressed pyrrhic, or the self-indulgence of the frequent spondee.
>
> (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p365)

Through his lovely reaction, the Keats cybrid reveals that he already possesses a consciousness that is becoming detached from the world because he desires to help the less-evolved consciousness of Leigh Hunt to appreciate the art of poetry, even if at this stage he still shares the pathos of humanity's weakness.

Even as the Keats cybrid is led to number 26 Piazza di Spagna by Leigh Hunt, and knowing full well what torture awaits him there, he still has the poetic capacity to liken his situation to Dante's *Commedia* as he quotes the line 'Abandon Every Hope, Who Enter Here', which is placed above the portals of hell (*The Fall of Hyperion*, p366). He is still able to note the irony of his present situation and embrace his humanity by revealing that he has a very human sense of humour. The ability to perceive and express irony is exclusively human and Simmons is subtly emphasising the Keats cybrid's humanity by assigning more and more human traits to him. When the Keats cybrid has just coughed up small parts of lung tissue, he is still in a remarkably buoyant spirit and even cracks a joke when Hunt, in referral to their generally desolate surroundings, calls their current position a terrible place to be in. The Keats cybrid is still humorous enough to wryly add that 'It cost me twenty eight shillings a month. Seven scudi. Highway robbery' (p381).

When Hunt brings the Keats cybrid breakfast the following morning, the cybrid reflects on his memories of how the real Keats ate those last few months before his death. He is neither embittered nor appalled by his fate, as he rather embraces it with a resigned and plagent air, casually noting that it is ‘odd how many suffering members of humankind have faced eternity obsessed with their bowels, their bedsores, or the meagreness of their diets’ (p399). Even in the face of terrible suffering and pain the Keats cybrid can embrace his humanity, thus further endearing himself to the reader.

In drawing a conclusion from the examination of Simmons’s novels in relation to Hesiod and Keats’s respective versions of the Hyperion myth, it is to be noted that three prominent governance structures, namely the Hegemony, the Ousters, and the TechnoCore, all thought they could successfully rule the entire cosmos alone. However, it is evidently impossible, which indicates that unlike Hesiod’s or Keats’s presentations of the Hyperion myth, the universe is just too infinitely large to be governed by one, singular entity. In Hesiod’s version, the old world order (the Titans) is merely replaced by a new world order (the Olympians), which still governs only over the mythological world. The pattern in Keats’s version is similar: the Olympians depose the Titans in order to gain control of the same domain that the Titans had power over, namely the mythological world. However, in Simmons’s novels, there are not merely other planets, but ‘other galaxies’ to which the human race has expanded (*The Fall of Hyperion,* p516). Thus, in Simmons’s novels there are multiple planets and galaxies that need to be managed, while both Hesiod’s and Keats’s versions are only concerned with a single realm. Simmons’s supposition of multiple planets and galaxies that need to be governed is reflective of the state of the present collective consciousness insofar as modern humanity, with the knowledge of contemporary science and astronomy to draw on, realises that they cannot preside over the entire universe as it is simply too infinitely large. It may furthermore be asserted that science has replaced the divine power of the gods and the supernatural element assigned to them.

Ultimately, the works of both Keats and Simmons centrally concern the replacement of one species by another in a proto-Darwinist manner. Both Keats and Simmons express

their evolutionary perceptions of progress by portraying change as natural and inevitable. Both authors implicitly use the succession myth to illustrate that in order to achieve progress, the old world order must necessarily be replaced by a new world order. Both Keats and Simmons demonstrate that the newer generation is implicitly evolutionarily superior. However, both Keats and Simmons understand that, in a de Chardinian manner, evolution is an ever-continuous process and that the evolutionarily superior 'offspring' of today will also one day be deposed by a newer, even more evolved race. Both Keats and Simmons grasp the fundamental imperative of evolution, namely that it is a relentless quest for improvement and thus it never stops, not even when the supposed Omega Point is achieved. This signifies that humankind will always evolve further, and perhaps more profoundly, that perfection is ultimately unattainable.

---

[1] Given the fact that this chapter will examine Simmons's novels in relation to Keats's poems of the same name, I shall, where necessary, indicate to which author's work I am referring to.

[2] Despite being a cybrid, I have decided to refer to him as a human from this point forward. The reason for my decision is that the Keats cybrid fathers a child with Brawne Lamia and he is, for all intents and purposes, John Keats. Dan Simmons also refers to him as a human throughout his two novels.

[3] The character of Ummon is based on the historical character of Yunmen Wenyan, a Chinese Zen master. Yunmen Wenyan was called Ummon, and he lived circa 862 to 949. He also founded one of the five major schools of Chinese Zen (Wu, 1996:10). In a series of questions and answers with the Keats cybrid and Brawne Lamia, Ummon makes certain crucial revelations about the plots of *Hyperion* and *The Fall of Hyperion*.

[4] The Shrike is essentially 'Father Time', or Cronus, in Greek mythology (Grimal, 1991:110). He may thus also be likened to the parental figure from this perspective.

[5] As indicated in Chapter Two, Moneta is the Roman equivalent of the Greek goddess Mnemosyne (Grimal, 1991: 279-280).

[6] In order to distinguish between quotes from Simmons's novels and Keats's poems, I have simply used the title and page number to refer to Simmons's novels, while I have employed the referencing technique used in Chapter Two to refer to Keats's poems. Thus, references pertaining to Simmons will include the page number on which the quotation is found, while references relating to Keats will include the book or canto and the lines quoted.

[7] According to the Bible (New International Version), God commanded Abraham: 'Take your son, your only son, Isaac, whom you love, and go to the region of Moriah. Sacrifice him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains I will tell you about' (Genesis 22:2).

[8] Silenus is credited with raising Dionysus, or Bacchus, the god of the vine (Grimal, 1991:401). More importantly, however, is that Dionysus is the son of Zeus and Semele and that he was known as the 'twice-born' god. At Semele's request, Zeus revealed himself to her in all his majesty, which he duly did, but she was unable to endure the display of Zeus covered in lightning and was struck dead. Semele was six months pregnant at the time and Zeus took the unborn baby from Semele's body and sewed it up inside his thigh. Dionysus was then 'reborn' at the right time; alive and perfectly formed to follow his mentor, Silenus, on a path of inebriation.

Conclusion

This dissertation has revealed that modern science has essentially replaced the divine power of the gods and the supernatural element assigned to them, from which this dissertation derives its title. It has been shown that the gods of Classical mythology are indeed protean by nature because even though their function remains the same, they are displaced in a modern context through science.

Through the displacement of the literary archetypes, the transformation of the myth of the *Titanomachia* has been traced from the Classical Greek period, to the Romantic period, to the contemporary period. By tracing the transformation of the myth of the *Titanomachia*, it has been shown that myth is indeed still present in the contemporary era, albeit scientifically displaced. It has also been revealed that due to certain scientific and technological advancements, myth necessarily had to become more scientific in order to reflect humankind's increasingly scientific consciousness. One of the premises posited, namely that science fiction is the contemporary guise of myth, has accordingly also been validated.

By virtue of the fact that science fiction is mythology in scientific garb, it is affirmed that humankind's collective consciousness no longer reflects mythic thought, but has evolved to reflect scientific thought. Accordingly, if humankind's collective consciousness has evolved to a higher realm of perception, it would constitute the confirmation of another premise, namely that de Chardin's hypothesis of the evolving collective consciousness holds true.

It has furthermore been revealed that both John Keats and Dan Simmons subscribe to the de Chardinian concept that humankind's collective consciousness is not only evolving, but evolving towards supreme consciousness, or the Omega Point. However, as mentioned in Chapter Two, the fact that the Omega Point can never be attained makes it an unstable referent, and thus no true referent at all because just as it appears as though

the Omega Point is about to be attained, it is revealed that it can never be reached. It has accordingly been shown that both Keats and Simmons grasp the fundamental characteristic of evolution, namely that it is a relentless quest for improvement and thus it never stops. This ultimately signifies that not only will humankind always evolve further, but also that perfection is ultimately unattainable.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Keats, J. (2001). *Complete Poems and Selected Letters of John Keats*. New York: Modern Library.

Simmons, D. (1989). *Hyperion*. New York: Bantam.

Simmons, D. (1990). *The Fall of Hyperion*. New York: Bantam.

Secondary Sources

Abbott, E. (1898). *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Abrams, M.H. (1993). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Achtemeier, P.J. (ed.) (1996). "Creation". in *HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*. San Francisco: Harper One.

Aerts, D., Apostel, L., De Moor, B., Hellemans, S., Maex, E., Van Belle, H., & Van der Veken, J. (1994). *World Views: From Fragmentation to Integration*. Brussels: VUB Press.

Aldiss, B.W. (ed.) (1974). *Space Opera: Science Fiction from the Golden Age*. London: Futura Publications Limited.

Alexopoulou, M. (2009). *The Theme of Returning Home in Ancient Greek Literature: The Nostos of the Epic Heroes*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Alkon, P.K. (1994). *Science Fiction Before 1900: Imagination Discovers Technology*. London: Routledge.

Alok, J. (2010). *Hydrogen Taxi Cabs to Serve London by 2012 Olympics*. The Guardian: 22 February 2010.

Althusser, L. (1969). *For Marx*. London: Verso.

Anderson, M.J. (1997). *Carl Linnaeus: Father of Classification*. New York: Enslow Publishers.

Apuleius. (1951). *The Transformation of Lucius Otherwise Known as the Golden Ass*. Trans. by Robert Graves. New York: The Noonday Press.

Arnold, V.I. (1989). *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Ash, R. (2008). *The Top Ten of Everything*. New York: Sterling.

Asimov, I. (ed.) (1989). *The New Hugo Winners*. New York: Wynwood Press.

Asimov, I., Greenberg, H.M. & Waugh, C.G. (eds) (1982). *Science fiction A to Z: A Dictionary of the Great SF Themes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Baldick, C. (2008). *Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bate, J. (1994). *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beichler, J.E. (2007). "Muggles, Matric and Silmaril: The Pride of Modern Mythology." in *The Journal of Spiritual and Paranormal Studies*. 30:3, pp. 127-156.

Belsey, C. (1980). *Critical Practice*. London: Routledge.

Benton, R.P. (1966). "Keats and Zen". in *Philosophy East and West*. 16:1-2, pp. 33-47.

Bewell, A.J. (1986). "The Political Implication of Keats's Classicist Aesthetics." in *Studies in Romanticism*. 25:2, pp. 220-229.

Bienkowska, B. (ed.) (1973). *The Scientific World of Copernicus*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Blunden, E. (1970). *Leigh Hunt: A Biography*. Yale: Archon Books.

Bodkin, M. (1934). *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bohm, A. (2007). "Just Beauty: Ovid and the Argument of Keats's *Ode on a Grecian Urn*." in *Modern Language Quarterly*. 68:1, pp. 1-26.

Bowder, D. (1978). *The Age of Constantine and Julian*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Brentano, F. (1978). *Aristotle and His World View*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bush, D. (1957). *Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry*. New York: Pageant Book Co.

Butler, M. (1982). *Rebels and Reactionaries*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, J.W. (1959). "The Historical Development of Mythology." in *Daedalus*. 88:2, pp. 232-254.

Campbell, J.W. (1972). *Hero of a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Campbell, J.W. & Greenberg, M.H. (eds) (1981). *Astounding Science Fiction July 1939*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Campbell, J.W. (1990). *Transformations of Myth Through Time*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cantor, P.A. (1984). *Creature and Creator: Myth-making and English Romanticism.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cassirer, E. (1946). *Language and Myth*. Trans. by Susanne Langer. London: Dover Publications Inc.

Chase, C. (ed.) (1993). *Romanticism*. New York: Longman.

Chernyshova, T. (2004). "Science Fiction and Myth Creation in Our Age." in *Science Fiction Studies*. 31:3, pp. 345-357.

Coombs, H. (1978). *The Age of Keats and Shelley*. London: Blackie & Son Ltd.

Cooper, J.M. (ed.) (1997). *Plato: Complete Works*. New York: Hackett Publishing.

Coupe, L. (1997). *Myth*. London: Routledge.

Coupe, L. (2005). *Kenneth Burke on Myth: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Cotterell, A. (1996). *The Encyclopedia of Classical Mythology*. Bath: Lorenz Books.

Cowden Clarke, C. & Cowden Clarke, M. (1969). *Recollections of Writers*. Sussex: Centaur Press Ltd.

Cunningham, A. (ed.) (1973). *The Theory of Myth: Six Studies*. London: Sheed & Ward.

Das Gupta, C. (1989). "Seeing and Believing, Science and Mythology: Notes on the 'Mythological' Genre." in *Film Quarterly*. 42:4, pp. 12-18.

De Chardin, P.T. (1959). *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Denham, R.D. (1978). *Northrop Frye and Critical Method*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Derrida, J. (1972). "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Sciences." in *The Structuralist Controversy*. Macksey, R. & Donato, E. (eds). Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Trans. by G. Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Disch, T.M. (2008). *On SF*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Douglas, W.W. (1996). "The Meanings of Myth in Modern Criticism." in *Literary Criticism and Myth*. Segal, R.A. (ed.), pp. 68-78. New York: Garland.

Douka Kabitoglou, E. (1990). *Plato and the English Romantics*. London: Routledge.

Dowden, K. (1992). *The Uses of Mythology*. London: Routledge.

Drabble, M. (ed.) (2000). The Oxford Companion to English literature. 6th Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Draper, J.W. (2007). "History of the Conflict between Religion and Science". in *The Agnostic Reader*. Joshi, S.T. (ed.) London: Prometheus.

Dubuisson, D. (2006). *Twentieth Century Mythologies*. 2nd ed. London: Equinox.

Duby, G. (1974/1985). "Ideologies in Social History." in *Constructing the Past: Essays in Historical Methodology*. le Goff, J. & Nora, P. (eds). Eng. Trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dupré, L. (2004). *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Edgecombe, R.S. (1994). *Leigh Hunt and the Poetry of Fancy*. Cranbury: Associated University Presses.

Einstein, A. (1905). "Does the Inertia of a Body Depend Upon Its Energy Content?" in *Annalen der Physik*. Trans. by Cowper, A.D. 18, pp. 639-641.

Evert, W.H. (1965). *Aesthetic and Myth in the Poetry of Keats*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fairchild, H.N. (1949). “Keats and the Struggle-for-Existence Tradition.” in *Modern Language Association.* 64:1, pp. 98-114.

Falck, C. (1989). *Myth, Truth and Literature: Towards a True Post-Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feder, L. (1996). “Myth, Poetry, and Critical Theory.” in *Literary Criticism and Myth*. Segal, R.A. (ed.) pp. 80-99. New York: Garland.

Fellows, O.E. & Milliken, S.F. (1972). *Buffon*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Felton, C.C. (1982). “A Discussion of *Hyperion*.” in *Nineteenth-Century Literary Criticism*. 2:1, pp. 145-161.

Fergusson, F. (1949). *The Idea of a Theatre*. New York: Doubleday & Co.

Finley, M.I. (1981). “The Elderly in Classical Antiquity.” in *Greece and Rome*. 28:2, pp. 156-171.

Fischman, J. (2010). *National Geographic Magazine*. January 2010. pp. 34-53.

Ford, N.F. (1953). “Keats’s Saturn: Person or Statue?” in *Modern Language Quarterly*. 14:3, pp. 253-257.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon.

Franklin, H.B. (ed.) (1966). *Future Perfect: American Science Fiction of the Nineteenth Century – An Anthology*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Franklin, J. (1982). “The Renaissance Myth”. in *Quadrant*, 26(11), pp. 51-60.

Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frye, N. (1963). “Myth, Fiction and Displacement.” in *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology*, pp. 21-38. New York: Harcourt.

Frye, N. (1976). *Spiritus Mundi: Essays on Literature, Myth and Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Frye, N. (1990). *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays, 1974- 1988*. Denham, R.D. (ed.) Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Gallant, C. (2002). *Keats and Romantic Celticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Geisler, N.L. (1999). *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. New York: Baker Books.

Gill, R. & Sherman, E. (eds) (1973). *The Fabric of Existentialism*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Goff, B. (ed.) (1995). *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Gorell, L. (1948). *John Keats: The Principle of Beauty*. New York: Haskell House Publishers.

Graves, R. (1955). *The Greek Myths*. Vols 1 & 2. London: Penguin.

Green, P. (2007). *Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenberg, M. & Asimov, I. (eds) (1990). *Cosmic Critiques*. Cincinnati: Writer's Digest Books.

Griffin, J. (1986). *The Mirror of Myth*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd.

Grimal, P. (1991). *The Penguin Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. St Ives: Penguin.

Gunn, J. (1982). *Isaac Asimov: The Foundations of Science Fiction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gunn, J. & Candelaria, M. (eds) (2005). *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press Inc.

Hammond, N.G.L. & Scullard, H.H. (eds) (1970). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hampson, N. (1968). *The Enlightenment*. New York: Penguin.

Harding, A.J. (1995). *The Reception of Myth in English Romanticism*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Harman, P.M. (1983). *The Scientific Revolution*. New York: Methuen & Co.

Hartwell, D.G. (2006). *The Space Opera Renaissance*. London: Macmillan.

Hawking, S.W. (2001). *The Universe in Short*. New York: Bantam Books.

Haworth, H.E. (1970). "The Titans, Apollo, and the Fortunate Fall in Keats's Poetry." in *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 10:4, pp. 637-649.

Head, D. (ed.) (2006). *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hebron, S. (2002). *John Keats*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heiden, B. (2000). "Major Systems of Thematic Resonance in the *Iliad*." in *Symbolae Osloenses*. 75:1, pp. 34-55.

Heinlein, R.A., Kornbluth, C., Bester, A. & Bloch, R. (1959). "Science Fiction: Its Nature, Faults and Virtues". *The Science Fiction Novel: Imagination and Social Criticism*. Chicago: Advent Publishers.

Herd, E.W. (1996). "Myth Criticism: Limitations and Possibilities." in *Literary Criticism and Myth*. Segal, R.A. (ed.) pp. 80-99. New York: Garland.

Hesiod. (1983a). *Theogony; Works and Days; Shield*. Trans. by N.A. Athanassakis. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hesiod. (1983b). *The Poems of Hesiod*. Trans. by R.M. Frazer. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Hewlett, D. (1938). *Adonais: A Life of John Keats*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Hill, J.S. (ed.) (1983). *Keats: Narrative Poems*. London: Macmillan.

Hillman, J. (ed.) (1991). *Facing the Gods*. Dallas: Spring Publications.

Hirst, W.Z. (1981). *John Keats*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Hodge, J. & Radick, G. (eds) (2003). *The Cambridge Companion to Darwin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holy Bible: New International Version. (1984). Vereeniging: Christian Publishing Company.

Hoppenstad, G. (2005). "Editorial: Series(ous) SF Concerns." in *Journal of Popular Culture*. 38:4, pp. 603-604.

Houtchens, L.H. & Houtchens, C.W. (eds) (1956). *Leigh Hunt's Literary Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hubble, E.P. (1936). *The Realm of the Nebulae*. New York: New Haven.

Hudson, P. (1992). *The Industrial Revolution*. London: Edward Arnold.

Humphrey, J. (1978). "The Poet Against Himself: A re-examination of Keats's 'Hyperions'." in *Modern Language Studies*. 8:1, pp. 40-47.

Hunt, L. (1855). *Stories in Verse*. London: Routledge.

Huxley, J. (1959). "Introduction". in de Chardin, P.T. *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Hyde, M. & McGuinness, M. (2004). *Introducing Jung*. Royston: Icon Books.

James, E. (1994). Science Fiction in the 20th Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jary, D. & Jary, J. (1991). *Collins Dictionary of Sociology*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.

Johnson, R.B. (ed.) (1891a). *The Poems of Leigh Hunt.* London: J.M. Dent.

Johnson, R.B. (ed.) (1891b). *The Essays of Leigh Hunt.* London: J.M. Dent.

Jones, J. (1969). *John Keats's Dream of Truth*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Jung, C.G. (1959). *Four Archetypes*. Trans. By R.F.C. Hull. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jung, C.G. (1963). *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*. Jaffe, A. (ed.) London: Collins and Routledge & Keegan Paul.

Jung, C.G. (1966). *Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Vol. 15. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jung, C. G. (1981). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Bollingen.

Kauffman, W. (1966). *Hegel: A Reinterpretation*. London: Anchor Books.

Kelly, M.R. (2008). *Locus Awards*. Available from http://www.locusmag.com/SFAwards/Db/Locus.html (accessed 24 November 2008).

King, B. (1984). *Women of the Future: The Female Main Character in Science Fiction*. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press Inc.

Kluckhohn, C. (1959). "Recurrent Themes in Myths and Mythmaking." in *Daedalus*. 88:2, pp. 268-279.

Knight, D. (2002). *Nebula Awards*. Available from http://www.sfwa.org/awards/about_neb.htm (accessed 24 November 2008).

Koyré, A. (1958). *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kübler-Ross, E. (1969). *On Death and Dying*. New York: Macmillan.

Lachman, L. (2001). "Keats's Hyperion: Time, Space, and the Long Poem." in *Poetics Today*. 22:1, pp. 89-127.

Landrum, G.W. (1927). "More concerning Chapman's Homer and Keats." in *Modern Language Association*. 42:4, pp. 986-1009.

Lawler, D.L. (1978). *Approaches to Science Fiction*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Leeming, D.A. (1981). *Mythology: The Voyage of the Hero*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Leitch, V.B., Cain, W.E., Finke, L., Johnson, B, McGowan, J. & Williams, J.J. (eds) (2001). *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: Norton.

Lempriére, J. (1949). *Classical Dictionary of Proper Names Mentioned in Ancient Authors, with a Chronological Table, 1788*. rpt. ed. F.A. Wright. New York: Dutton.

Levy, M. (2003). "*The Iliad* as Science Fiction." in *Publishers Weekly*. 250:21, p53.

Lincoln, B. (1986). *Myth, Cosmos and Society*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Little, J. (1975). *Keats as a Narrative Poet.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Long, G. (ed.) (1861). *The Epics of Hesiod*. London: Whittaker & Co.

Malmgren, C.D. (1988). "Towards a Definition of Science Fantasy." in *Science Fiction Studies*. 15:3, pp. 259-281.

Manganaro, M. (1992). *Myth, Rhetoric, and the Voice of Authority.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Matten, M. & Hankinson, R.J. (1993). "Aristotle's Universe: Its Form and Matter". in *Synthese*. 96:3, pp. 417-435.

May, J. (1984). *A Pliocene Companion: A Guide to the Saga of Pliocene Exile*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Mayr, E. (1981). *The Growth of Biological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCaffery, L. (ed.) (1990). *Across the Wounded Galaxies*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Minchin, E. (1992). "Scripts and Themes: Cognitive Research and the Homeric Epic." in *Classical Antiquity*. 11:2, pp. 229-241.

Morford, P.O. & Lenardon, R.J. (1985). *Classical Mythology*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman.

Morford, P.O. & Lenardon, R.J. (2003). *Classical Mythology*. 7th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morpurgo, J.E. (ed.) (1949). *The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt*. London: The Cresset Press.

Muir, K. (1969a). *John Keats: A Reassessment*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Muir, K. (1969b). "The Meaning of Hyperion." in *John Keats: A Reassessment*. Muir, K. (ed.) pp. 103-123. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Murray, G. (1927). "Hamlet and Orestes." in *the Classical Tradition in Poetry*, pp. 205-240. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Palmer, C. (1999). "Galactic Empires and the Contemporary Extravaganza: Dan Simmons and Iain M. Banks." in *Science Fiction Studies*. 26:1, pp. 73-90.

Peck, J. & Coyle, M. (2002). *Literary Terms and Criticism*. 3rd ed. New York: Palgrave.

Pinion, F.B. (1992). *A Keats Chronology*. London: Macmillan.

Porter, R. (1990). *The Enlightenment*. London: Macmillan.

Powell, B.B. (2002). *A Short Introduction to Classical Myth*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Pringle, D. (1985). *Science Fiction: The 100 Best Novels*. London: Xanadu.

Rees, J. (1968). *Bright Star: The Story of John Keats and Fanny Brawne*. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd.

Reiman, D.H. (1971). "Keats and the Humanistic Paradox: Mythological History in *Lamia*." in *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 11:4, pp. 659-669.

Richardson, J. (1952). *Fanny Brawne: A Biography*. Norwich: The Vanguard Press Inc.

Richardson, J. (1980). *Keats and His Circle*. London: Cassell Ltd.

Ricks, C. (2002). *Allusion to the Poets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Righter, W. (ed.) (1975). *Myth and Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rindler, W. (1977). *Essential Relativity*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Roberts, A. (2006). *The History of Science Fiction*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, M.B. (1993). *The Diamond Path: A Study of Individuation in the Works of John Keats.* PhD Thesis. University of Adelaide.

Roberts, M.B. (1997). *Sparks of Divinity: Keats's Gnostic Vision of Soul-Making*. Available from http://www.jungcircle.com/papers.html (Accessed 16 December 2010).

Robertson, R. (1987). *C.G. Jung and the Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*. New York: Peter Lang.

Roe, N. (ed.) (1995). *Keats and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roe, N. (ed.) (2003). *Life, Poetics, Politics*. London: Routledge.

Roe, N. (2005). *Fiery Heart: The First Life of Leigh Hunt*. London: Pimlico.

Rogers, P. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to Alexander Pope*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roller, D.W. (2010). *Eratosthenes' Geography*. Trans. by D.W. Roller. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rosenbloom, D. (1995). "Myth, History, and Hegemony in Aeschylus." in *History, Tragedy and Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama.* Goff, B. (ed.) Austin: University of Texas Press.

Russell, W.M.S. (1982). "Folktales and Science Fiction." in *Folklore*. 93:1, pp. 3-30.

Saberhagen, F. (1964). *The Year's Best S-F*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sandywell, B. (1996). *Presocratic Reflexivity*. Vol. III. New York: Routledge.

Schultz, D.P. & Schultz, S.E. (2008). "Functionalism: Antecedent Influences." in *A History of Modern Psychology*. 9th ed. Sydney: Thomson.

Scudder, J. (ed.) (1899). *The Complete Poetical Works and Letters of John Keats*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Segal, R.A. (1987). *Joseph Campbell: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Segal, R.A. (ed.) (1996). *Theories of Myth*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Shackford, M.H. (1925). "Hyperion." in *Studies in Philology*. 22:1, pp. 48-60.

Sharp, W. (1892). *The Life and Letters of Joseph Severn*. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. Ltd.

Shea, W.R. (1972). *Galileo's Intellectual Revolution*. London: Macmillan Press.

Shelburne, W.A. (1988). *Mythos and Logos in the Thought of Carl Jung*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Shindler, D.T. (2001). "Dan Simmons." in *Writer*. 114:2, pp. 30-33.

Sider, M.J. (1998). *The Dialogical Keats: Time and History in the Major Poems*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.

Simmons, D. (1996). *Endymion*. New York: Bantam.

Simmons, D. (1997). *The Rise of Endymion*. New York: Bantam.

Simmons, D. (2002). *World Enough and Time*. New York: Harper Collins.

Simmons, D. (2008). *Awards*. Available from http://www.dansimmons.com/books/bibliography.htm (accessed 24 November 2008).

Smith, W. (1952). *Everyman's Smaller Classical Dictionary*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons.

Spencer, L. & Krauze, A. (1996). *Hegel for Beginners*. London: Icon Books.

Spinrad, N. (ed.) (1974). *Modern Science Fiction*. New York: Anchor Books.

Stableford, B., Clute, J., & Nicholls, P. (1993). "Definitions of SF". in *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*. Clute, J. & Nicholls, P. (eds). pp. 311–314. London: Orbit.

Staicar, T. (ed.) (1982). *Critical Encounters II*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.

Steinhoff, S.T. (ed.) (1987). *Keats's* Endymion*: A Critical Edition*. New York: The Whitston Publishing Company.

Steup, Matthias. (2005). Epistemology. Available from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology/ (accessed 24 November 2008).

Stillinger, J. (1974). *The Texts of Keats's Poems*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press.

Storr, A. (1973). *Jung*. Glasgow: Fontana.

Storr, A. (ed.) (1983). *The Essential Jung*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Strelka, J.P. (ed.) (1980). *Literary Criticism and Myth*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Sutton, T.C. & Sutton, M. (1969). "Science Fiction as Mythology." in *Western Folklore*. 28:4, pp. 230-237.

Tarnas, R. (1991). *The Passion of the Western Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Taylor, A. (1979). "Superhuman Silence: Language in *Hyperion*." in *Studies in English Literature*. 19:4, pp. 673-687.

The Hugo Awards. (2008). Available from http://www.thehugoawards.org/ (accessed on 24 November 2008).

Thompson, J.R. (1977). *Leigh Hunt*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Tracy, S.V. (2009). *Pericles: A Sourcebook and Reader*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tulloch, S. (ed.) (1993). *The Oxford Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Post, L. (1975). *Jung and the Story of Our Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Van Ghent, D. (1983). *Keats: the Myth of the Hero*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vickery, J.B. (1966). *Myth and Literature: Contemporary Theory and Practice.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Von Fritz, K. (ed.) (1970). *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Walker, S.F. (1995). *Jung and the Jungians on Myth: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Warrick, P., Greenberg, H.M. & Olander, J. (eds) (1978). *Science Fiction: Contemporary Mythology: The SFWA-SFRA Anthology*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Waters, K.C. (2003). "The Arguments in Darwin's *Origin of Species*". in *The Cambridge Companion to Darwin*. Hodge, J. & Radick, G. (eds). pp. 116-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, M.L. (ed.) (1966). *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wiebe, P.M. (1999). *Myth as Genre in British Romantic Poetry*. New York: Peter Lang.

Wolfson, S.J. (ed.) (2004). *The Cambridge Companion to John Keats*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wollheim, R. (1971). *Freud*. London: Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.

Wu, D. (ed.) (1996). *Romanticism: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wu, J. (1996). *The Golden Age of Zen*. New York: Image.

Young-Eisendrath, P. (ed.) (1997). *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ziolkowski, T. (2000). *The Sin of Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.