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THE REFLECTIONS OF PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY’S RADICAL PERSONALITY AND MENTALITY IN SOME OF HIS POEMS

ABSTRACT
This study focuses on Percy Bysshe Shelley’s opposition to all kinds of authorities both in his life and in his works. This study gives an account of the effect of Shelley’s radical life on his works. The study first begins with some brief information about the poet’s life, then it will briefly focus on the Romanticism and Shelley’s contribution to Romanticism. After giving some information about above-mentioned issues, Shelley’s three poems, “Ozymandias”, “England in 1819” and “Ode to the West Wind” will be analyzed, because these poems reflect Shelley’s literary identity more significantly than his other works. Overall, these poems support the views of this study. Due to the practical constraints, this paper cannot provide a more comprehensive review of the poet’s other works.

Keywords: Percy Bysshe Shelley, opposition to authority, Romanticism, French Revolution

1. INTRODUCTION
In recent years, while there has been increasing interest in the literary works and the writers after the twentieth century, the authors and the works which belonged to the earlier periods have generally been neglected. Few published studies have actually examined the Romanticism and its contribution to the English Literature so far, when it is compared to the contemporary literature. The purpose of this study is to recall that there were a lot of valuable works before the twentieth century, especially in the nineteenth century which needs to be re-examined.

Similarly, Shelley’s works have not been adequately examined. An objective of this study was to investigate Shelley’s life and its reflections in some of his works. As the scope of this study, Percy Bysshe Shelly was chosen on purpose because of his striking worldviews and life-style which were
always criticized by many people throughout his life. With his worldviews and literary career, he has been thought of as a key poet in history for the development of Romanticism. There are many pieces of evidence that his libertarian life had crucial influences in the formation of some radical Romantic ideals. Before analyzing his words, some brief information about his early life would be better to understand and evaluate his works, because his early education at Eton and Oxford had undeniable effects on his works.

Percy Bysshe Shelley was born into an aristocratic family in 1792. As Keach, Richetti, Robbins & Moulton (1996) state “Like Byron, Shelley was born into an upper-class family. His father, Timothy Shelley, was a member of Parliament from Sussex, a county just south of London” (p. 542). Although he was born to a conservative aristocratic family, Shelley was not influenced by his aristocratic and upper-class familial ties. On the contrary, he was influenced by the doctrines of the Age of Enlightenment in his early youth and passionately defended freedom and rebellion against the constraints of British politics and religion” (Benêt, 1965, p. 923). “Shelley was the grandson of a baronet and his family were squires in Sussex. He was born in that county, at Field Place near Horsham, in the year which saw the deposition of Louis XVI and the imprisonment of the French royal family: he could be called a child of revolution” (Stapleton, 1983, p. 797).

2. SHELLEY’S RADICAL WORLD VIEW

Conspicuously, he had always been a child of revolution for the rest of his life without making any concessions to his political views. It is generally argued that Percy Bysshe Shelley may be the most revolutionary and non-conformist of the Romantic poets. Shelley’s revolutionist worldviews were first begun to be formed in the early years of his education at Eaton. “It was at Eton that Shelley first became determined to fight against the forces of injustice and oppression in life” (Keach et al, 1996, p. 542). As Drabble suggests that,

“In his early childhood and youth, he always showed that he was different from his peers. While studying at Eton College, since he challenged and opposed to all kind of social and religious authorities, he was mocked by other students as ‘Mad Shelley’ or ‘Eton Atheist’”


He was an individualist and idealist who rejected the institutions of family, church, marriage and the Christian faith and rebelled against all forms of tyranny. According to Shelley, some institutions like marriage are illiberalizing impediments restricting the social life and human relationships Similarly, many of his poems deal with social and political issues and reflect his radical world views as Ousby (1996) states as follows:

“He drew no essential distinction between poetry and politics. His work continues and revitalizes the radical tendencies of earlier Romantic writing, expanding its critique of social injustice into an attack on specific institutions of oppression” (p. 357).

Shelley’s ideas were considered as anarchic and dangerous by the conservative society of his time. Having traveled to various European countries, Shelley continued to spread his liberal philosophy of life on all occasions. He wrote various pamphlets praising extramarital affairs, giving countenance to vegetarianism and criticizing certain religious affairs.

Apart from Shelley’s education at Eton, his meeting with William Godwin was also an outstanding event in his life, since his becoming acquainted with William Goldwin resulted in two major developments: Firstly, after meeting William Godwin, Shelley was influenced by his radical political views, and secondly, he fell in love with Godwin’s daughter Mary who will be his future wife. Like William Godwin, her mother, Mary Wollstonecraft was also an intellectual, who was among the most imposing advocates of women’s rights at that time (Keach et al., 1996, p. 542).

As explained earlier, Shelley always supported the idea that human relationships should not be limited to legal or social traditions. After falling in love with Mary, although he is married to Harriet, after leaving his wife Harriet and her two children, he goes to France with her lover for a short visit. However, when they return to England. they find themselves alienated from society. Shelley felt himself an alien and an outcast in his own country. After Harriet’s death, Shelley married Mary Godwin in 1818. Since
Shelley was severely criticized by his social circle because of his extramarital affair with Mary Godwin, he had to leave Britain to live in Italy in debt and health problems (Keach et al., 1996). The newly-wed couple had to move constantly until Percy Bysshe Shelley died by drowning in La Spezia bay in August 1822. Shelley lives in Italy and spends four years there between 1818 and 1822 and he never returns back to England until his death. These four years in Italy passed in financial difficulties. Drinkwater (1957) states Shelley’s final years in Italy as follows: “His second wife was Mary Godwin, afterwards the author of *Frankenstein*. They settled in Italy, where nearly all his chief poems were written and from which he was never to return” (1957, p. 436).

3. **THE EMERGENCE OF ROMANTICISM IN EUROPE AND IN ENGLAND**

Romanticism started as a literary movement in the late eighteenth century in Europe and other artistic fields, and continued its influence until the middle of the nineteenth century. It is assumed that Romanticism reacted against the Neoclassical views on literature, philosophy, art, religion and politics, and the formalist conservatism of the previous period (Benét, 1965, p. 871). There were two remarkable revolutions towards the end of the nineteenth century: The American and French Revolutions. The first revolution caused the independence of America after the revolt by the English colonies in the American Continent. The French Revolution in 1789 was more widely felt all over the world. The influence of the French Revolution was not different in England. As Keach et al. (1996) state “In England, the Crown and the ruling classes came to fear the effects of the French Revolution”, because “French Revolution not merely a rejection of authority and control by a distant and as yet disorganized group of colonies, but a complete overthrow of the government of great European power from within” (Keach et al., 1996, p. 458).

French Revolution was one of the most outstanding historical phenomena influencing the emergence of Romanticism and it paved the way for the formation of this literary movement. It brought certainly remarkable transformations in the social structure. After the Revolution, while the aristocratic class lost their power significantly, the bourgeois class gained strength in many fields. With the radical ideologies of French Revolution, the Romantic movement emerged as a reaction against the Neoclassical views on literature, philosophy, art, religion and politics, and its formalist conservatism towards the end of the eighteenth century.

Some philosophers such as J. Rousseau and Montesquieu, who were always in conflict with the views of the feudal system, made a spectacular contribution to the emergence and development of the Romantic Movement with their revolutionary ideals. Some poets headed after the views of these philosophers. Percy Bysshe Shelley was among these poets who followed these ideals and reacted against the power of aristocracy and authority and all kinds of atrocities and tyrannies in his works. It is commonly accepted that Romanticism in Britain started in 1798 with *Lyrics Ballads*, which was co-written by William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and ended in 1832 when the first Reform Law was passed in the Parliament (Benét, 1965, p. 871; Harmon & Holman, 1995, p. 452).

Romantic writers produced their works to emphasize the necessity of individualism, imagination, emotion, fight for freedom, worship of nature, primitivism, interest in the Middle Ages and the East, philosophical idealism, opposition to all types of political and social authorities and traditions, and praise of physical passion. They praised the beauty and mystery of nature in their works. The Romantics had radical views about the current aristocratic system in nineteenth century Britain. They expressed their oppositions to capitalism, industrialism and materialist world view (Benét, 1965, p. 871; Keach et al., 1996, p. 456).

William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, known as the older generation of Romanticism, were marked with their simple ideals and reverence for nature. If we now turn to the poets of the younger generation such as Percy Bysshe Shelley, John Keats and Lord Byron, the significant differences between these two schools can be clearly seen, because the poets belonging to younger generation were keen on exploring the intense passion and supporting political radicalism in their works. Percy Bysshe Shelley belonged to the younger generation of the "English Romantic poets whose sensitive aestheticism, intense passions, political radicalism, and tragically short lives rose them to fame. In fact, Shelley’s life and work unquestionably support such a perception" (Mirc Bakic and Loncar Vujnovic, 2019, pp. 129-130).
Although William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge laid the foundations for the Romanticism in England, it is assumed that Shelley, Byron and Keats, the Romantic poets of the second generation, are more inspirational for British Romantic poetry (Keach et al., 1996, p. 469). Shelly wrote essays on political issues with John Keats. Shelley (1792-1822), Byron (1788-1824) and Keats (1795-1821) are known as the Romantic poets of the second generation. Shelley met George Gordon Byron, another prominent Romantic writer in 1816, and the following years he became acquainted with another important Romantic poet John Keats.

“The difference in age between the two generations is significant. Wordsworth and Coleridge both became more conservative politically after the democratic idealism and revolutionary fervor of their early years. The younger Romantics, particularly Byron and Shelley, felt the founders of English Romanticism had given in to the values of an unjust and reactionary society” (Keach et al., 1996, p. 470). The life stories of Shelley, Byron and Keats are tragic. In fact, Wordsworth and Coleridge were at least twenty years older than these young poets, but they lived longer (Keach et al., 1996, p. 469). Apart from the age disparity between these two generations, there were remarkable differences in their political views. Wordsworth and Coleridge took a more conservative attitude by abandoning their revolutionary exuberance and democratic idealism in their early years. Young romantics poets were disappointed because of Wordsworth and Coleridge’s attitudes, therefore, they started to develop their own artistic features by leaving them (Keach et al., 1996, p. 470). These young writers were radical-minded writers who condemned persecution, corruption and hypocrisy, and were involved in conflicts during their lifetime (Fleischmann, 2013). Byron criticizes Lake Poets in the first episode of “Bards and Scotch Reviewers” and “Canto I of Don Juan”. While Southey talks about them, he blames the poem as “The Demonic School”. Shelley likewise criticizes Wordsworth and Coleridge for abandoning radical political thoughts and adopting the conservative view. Keats also rejects Wordsworth for similar reasons (Volceanov, 2007, p. 153).

Shelley and Byron are considered as alienated Romantic poets as they rejected the norms accepted by society during their lifetime. In addition, they did not have any efforts to be accepted by society, either. George Gordon Byron and Percy Bysshe Shelley had some strikingly similar features. Both were born in the aristocratic family; they went to prestigious private schools and universities. Both were subjected to social pressure because of their unconventional life styles and therefore had to leave England. They both lived and died in the Mediterranean countries far away from their countries at a very young age. There are a number of significant differences between Shelley and Byron. Byron was different from Byron in a number of respects. For example, when Byron had to leave England in 1815, he was very popular and recognized as an important poet not only in England but also in Europe. His autobiographical work, Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage had been appreciated by many people, while Shelley had never been popular throughout his life and had always been misunderstood by the audience (Keach et al., 1996, p. 470).

4. SHELLEY’S CONTRIBUTION TO ROMANTICISM

After giving some brief information about Shelley’s early years, his general worldviews and the emergence of Romanticism in Europe and in England, in this section Shelley’s contributions to English Romanticism will be discussed. Shelley's revolutionist views, which had always been found dangerous since he lived in a conservative period, can be clearly seen in some of his poems. In some of these poems, such as Devil’s Walk (1812, The Masque of Anarchy (1819) and England in 1819, he reflects his radical criticism against the monarchy in all of these poems he mercilessly criticizes the corruption in society, and attacks the King, the royal family, nobility and public officials.

“Queen Mab” is Shelley’s one of his ideological poems, in which he mercilessly attacks the taboos in society. “Queen Mab”, apart from some verses, contains some essays about his political and philosophical world views (Drabble, 2000, p. 925). “Shelley’s thoughts on human institutions are spoken by Queen Mab: marriage, trade, Christianity, kings, priests, and statesmen are exposed to the poet’s censure. The poem carries a message of hope for a better world in future” (Stapleton, 1983, p. 730). In this poem, he criticizes the monarchy, marriage, religion and eating meat and infamizes them as evils in society. “Shelley had a desperate hostility to marriage; and his narrative poem of Rosalind and Helen is an elaborate plea against that institution” (Backus, 1882, p. 312).
Regarding the social oppression, it may be outstanding to note that although he was a radical supporter of free love and rejected the belief in marriage, he had to marry Harriet in 1814 because of securing their children before the law. According to Shelley, freedom and love are the only remedies in society. People can overcome the restrictions and tyrannies in society through freedom and love. Because of his unconventional and radical worldviews, atheistic views and sexual promiscuity both in his life and works, he was condemned and harshly criticized.

Shelley recommends Republicanism, illicit cohabitation, atheism and vegetarianism in place of monarchy, marriage, religion and eating meat, respectively (Drabble, 2000, pp. 831-831). As Stapleton suggests “The poem said plainly that the Christian religion contributed much to the total of human suffering, that marriage and contemporary morals encouraged the worst sort of hypocrisy, and that ‘God’ was a projection of the cruelty and arrogance of man himself. The poem became a favourite with 19th-century radicals” (1893, p. 730).

While studying at Oxford, Shelley published a radical pamphlet with his close friend Thomas Jefferson Hogg jointly, “The Necessity of Atheism”, in which they questioned God’s existence. “The Necessity of Atheism” was a pamphlet in which Shelley declared that the existence of God was not proven and that there was no evidence in support of such a belief; a free enquiry into the matter was necessary” (1983, p. 798). In this pamphlet, Shelley echoed his atheistic views and political tendencies. Because of this pamphlet, he drew reactions of Oxford authorities who requested from Shelley and Hogg to declare a defense statement. However, Shelley and Hogg both refused to make such an excuse, so they were expelled from university together.

After this most radical opposition to the authority and religious institutions, Shelley signalizes that he would never seize to express his own political view without hesitation throughout his life. Drinkwater (1957) expresses this event as follows: “In due course, he went to Oxford. There he put forth a pamphlet of two pages on the Necessity of Atheism. The authorities, without argument, expelled him promptly. Yet the University has, in recent years, set up his statue, and so claimed him, with some irony, among her cherished sons” (p. 436).

His father tries to move his son away from Hogg through threatening Shelley to withdraw his material aid and spiritual support unless he returns home and receives religious education. His father also requests him to apologize from the Oxford authorities. While Hogg reconciles with his family and returns his home to study law in York (Stapleton, 1983, p. 798), Shelley refuses to do so. He completely breaks his ties with his family; he goes to Scotland and never returns home until the end of his life at the expense of losing a high amount of heritage. Breaking his ties with his family and even leaving his country for his ideals demonstrates that he will never submit to any kinds of authority throughout his life. From 1811 until 1814, Shelley participated in various political and social reformist activities in Ireland and Wales, and wrote many radical pamphlets related to his views about liberty, equality and justice.

4.1. Ozymandias

In this section of the study, Shelley’s poem, “Ozymandias”, which was published in the form of a sonnet in 1818, will be examined, because this poem occupies a pivotal place in poet’s political opinion. This poem, written two years after the exile of Napoleon for the second time, is Shelley’s critique of persecution and dictatorship. It can be assumed that this poem is an open challenge to tyrannical powers and clear political criticism of the authority. As Benét (1965) states it is about worthlessness and meaninglessness of a tyrant’s power (p. 749). This sonnet reminds the rulers who would have tendencies for totalitarian regime and dictatorship that their ruling period will be temporary and that one day their sovereignty will end like many otherworldly powers. There is an irony in the title of the poem as Collins suggests:

“Ozymandias is inherently ironic. Even its title has ironic connotations. The name comes from the Greek ozium (air) and mandate (to rule). Ozymandias is a ‘ruler of air’ or simply a ‘ruler of nothing’. Furthermore, the inscription is intended as a boast to other rulers, albeit a shortsighted one. The cruel irony is that this boast has turned into a warning. Ozymandias has turned to dust and for this, other rules should despair, because they too will one day suffer the same fate” (URL 1).
As John Rodenbeck (2004) describes, "Ozymandias is an ancient Greek name for Ramses II, pharaoh of Egypt during the nineteenth dynasty. It is actually a Greek version of the Egyptian phrase "User-maat-Re", one of Ramses' Egyptian names. As Keach et al. (1996) state Ozymandias is “another version of the Egyptian name Rameses. The king referred to in the poet is Ramses II, a great builder of palaces and temples who ruled Egypt during the thirteenth century B.C., and who left a number of statues of himself” (p. 544). There are two speakers in the poem. At the beginning of the poem, the first speaker states that he met a traveler from an ancient land, most likely Egypt, and the rest of the dialogue belongs to this traveler who talks about a statue he saw in this ancient land. The traveler states what he saw in Egypt as follows:

“I met a traveler from an antique land / Who said: “Two vast and trunkless legs of stone / Stand in the desert . . . Near them, on the sand, / Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose / Frown, / And wrinkled lip, and sneer of cold command, / Tell that its sculptor well those / Passions read / Which yet survive, tamped on these lifeless things, / The hand that mocked them, and the heart that fed: / And on the pedestal these words appear: / ’My name is Ozymandias, king of kings: / Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!’ / Nothing beside remains. Round the decay / Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare / The lone and level sands stretch far away” (Delaney, Ward & Fiorina, 2003, p. 45).

This statue had been sculptured by a king named Ozymandias to glorify his magnificence. The traveler states that the statue survived only as a mass of fragments such a pair of huge legs of stone without a trunk and a visage half buried in the sand next to the huge legs, though it was enormously sculptured to glorify pharaoh’s magnificence. From the facial expression of the half sunk and shattered visage of the trunkless statue, it can be seen that Ozymandias had been impersonated as an insulting and scorning ruler, especially with his frown, wrinkled lip and sneer of cold command expressions. In a sense, the expression, “cold command” was used to confirm the king’s tyrannical and heartless personal features.

After pointing out the visual expressions of the statue, the speaker abruptly indicates that sculpture did a great job with stamping king’s humiliating and heartless facial expressions and reflecting the king’s passion on this lifeless thing. The traveler suggests that the sculptor fulfilled his duty perfectly by reflecting the arrogant, self-satisfied and commanding features of Ozymandias as desired.

The inscription on the pedestal which the poet indicates in the third stanza throws the king’s arrogant characteristics into stark relief. With this inscription, Ozymandias tries to demonstrate his magnificence with his works emphasizing with the following statements: “My name is Ozymandias, king of kings: / Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!” It is noteworthy that Ozymandias uses the phrase “king of kings” when expressing himself. It is likely that the inscription on the pedestal reinforces the arrogant visual expressions created on the shattered visage.

In the final stanza of the poem, Shelley creates a situational irony. Although Ozymandias boasts about his paramount works, the traveler can see nothing around the colossal since nothing beside remains except the “boundless, lone and level sands” which represents nothingness. With these verses, Shelley mocks with Ozymandias’ claims that he was “the king of kings” and the most powerful man in the world with his mighty works, as written on the pedestal. As an ironical situation, none of Ozymandias’ works survived, only the ruins of the statue of the kind, which was produced by an artist, remains.

According to Shelley, everything related to art, artist and artistic creativity is imperishable and has more strengths that any political powers. From this poem, it can be deduced that the rulers are not so effectual as the artists. With this poem, Shelley implies that political regimes and rulers, like Ozymandias, will perish, disappear and fall in time. The statue which represents tyranny and oppression turned into a pile of rubbles in the progress of time. Similarly, this poem is actually a stern warning for all oppressive systems, authorities and kings. Shelley gives messages to all kings and oppressive regimes, especially the kings of England and France. Shelley emphasizes that oppressive rulers and tyrants, no matter how hard they try to preserve their own greatness, will not be able to keep up with time, and one day they will disappear from the world without leaving any traces behind. As a result, the statue, which was once used as a symbol of sovereignty and glorification in the past, becomes a symbol for man’s weaknesses and mortality.
4.2. “England in 1819”

In this section of the study, another politically strong work of Shelley, “England in 1819” will be thematically analyzed. Like “Ozymandias”, “England in 1819” is another sonnet with political content written in a bitter and harsh tone. It was written as a response to the brutal Peterloo massacre in August 1819, and in many ways it is similar to “Ozymandias” with its attacks against the oppressive ruling class people in England. The Peterloo Massacre, which Shelley protested in “England in 1819”, happens as follows:

A meeting was organized under the leadership of a radical leader Henry Hunt to demonstrate the general discomfort of the people with the intention of certain parliamentary reforms. Approximately 60,000 people attended the meeting of the majority of which, consisted of women and children. Nobody was armed and their intentions were completely peaceful. The judges, who were nervous before the meeting, were worried that the crowd would be too much, and the soldiers on duty arrested some of the demonstrators as soon as the meeting started. These soldiers did not only arrest the leaders, but they also attacked the crowd. Within ten minutes, the demonstrators were frightened by the soldiers and they were scattered in a few minutes. Although there are some contradictory claims about the number of dead and injured people, probably eleven people were killed and 500 were injured after this incident. Hunt and other radical leaders were arrested, tried and punished. Hunt was sentenced to two years in prison (URL 2).

England was ruled by King George III in 1819, whom Shelley severely criticizes mercilessly and defines him as being “old, blind, despicable and dying king”. Under the rulership of King George III, Britain had to overcome some international problems with France and North America. During his reign, the United States declared its independence after winning the War of Independence. In addition to his political failures, the king had some health problems and suffered from mental illness in his last years. Shelley criticizes the king and the other ruling classes in this poem as follows:

“An old, mad, blind, despised, and dying King; / Princes, the dregs of their dull race, who flow / Through public scorn,—mud from a muddy spring; / Rulers who neither see nor feel nor know, / But leechlike to their fainting country cling / Till they drop, blind in blood, without a blow. / A people starved and stabbed in th’ untilled field; / An army, whom liberticide and prey / Makes as a two-edged sword to all who wield; / Golden and sanguine laws which tempt and slay; / Religion Christless, Godless—a book sealed; / A senate, Time’s worst statute, unrepealed— / Are graves from which a glorious Phantom may / Burst, to illumine our tempestuous day” (Delaney, 2003, p. 47).

In the poem, King George III was depicted as a dying, old, blind, insane and despised monarch. His descendants were conceited and scornful princes who were depicted as “dregs of dull race”. King’s ministers were also leechlike creatures who manipulate the monarchy politically for their own benefits. The army was like “two-edged sword” whose function should have been to protect the people was doing just the opposite through killing innocent people. According to Shelley, the army was used by malignant officials to destroy liberty for marauding. On the other hand, “people starved and “stabbed” by the army when they tried to defend their personal rights. The law was useless and manipulated for the sake of powerful ruling classes while enchaining the poor farmers. Religion is depicted as a Godless religion and Parliament denies the civil rights of Roman Catholics.

As Shelley depicted in this poem, England in 1819 was in a terrible condition. However, Shelley, like in many of his poems, does not seem to lose his hope for the future, because there was an example of independence in France which took place in 1789. In the last two lines, he expresses his hope by stating that “glorious Phantom” may burst and illumine their tempestuous day. With these lines, he refers to French Revolutions. Shelley states that he will never lose his hope for better days, but there is only one solution to get rid of these problems that the people had to suffer. With a revolution to similar to the French Revolution, democracy will be established, and monarch with his accomplices will have to lose their powers. In his poem, Shelley fearlessly expresses his radical political views against all kinds of authorities and tyrannies. Shelley criticized the Peterloo Massacre in another poem, “Mask of Anarchy”. This poem, written in August 1819 and published in 1832, criticized the Peterloo Massacre like in
“England in 1819”. In this poem, written in ballad style, Shelley did not blame British political leaders such as Castlereagh, Eldon, Sidmouth, who were held responsible for the killing and injuries of some innocent people involved in a meeting for parliamentary reform. He criticized the general oppression and tyranny in England, stating that anarchy has taken over the country in every respect and triumphed (Drabble, 2000, p. 651).

4.3. Ode to the West Wind

The poem, “Ode to the West Wind”, written near Florence in October 1819, was published in 1820. This poem, written in ode style, is an addressing to the spirit of the West Wind, which is depicted as “both destructive and protective”. The poem consists of five stanzas, each of which is written in sonnet type. The West Wind is a constant force for Shelley to carry the “undisturbed” political hopes to the “awakened world” and also represents ideals, expectations, creativity (Drabble, 2000, p. 736). The subject of this poem, like “England in 1819”, is about the need for a revolution to renew the dead and corrupted systems and ideals in a corrupted world.

In this ode, Shelley addresses the West Wind as if it were a living being, and described his strength. While the first three stanzas emphasize the effects of wind on nature, the last two stanzas are about the effect of wind on the author. The poet begs the West Wind in the first stanza and praises his power. The wind blows away dead leaves whose colors are yellow, black and red, reminding of the people who died from the disease. The wind is not only destructive, but it is also protective because it carries seeds that will revive nature, and it ensures that more vibrant colors will prevail in spring. In a sense in these lines, dead leaves represent all kinds of corruptions in society. The West Wind will eliminate this corrupted system and thoughts, and sow the seeds of a more innovative and independent system instead.

In the second stanza, the poet focuses on the influence of the West Wind in the sky. Similar to dead leaves, it also carries the clouds with its power and causes commotion in the sky. In the third stanza, the poet focuses on the effect of the Western Wind on the Mediterranean coast. He talks about the ruins of an ancient city with the ruins of palaces and towers under the sea at Baiae Bay. The foliage under the Mediterranean Sea trembles just like dead leaves on earth and clouds in the sky. The fourth stanza is like a summary of the previous first three stanzas. Shelley puts himself at the place of the dead leaves, clouds, and waves in the ocean, because he wishes to feel the power of the West Wind like them. He wants to be taken elsewhere by the West Wind, like dead leaves, clouds and waves, because his social milieu in England, is the biggest obstacle for him to be free both in his thoughts and experiences. He feels alienated and restricted in England and his life become an unbearable burden for him. When he remembers his early life, he remembers that he also had similar characteristics with the West Wind, such as being tameless, swift and proud. He wants to be wild, fast and proud again as the West Wind.

“Make me thy lyre, even as the forest is: / What if my leaves are falling like its own! / The tumult of thy mighty harmonies
Will take from both a deep, autumnal tone, / Sweet though in sadness. Be thou, Spirit fierce,
My spirit! Be thou me, impetuous one!
Drive my dead thoughts over the universe, / Like wither’d leaves, to quicken a new birth! /
And, by the incantation of this verse”  
(Delaney, 2003, p. 42).

In this poem, the poet addresses wild and strong wind of autumn that he was once “untamed and fast and proud” like him, and begs him to give life to him now with his power” (Benét, 1965, p. 728). The extinguished fire he speaks of here in the last lines represents the revolutionary spirit the poet feels in his heart. Although he may seem suppressed, the revolutionary spirit in him will never be missing. The poet just waits for a wind to blow and reignite that fire. In England nobody can understand him and his ideals, so he asks West Wind to take him to other places in the world where he could be better understood and appreciated. Now the season is winter, but it will not always continue as winter, because winter is actually the harbinger of spring. Shelley likens the country’s present situation to the winter and states that he will never lose his expectations like in the previous poems, because there will always be the possibility of revolution in England like the French Revolution. In the last lines he states his hope as follows:
“Scatter, as from an unextinguished hearth / Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind! / Be through my lips to unawakened Earth” (Delaney, 2003, p. 42).

5. CONCLUSION

Consequently, despite being from a member of an aristocratic family, Shelley never wishes to make use of his noble class. On the contrary, he always had radical ideals which he would never leave behind his ideal for any temporary and insignificant expedience. Opposing any kinds of authority and oppression, Shelley tries to speak and think freely and tries to encourage the readers to follow his way. Leaving his family and country resembles the reader the life of a modernist writer, James Joyce, who also tried to unchain himself from the boundaries of authorities, like his own religion, family and country. Shelley continued to oppose to any kinds of tyrannies wherever he went. In all his works, he tried to convey his social and political ideologies to the reader. He used sonnet, ode and ballad styles to give voice to his ideals. The form is not important but the content of his works was more important for him. For example, he used sonnet style when writing his poems, “Ozymandias” and “England in 1819” and ode style in his “Ode to the West Wind”. However, he gives similar messages in three of these poems. In all of these poems in which this study analyzed, he criticized all misused powers and tyrannies that caused chaos in society. He becomes the spokesperson of the otherized and oppressed people, and he passionately supports the ideologies which were brought to the agenda of the world after the French Revolution.
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