Janneke van der Leest

The pastoral elegy rocks
Shelley's revisions of an ancient genre open the way to honour Brian Jones

Romantic revision of the pastoral elegy

At the famous Hyde Park concert on the 5th of July 1969 Mick Jagger paid homage to his ex-colleague Brian Jones, who had died three days earlier. He did this by citing two stanzas of Percy Bysshe Shelley's 'Adonais; An Elegy on the Death of John Keats, Author of "Endymion," "Hyperion," etc.' (1821).[1] This poem, a lamentation for the young deceased poet John Keats, was an important contribution to the cliché idea of the 'romantic artist': the genius who struggles with existential questions and deep, dark feelings, lonely and tormented, ignored by both friend and enemy. Shelley wrote it in the classical genre of pastoral elegy. He revised this genre and put it to his hand – in a romantic way.[2] In this article, I firstly focus on the pastoral elegy and Shelley's romantic revisions. Secondly, I concentrate on two twentieth-century elegies. Not only Jagger, namely, payed homage to Jones. The Doors's singer Jim Morrison and The Who's guitarist Pete Townshend both wrote poems in remembrance of Jones. Do these twentieth century elegies follow the ancient genre and its romantic revisions?

The pastoral elegy

The term 'elegy' has its origin in the Greek 'elegos' and its derivatives 'elegeion' and 'elegeia'.[3] In classical Greek poetry these words *could* refer to the singing of a short, sad and mournful song, accompanied by the aulos. But they referred *in any case* to the rhythm: the combination of hexa- and pentameter in one couplet. In the course of time, the elegy became more and more the pre-eminent form for melancholic poetry and laments.

[1] Van der Leest 2018.
[2] Callaghan 2019; Swann 2019.
[3] Nagy 2018.

William H. Race (1988) sums up the characteristics of lament implied in the elegy as follows: "1) a list of mourners (often summoned in a 'call'); 2) disfigurement (of mourners or the corpse); 3) praise of the deceased; 4) a contrast of past (alive) and present (dead); 5) a description of the last day; 6) the finality of death; 7) complaints: a) 'what boost it?', b) 'the good die, the unworthy survive'" (p. 92). On the basis of Peter M. Sacks's (1987, pp. 1-37) study of the elegy we can add: the fracturing or separation of voices; traces of the theatrical and ceremonial rituals associated with the death and rebirth of vegetation gods; repetition of words, names, formulas and rhythm and of elegiac questioning. The characteristic of repetition can be extended further. Sacks claims that elegies are actually "repetitions in themselves" (p. 23), based on the return of characters, myths, roles and relations throughout an individual poem as well as throughout the history of the elegies as intertextual repetitions.

The *pastoral* elegy has its origins in the second century BC with Bion's 'The Lament for Adonis'. Bion mourns the death of the mythological character Adonis, hunter, shepherd and beloved.[4] When Bion died, he was mourned by (pseudo-)Moschus in the pastoral elegy 'Lament for Bion' (ca. 150 BC), in which he is imagined as a shepherd.[5] With this poem starts the tradition in which a poet mourns the death of a fellow poet in an elegy – and in this way thematising poetic inheritance – while evoking associations with the death of a pastoral character.

A later, Latin example of a pastoral elegy can be found in Virgil's (70-19 BC) 'The Eclogues' (or 'Bucolica'). This work consists of ten poems based on the Greek bucolic poetry of Theocritus (third century BC), the founder of that genre.[6] Bucolic poetry, or pastoral poetry, idealises the rural and nature. Together with the elegy, it forms the basis of the pastoral elegy. Virgil composes two of his eclogues in the subgenre of pastoral elegy. In the fifth eclogue Daphnis is the subject. He is the Adonis-like bucolic hero of Theocritus. 'Eclogue 10' is written for the love-sick elegiac poet Gaius Cornelius Gallus – the founder of Latin elegiac poetry.[7] Virgil *imagines* him dying; this is not based on a real death. Whereas the Hellenistic Greek poet Theocritus put his scenes in Sicily, Virgil places his tenth eclogue in Arcadia. Besides this important geographical shift Virgil replaces the old mythological hero Daphnis with his contemporary friend Gallus – like Moschus replaced the Adonis with his contemporary Bion.

The history of the pastoral elegy thus shows that poets like to associate themselves with famous deceased colleagues, not in the least in

[4] Theocritus et al. 2015, pp. 504-517.
[5] Theocritus et al. 2015, pp. 467-481.
[6] Davis 2010, p. xvi.
[7] Davis 2010, p. xiv.

order to benefit from their success.[8] In addition to the intra-personal side, the genre also has an intertextual character: quoting or referring to the work of deceased literary 'greats'. It proves that the poet knows and builds on the literary tradition; that he appreciates and honours his predecessors. In Romanticism, however, the idea of 'the artist as genius' arises. Such an artist becomes inspired by nature, imagination or by the divine itself. Art had to be original and authentic. Innovativeness and literary rebellion against previous generations of artists are irrevocably coupled with these ideas. No wonder then, that pastoral elegy, with its tangle of recursion, is difficult to reconcile with romantic poetry. And no wonder that, as we shall see, Shelley struggled with this genre and tried to separate it from its tradition. He prepared it for the future, in which Morrison shows that the romantic pursuit of originality and authenticity – although with him, hidden behind a theatre mask – can be linked to a multi-layered intertextuality within the elegy in which tradition shines through.

'Adonais' and how Shelley revives and revisions the pastoral elegy

It was not obvious for Shelley to choose the pastoral elegy as a form to honour Keats, because it was outmoded. Michelle Turner Sharp (2000) speaks of the pastoral elegy being "both obsolete and explicitly maligned" (p. 299) in Shelley's days. He must have chosen it, according to Karen Swann (2019), because of its history: "of acknowledging premature death, especially that of a poet by a fellow-poet, and especially a poet seen in the context of a hostile world." (p. 58). Besides, the pastoral elegy gave Shelley a chance to place the narrative in a Greek landscape, which calls to mind Keats' work.

Nevertheless, formally, 'Adonais' is no elegy, because its stanzas do not follow the combination of hexa- and pentameter. Shelley chose the Spenserian stanza in order to honour Keats by referring to his example and favourite poet Edmund Spencer (1552-1599), composer of 'Astrophel. A Pastoral Elegy upon the Death of the Most Noble and Valorous Knight, Sir Philip Sidney'.[9] Overall, however, Shelley does use formalistic characteristics of the elegy.

[8] In addition to the examples already mentioned: Edmund Spencer's 'Astrophel. A Pastoral Elegy upon the Death of the Most Noble and Valorous Knight, Sir Philip Sidney'; Ben Johnson's 'To the Memory of My Beloved, the Author Mr William Shakespeare and What he Hath Left Us'; Thomas Carew's, 'An Elegy upon the Death of the Dean of Paul's, Dr John Donne'; Robert Garnier's 'Elégie Sur le Trespas de Pierre de Ronsard'.

[9] Sir Philip Sidney was also a poet who died young.

At first sight there are many similarities with earlier pastoral elegies, but while Shelley *uses* the history of the genre, he *alters* it at the same time. First of all, there is the newly created figure 'Adonais'. This seemingly small alteration of the name[10] Adonis gives Shelley freedom to deviate from the exact myth of this ancient god. Further, by renaming Keats, Shelley creates the possibility of transforming Keats' image and biography according to his own wishes. According to Shelley, for instance, Keats' disease (consumption) was caused, and his death heralded, by a hostile review. In the preface to his poem Shelley does not shy away from calling the reviewer a murderer. Neither description of the last days nor the accusation of murder are new ingredients of the (pastoral) elegy. Nor is it Shelley's own invention that a negative review would have led to Keats' death. But his elegy definitely finalises the romantic attitude of granting "cultural prestige to the pathos-laden figure of the artist seen as a victim or casualty of a world hostile or indifferent to genius." (Swann 2019, p. 57).

Shelley also puts the image of the immortal pure spirit of Keats to his hand. 'Adonais', namely, celebrates the return of Keats' soul "back to the burning fountain whence it came" (339) – completely in line with Shelley's vision of the genius soul, and contradictory to Keats' view of the soul which is much more bound to the world.[11] Whereas the distortion of the human body is a traditional theme in the elegy, Shelley distorts the immaterial remains of Keats: his biography and spirit.

Adonais not only represents Keats, but also shows characteristics of Shelley. An example is the issue of literary critique. Although Shelley used to present himself as independent of and indifferent to it, he was very sensitive to the opinions of critics and of his peer group. This sensitivity is thematised in 'Adonais' and in its preface as a (deadly) characteristic of Adonais/Keats. Therefore, some critics have "postulated that Shelley projects his [own] anxieties on to Keats." (Callaghan 2019, p. 198). This elegy depicts not only the deceased poet and the remembering one as two separate figures with separate roles. Here, the writer commemorates, but he is also *part of* the commemorated figure. This mixture makes the poem not only point toward the past (Keats alive) and present (Keats dead) – one of the characteristics of the elegy – but also to the future: Shelley's own death, when he will coincide with the figure of a deceased person. At the same time, it gives Keats a spark of life, for his image coincides with the living Shelley.

Beside the mixture of the persons Keats and Shelley, references to their works are mixed. As suits a good pastoral elegy, there are many allu-

[10] Van der Leest 2018, pp. 20-21.
[11] Sacks 1987, pp. 160-161.

sions to the works of the deceased poet.[12] So much that, as Swann puts it, "Within the fiction of the poem… it's not Shelley but the corpus that returns to the corpse." (2019, p. 55). In addition to quoting and alluding, Shelley mixes Keats' work at different levels in his own poem. The allusion in 'Adonais' to Keats' 'Isabella; or, The Pot of Basil' (resp. 48-49 and III.7-8), for example, illustrates this. It echoes Keats' poem, appropriates it, *and* introduces the key theme of 'Adonais' and that what it wants to effectuate metaphorically: flowers growing from a dead body.[13] Furthermore, this theme is part of the ancient Adonis myth.

Shelley not only forms a double persona with Keats, he also doubles himself: he is both the narrator and his persona the Poet. Shelley struggles with the poetic process. While describing it, it becomes a "dying lamp, a falling shower / A breaking billow" (284-285). The narrator points to the fleeting nature of time in relation to the writing process: "even whilst we speak / Is it not broken?" (285-286). As Bennett (2004) states about Shelley's idea of his own poethood in 'Adonais': "Shelley figures the effect of poetry as a kind of haunting power and proceeds to ghost-write his own life, to ghost himself" (p. 19). In his self-imagining, he works towards a mythological identity as the Powerful Poet. Shelley both undermines and glorifies his self-portrait as a poet.

Although ambivalent with regard to his own image, Shelley works on it at the expense of paying tribute to Keats. This attitude has led to accusations of narcissism.[14] In earlier pastoral elegies we also saw the unmistakable presence of the writer of the poem commemorating his deceased colleague. If the elegist does his job well, he himself, the one he laments, and the works of both of them will be saved for posterity. This is a consoling side effect of a successful elegy. Then what is the romantic difference 'Adonais' makes? Shelley wants to grant Keats the status of a *poetic genius*, though Keats is not yet a celebrated poet. He is convinced of Keats' success in the future, provided that he – Shelley – passes the memory of Keats and his work to the future. Shelley makes a prophet of himself. What is more, 'Adonais' "has played a significant role in the shaping of both Keats' and Shelley's reputations after their deaths." (Swann 2019, p. 57). The prophecy will come true in the later nineteenth century when Keats eventually gets the recognition Shelley plead for. The image of Keats and of himself – bound in 'Adonais' – then becomes the established image of a romantic poet.

[12] Everest points to the rich texture of these allusions (2007, pp. 237-264); Garrett sums up some important allusions (2013, pp. 4-5); and Callaghan speaks in this context of the "transference of energies between the elegy and Keats's own poetry" (2019, p. 194).
[13] Or as Epstein puts it: the allusion leads to the conclusion that 'Adonais' "itself mirrors the basil plant growing from the soil nourished by the murdered subject's head." (1999, p. 112).
[14] Although not all scholars agree with that judgement, see Callaghan 2019, p. 195.

It is not just this prophetic attitude and pre-occupation with his self-image that makes Shelley a narcissist in 'Adonais'. Sacks sees a narcissistic attitude in relation to Keats' death as well and links this to Freud's theory of mourning and melancholia, according to which *healthy mourning* means that after the loss of a love-object, the ego must point itself to a new love-object. Shelley still, "identified *a part* of his ego with the lost object." (Sacks 1987, p. 156). This unhealthy mourning, or *melancholia*, causes a split within the ego. This is expressed in Shelley referring to himself both as 'he' and 'I'. A fragmentation of voices is a characteristic of the pastoral elegy, but Shelley adds to it a division of *internalized* voices. The way he 'practises' it offers no consolation, but becomes a sign of narcissistic melancholy instead. In stanza 31-33 Shelley represents himself in terms of wounded and withered, and in reference to ancient, vegetation figures that underline the identification of the mortal part of Shelley's ego with the deceased Adon(a)is. This identification prepares the way for another one, that with Keats – the lost love-object. In the first part of the poem Shelley identifies with Keats the man of flesh and blood who was done wrong and was misunderstood, but in the last part he identifies his immortal self with the immortal poetic genius soul of Keats. He detaches from the natural and reattaches to a transcendent ideal. This is a move of his narcissistic libido, which is susceptible to melancholy instead of mourning.

The shift to the quasi-neo-platonic ideas occurs definitely in line 343,[15] after the lamentations (1-153) and consolations to the mourners (154-342). Shelley announces and justifies this abrupt change "by disclosing Adonais's continuing if transformed existence: 'He wakes or sleeps with the enduring dead' (336) (…). The relation of life and death is now reversed" (Hühn 2016, p. 208). Keats is dead, but lives now among eternalized dead young poets "as their most prominent member (397-414)" (Hühn 2016, p. 209). This is consoling; he will be remembered like they are. But we, the living, we are dying: "*We* decay / Like corpses in a charnel" (348-349) – note the literally imagined, archetypal characteristic of the elegy, the disfigurement of the mourners.

We still live in a material, natural world. As a true Romantic, Shelley feels the natural force, the erotic flow, but he wants to transcend that, to spiritualize its energy. He thus disapproves of the embeddedness of the mourners in myths of nature, in the material world. Nevertheless, it is with "erotic and material images of elevation, penetration, and glowing radiance that Shelley will have to reach for consolation, trying to cut or burn through all material textures" (Sacks 1987, p. 153-154). He must use the images from the originally physical realms in order to try to find consolation.

[15] Where Jagger starts his reading at the Hyde Park concert.

Mourners from the pastoral tradition are mobilized: "nature in various manifestations such as morning, echo (with a reference to the myth of Echo and Narcissus), spring, winter and Albion." (Hühn 2016, p. 207). They overlap with figures from "a Greek pastoral world especially identified with Keats' oeuvre" (Swann 2019, p. 56). New are contemporaries of Keats and Shelley joining the procession of mourners: Byron, Thomas Moore, and other members of their circles. The world of letters is being re-orientated in 'Adonais'. The gravity is moved toward youth, not least through the appearance of early deceased predecessors of Keats – Lucan, Sidney and Chatterton – as mourners.

Shelley also presents himself as mourner, but in the first instance "in a very distancing and alienating manner" (Hühn 2016, p. 207) which is in accordance with the tradition. Nevertheless, he doubts the power and efficacy of mourning, weeping and consolation in the context of pastoral elegy. This is reflected in the revised way in which the conventional 'elegiac questioning'[16] appears in 'Adonais'. Shelley does not question why Adonais died. He questions his own call to mourn. Immediately after his call on Urania – "Wake, melancholy Mother, wake and weep!" (20) – he questions his act: "Yet wherefore?" (21). He alters tradition: he enlarges and modernizes the list of mourners and questions both them and the act of mourning itself – instead of letting the figures do their mourning-job.

Shelley's impatience with mourning is reflected in the fact that he lets the gods recede (stanza 14, 15 and 16) from Adonais's world. This is a radical break with the ancient pastoral elegy in which the gods, half-gods, and mythological figures are always and everywhere around. Here, they cannot comfort, pay tribute or set an example anymore; they are unemployed, freed from their ancient jobs. At the same time, Shelley shows that Keats' repertory of Greek figures was insufficient. Keats himself knew it already. He wrote about them as if recycling memories from a high literary past. Shelley confirms Keats in this and takes it one step further. Like Swann says: "Keats' Echo, his Hyacinthus, his Narcissus, his Adonis reappear in *Adonais* as afterlives of afterlives." (Swann 2019, p. 61).

Why are the mourners in 'Adonais' insufficient? To take the first one, the Hour: Shelley calls on her to grieve and to teach her compeers her own sorrow, while she is dead herself. She is encouraged to say to her compeers: "With me / Died Adonais" (6, 7). Thus, she is speaking from within death. There are many more inadequate mourners, like Spring (stanza 16) who grieves and has no reason to wake, since Adonais has

[16] Sacks, p. 22. This questioning is more or less similar to Race's noticed complaints.

gone. Adonis should have motivated her to wake – the mythological figures Spring and Adonis are dependant upon each other for their ever-returning cycle. But by the transformation of Adonis to Adonais the very relation to the natural season is gone, there is only a reference. Therefore, there is no reason for Spring to regroup herself and take on her natural and mythological role. This stepping out of the natural cycle and breaking with the myth is Shelleyan Romanticism.

In the course of 'Adonais' Shelley parts with the list of mourners and with his own distancing presence as mourner. He starts expressing his authentic feelings. Expressing one's emotional engagement is a typical romantic addition to the elegy. Shelley emerges himself as a self-interested mourner and examines how far he can go in his *own* grieving. It seems, if we take his investigation of self-interested mourning seriously, that he does not deliberately, or out of rebelliousness push the boundaries of the genre and its tropes; he does so because he is searching for a way to express his own original mourning. Apparently, the language and style of the traditional elegy are not suitable for this.

In line 151 Shelley breaks through the row of mourners. His true personal voice can be heard for the first time, in the breaking through of a curse: "As Albion wails for thee: the curse of Cain / Light on his head who pierced thy innocent breast, / And scared the angel soul that was its earthly guest!". Here Shelley refers for the first time to Keats' – and his own – enemy, the reviewer. Moving closer to his own voice gives him room for releasing anger and energy for mourning. He is able to give an outcry of personal grief: "Ah, woe is me" (154).

Nevertheless, Shelley's personal involvement with Keats weighs heavy, and he would rather lose it than express it. Therefore, he lets Urania return in the poem. Stanza 26 shows a psychologically reversed, unnaturalscene of a mother losing her child.[17] The reversion results in a contra productive way of mourning: Urania becomes melancholic. This is a way for Shelley to get rid of his own melancholic attitude. He transfers it to her. She cannot turn away from Adonais, she wants him to speak to her, to kiss her, she wants to be dead like him.

Besides Shelley's dealing with mourning, releasing of anger and transference of melancholy we can also observe the 'complaint' – not a direct, shallow utterance like the traditional complaint such as "the good die, the unworthy survive", but a more profound one. It concerns – with the reviewer as a metaphor – a society that is not receptive to romantic poetry. Keats'

[17] Both the Oedipus-myth and its reception in psychoanalyses are about the child who has to come to terms with the otherness and absence of his first love-object. In 'Adonais' the focus is on the mother who is left behind. For an elaboration on this aspect of the poem, see Swann 2019, pp. 66-75.

death becomes a symbol of the death, or at least the neglect, of the arts. And Keats becomes "a hero and martyr of poetry" (Wolfson 1995, p. 19).

The hostility towards the arts experienced and criticized during Romanticism, is associated with the limits of the arts, and more specifically those of poetry. The limits of poetry (that it is only active in an immaterial realm), but also its limitless possibilities (everlasting memory), were already themes in the traditional pastoral elegy. Shelley neither accepts those limits nor the consolation of preservation in memory. For him poetry is not just an exile to the mind, locked in the domain of memory and imagination. It is not that passive for him: "Adonais works to secure the survival of the possibility of poetry into a modernity potentially indifferent and hostile to its power, in verse that will come to possess a posthumous sting of its own." (Swann 2019, p. 75). Shelley actively rules over Keats' grave and over his own – in accordance with his prophetic attitude.

'Ode to L.A. While thinking of Brian Jones, deceased'

The genre of pastoral elegy functioned well for centuries, but once the object as well as the subject of mourning are so prominently present in the poem, it becomes an individualized poem with authentic expression of grief and despair. For Shelley, as a romantic poet, it is impossible to express himself with the help of the artificial tropes of the pastoral elegy. He struggles with and alters the genre, by permeating it with the presence and working of romantic self-consciousness. Do the elegies in rock music pick up Shelley's romantic revisions?

To answer this question, I will first study the poem 'Ode to L.A. While Thinking of Brian Jones, Deceased' by Jim Morrison, singer of The Doors. Morrison was a Jones-fan. Notebooks from the time of his graduation (summer 1965) reveal this. It is also known that he had a collage with images of Jones on the wall, he took over his whispering way of speaking, and he was impressed when he witnessed one of Jones's violent episodes in a bar in L.A. in 1966. In the summer of 1967 both men had a relation with singer and model Nico.[18] So, Morrison and Jones had been in each other's environment, but never met.

Meanwhile however, Jones degenerated into a tragic character, addicted to alcohol and drug, not able to work – neither in the studio, nor on tour – and eventually, in July 1969, he drowned. Perhaps Morrison recognized himself in his idol and feared that the same fate awaited him.

[18] Davis, resp. p. 68, 71, 69/87, 123 and Trynka 2014, pp. 158-160.

Directly after the tragic news of Jones's death namely, he asked Steve Harris, executive at record company Elektra, what would happen to The Doors if he would suddenly die.[19] Soon after, he wrote the ode to be discussed here. Less than three weeks after Jones's death, The Doors played twice one evening in The New Aquarius Theatre at Sunset Strip, recording a live album. Upon entering, concertgoers were given a copy of this elegy for Jones.

The title

The title 'Ode to L.A. while thinking of Brian Jones, Deceased' echoes titles for elegies and odes of the past. It suggests that the poem is an ode to the city, with an additional, elegiac homage to the musician. In his poetry and lyrics Morrison contrasts the images with which he describes the city, and more specifically Los Angeles, diametrically with the images with which he describes the countryside, the desert and the forests. That more primitive set of images of nature includes the earth, day, the unconscious and the idea of some kind of nature religion. The set of urban images includes the night and the conscious reasoning of residents and travellers who are out to get what they want.[20]

Morrison would depict his ambivalent feelings about L.A. later, in 1971, in the song 'L.A. Woman', in which he represents the "city of night" as a woman. The sexual appeal and luxury of L.A. arouse a sense of excitement, but at the same time there is a sense of hesitation due to the desolation of insatiable desire and decadence. A manifesto that Morrison wrote for the record company Elektra says: "I am primarily an American; second, a Californian; third, a Los Angeles resident." (Davis 2004, p. 155). In addition to gradually zooming in on the West Coast and the city, however, there is plenty of room left in his being for the indigenous cultures of America that fascinate him and from which he draws his own mythology. Now and then, both Jones and Morrison assume themselves a shamanistic attitude in relation to old, primitive cultures.

There is thus a construction of ambivalences surrounding Morrison's representation of the city: the city as a source of both excitement and aversion; and the city versus nature. In the ambivalent persona of Brian Jones, the urban, decadent pursuit of all modern and sexual needs on the one hand, and the retreat into ancient primitive cultures and places on the other, are united. In the poem Morrison portrays him as something both angelic and satyr-like – paralleling the Janus face of L.A. He also refers to Jones's natural, untouched, wild side – paralleling the counterpart

[19] Davis 2004, pp. 342-343.
[20] Campbell and Jacobs 2009, p. 221.

of the city. So, it is no surprise that Morrison combines his ode to L.A. with his reverie about Jones. Besides, a certain "romantic dualism [is] at the heart of Morrison's nature" anyway, as Tony Magistrale (1992, p. 144) claims on basis of Morrison's poetry and lyrics.

The poem

The opening line of the poem – "I'm a resident of a city" – is reminiscent of the quote from the Elektra pamphlet. As the title explains, that city is Los Angeles. Being an L.A.-resident is an essential part of Jim Morrison's life and image. Next, he sees himself being assigned the role of Hamlet and attributes to Jones that of Ophelia:

> They've just picked me to play
> the Prince of Denmark
>
> Poor Ophelia

Jones has drowned, like the young woman from Shakespeare's play. And while Ophelia's suicide was turned into a fatal accident to allow a Christian funeral, speculation about whether Jones's accident might have been murder, or perhaps suicide, had circulated from the outset. In short, confusion and doubt in both cases. Then there are more images from 'Hamlet', mixed with references to Jones:

> All those ghosts he never saw
> Floating to doom
> On an iron candle
>
> Come back, brave warrior
> Do the dive
> On another channel

Hamlet promised the ghost of his late father (former king of Denmark), which appeared to him several times, to take revenge on his murderer, but he was unable to live up to his words. Among other things, he played for total idiot. And he was also madly in love. When he finally came to the act of revenge, everything ended in a fiasco that had no survivors. Does Morrison see similarities between Jones and Hamlet? You could argue that at times Jones was also cunningly foolish; went regularly crazy with love, and eventually made a big mess of his life and its ending.

With the words "come back, brave warrior" Morrison seems to want to revive Jones, to let him take up his Hamlet-role again. He suggests Jones to try a second chance: a dive in "another channel". Does Morrison

not want to take over the Hamlet-role? It is surely clear in retrospect that he did follow in Jones's footsteps. Morrison could not yet have known that he would die two years later, to the day, at the same age as Jones and also in the water, in a bathtub. Would he give Jones a second chance, because he – a similar destructive character – saw himself confronted with his own fate?

After this, Morrison directly refers to Jones's life and to his interest in Morocco:

> Hot buttered pool
> Where's Marrakesh
> Under the falls
> the wild storm
> where savages fell out
> in late afternoon
> monsters of rhythm

Marrakesh was for Jones a paradise of relaxation, drugs, exotic atmospheres and encounters with the hip high society from the West, but also a base from which to set out with a tape recorder to make recordings of indigenous music. He shared the fascination for traditional music, primitive peoples and their rituals with Morrison. Both artists were familiar with trance and the climax that results in ecstasy through musical repetition, exhaustion and high volume – it is even a trademark of Morrison as performer. Jones discovers these forces of music in Morocco in an ultimate form, in the rhythmic trance music of the Gnawa and in ceremonial indigenous music in Joujouka. There, he witnessed part of an annually performed ancient ceremony, culminating in the Bou Jeloud ritual. Bou Jeloud is likely a North African version of the Roman deity Pan, and the ritual in Joujouka is likely to be an equivalent of the Roman "Rites of Pan".[21] During the ceremony he heard that the drummers, the "monsters of rhythm", beat an irresistible rhythm; they "maintained a resounding heartbeat pulse on the bottom skin, and a fast machine-gun rat-a-tat on the top skin, the rhythms steady and hypnotic yet even-changing via some deep telepathy. The volume was immense, echoing across the mountain" (Trynka 2014, p. 288).

Just as Jones became obsessed with the Gnawa and the people of Joujouka, Morrison thought he was possessed by one or more of the ghosts of Indians he had seen – as a child – dead or dying in a car accident. During his college years, Morrison and a friend travelled regularly to the desert southeast of L.A. using drugs or alcohol. Once, Morrison had a

[21] Trynka 2014, p. 284; Pattison 1987, p. 73.

"spectacular, shaman like experience that flashed him back to the Indian car wreck he had witnessed as a child." (Davis 2004, p. 52). After that trip he became interested in shamanic knowledge and practices. The Doors's keyboardist, Ray Manzarek, labelled the scream that Morrison occasionally let out onstage "a possessed Indian yell" (Fowlie 1993, p. 4). No doubt Morrison could imagine Jones's obsession with Joujouka music and their ritual practice. It is not without reason that he evokes it in the poem. Later, there is a second, more implicit, passage related to the Moroccan musical and ritual adventure. But first, Morrison makes other moves, such as this existentialist passage:

> You've left your
> Nothing
> to compete w/
> Silence

Morrison depicts Jones here as someone who leaves his life – "your Nothing" – behind to compete with "Silence" – in death. Jones does not go from his earthly "Nothing" to another nothing, but to "Silence", which for a rock star who lives from and with sound, means: nothing in the superlative. These lines are an expression of Morrison's nihilistic and existentialist vision of life, which he derived mainly from Nietzsche and Sartre, and indirectly from the beat generation. Perhaps Morrison saw how difficult it is to measure yourself in terms of a 'something'; to coincide with yourself. It is not without reason that he speaks about himself and lets others speak about him in metaphors as: "Dionysus, the Lizard King, the shaman, the dark angel, Mr. Mojo Risin" (Fowlie 1993, p. 104). Who is Jim Morrison? Who is hiding behind the pop star's mask? A life and/or a person of Nothing? That is what he concludes with Jones. He continues in a positive tone; Morrison hopes that Jones died with a smile:

> I hope you went out
> Smiling
> Like a child
> Into the cool remnant
> of a dream
> […]

After a few lines referring back to 'Hamlet', he continues about a dream:

> Leaves, sodden
> in silk

Chlorine
dream
mad stifled
Witness

The diving board, the plunge
The pool

This dream seems like a sketch of the drowning, including the witness on whose role is much speculated until this day. The lines referring to 'Hamlet', and mixed with Jones's characteristics, go like this:

The angel man
w / Serpents competing
For his palms
& fingers
Finally claimed
This benevolent
Soul

Ophelia

Here Jones is "the angel man". Again, it is not strange, then, to honour both this man as well as Los Angeles, which literally means "the angels", in one ode. Jones is angelic to *behold* anyway, with his light blond hair that almost looks like a halo. Words later in the poem – "You were the bleached / Sun" – put this aptly. This angel competes with Serpents, animals reminiscent of the false cause of death of Hamlet's father whose ghost communicates to his son: "'Tis given out that, sleeping in my orchard, / A serpent stung me; so the whole ear of Denmark / Is by a forged process of my death / Rankly abus'd; but know, thou noble youth, / The serpent that did sting thy father's life / Now wears his crown" ('Hamlet', Act 1, Scene V).

As in Ophelia's case, the cause of death of Hamlet's father has been misrepresented – his brother killed him, not a snake. In this context of Hamlet-parallels, "competing with snakes" can symbolize competing with lies and with murderers. Furthermore, the often-ambiguous image of a serpent or snake, has a sexual connotation.[22] "The angel man" who competes with a phallic symbol finally claims Ophelia, plays her role. The wine god Dionysus, who will be discussed later, is also associated with serpents. He is the son of the supreme god Zeus, who seduced

[22] The snake is associated with male and female sexuality, and with fertility, but also with wisdom, healing power and guilt, among other things.

Dionysus's mother Persephone in the form of a serpent; the knowledge of making wine from grapes was given to Dionysus by a snake; and a serpent was often carried about at cult festivals in honour of him. Back to the drowned man:

> You were a fighter
> a damask musky muse
>
> You were the bleached
> Sun
> for TV afternoon
>
> horned-toads
> maverick of a yellow spot

Here a negative image – "a fighter" – is juxtaposed with a positive image – "the bleached sun". The ambivalence between the dark and bright side of Jones comes to the fore briefly but powerfully. The soft, almost fondleable description "damask musky muse" contrasts sharply with the "horned-toads". The spiny reptile is the "maverick of a yellow spot": a resident of the desert, a place that enchanted both Morrison and Jones. In appearance Jones is an outsider, a maverick, just as he seems the bleached Sun between his dark band mates with his dot of light blond hair, especially on the black and white TVs of the 1960s. Moreover, he is figuratively an outsider, a dissident within his band. The horned-toads that fascinate Morrison so much (Davis 2004, p. 10) symbolise Jones, and Morrison thus shows his fascination for Jones with this image. But now see where his individualistic behaviour has led Jones – to "meat heaven", the materialistic heaven, not the spiritual one:

> Look now to where it's got
> You
>
> In meat heaven
> w / the cannibals
> & jews
>
> The gardener
> Found
> The body, rampant, Floating
>
> Lucky Stiff
> What is this green pale stuff
> You're made of

Meat heaven can refer to death: after all, meat – like flesh – is marked by finitude, it perishes. The life that Jones lived was indeed like a "heaven" full of wannabe friends: "cannibals" living on Jones's wealth, consuming his materiality. Morrison mentions jews here in the same breath as cannibals, though it is not known whether he had anti-Semitic ideas.[23] One of the profiteers was – at least as it appears in many accounts of Jones's last days – the handyman Frank Thorogood. He, not the gardener, as Morrison mistakenly writes, found the body floating in the pool.

"This green pale stuff / You're made of" reminds us again of Shakespeare, this time of 'The Tempest' where Prospero says: "We are such stuff / As dreams are made on, and our little life / Is rounded with a sleep" ('The Tempest', Act IV, Scene I). The magician has just made a group of spirits disappear and reminds his daughter and her fiancé that mortal life is soon ending. What does this strange *green* stuff represent?[24] The earthly, the green, the natural, the material "you're made of" and that will perish? While this "you" is more like a dream, immaterial. This is the 'rock star Jones', the image that Morrison admired. A few years earlier he dreamt of being like him. But Jones turns out to be fleeting, Nothing, like a dream. He disappears, like everyone else and everyone's "little life" – to speak with Prospero – will disappear.

Poke holes in the goddess
Skin

Will he Stink
Carried heavenward
Thru the halls
of music

No Chance.

Here Morrison sketches – apart from the question of stink which brings in an earthly, carnal element (smell) – the image of an ascension

[23] Why is Morrison using the word jews in a negative sense? Most likely it was just meant to shock. Romantics like Byron and in his way Shelley and later the Symbolist poet Rimbaud were not averse to shocking their readers, and this literary way of shocking went on openly in pop culture. The Sex Pistols, Joy Division, Rammstein – there is a whole tradition in rock music that shocks with Holocaust references (to take only that example of shocking material). On the one hand this breathes the atmosphere of the tough, destructive, rebel artist (the Shelleyan one), but on the other, that type of romantic artist makes use of images associated with the ignored, the discriminated against (the Keatsian romantic artist).

[24] The colour green often occurs in Morrison's poetry. Campbell and Jacobs (2009 p. 218) notice this fact, but have no explanation for it, nor give it any specific meaning.

like a saint. This time, not among the cherubim known from religious imagery, but rather through the "halls of music". The plural is reminiscent of the different celestial circles, as mentioned for example, in Dionysius the Areopagite or Dante. But Jones has "No Chance" to go heavenward. What then is in store for him after his death? Morrison explains this at the end of his ode, in his:

> Requiem for a heavy
>
> That smile
> That porky satyr's
> leer
> Has leaped upward
>
> Into the loam

This poem is a requiem for a "heavy(weight)" in rock music. "That smile" is reminiscent of the line: "I hope you went out smiling". Jones was like a "porky satyr": he was getting fatter, just like Morrison, because of (alcohol) addiction. Half goat, half human, the satyr is cheerful, smiles, but the creature is also naughty, has a lusty, sly look, a "leer" – again a duality.

Finally, with a goat's jump the satyr "has leaped upward". Not to heaven, but "into the loam", the material of the Greek vases depicting satyrs. Thus, the poem reminds us of John Keats' 'Ode to a Grecian Urn', about a vase depicting a kind of Dionysian feast: "What men or gods are these? What maidens loth? / What mad pursuit? What struggle to escape? / What pipes and timbrels? What wild ecstasy?" Keats urges the flute to continue playing: "ye soft pipes, play on; / Not to the sensual ear, but, more endeared, / Pipe to the spirit ditties of no tone". The unheard melodies are sweeter than the heard ones, according to Keats. We long to hear them, we dream of them. Likewise, we can now only guess at the musical productions Jones could have made, had he lived longer. But he is *still* now, like the quiet figures on the urn immortalized in Keats' ode. Similarly, Jones is immortalized in Morrison's ode. Eventually, he is buried in the earth, to which the clay/"loam" also refers.

Pan and Dionysus

Michael McClure, poet, writer and friend of Morrison notes: "Brian Jones, in this tragic decay, had become Jim Morrison's metaphor for himself." (Davis 2004, p. 343). That much is clear, but there is more to it. The fan Morrison *surpasses* his idol Jones. With Jones's death, the tables are

turned. Although Jones has been compared to both Dionysus and Pan – the most famous satyr in Dionysus's retinue – Morrison presents him in his ode just as a satyr. On the other hand, he identifies himself – supported by both acquaintances and critics[25] – with Dionysus, the god of wine, fertility and annual rebirth of nature. He does not emphasize this shifting relationship, but within the context of Morrison's symbolic play, this turn is significant. And as already mentioned, Dionysus is associated with snakes, so when Jones competes with snakes (earlier in the poem), it can be read as Jones competing with Morrison – for fame, for women, or for artistic recognition.

Fowlie explains the link between Morrison and Dionysus as being broader than the obvious statement that Morrison is a symbol for 'sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll' and Dionysus, the fertility and wine god honoured with orgies and bacchanals. He explains that the tradition of the poet singing his own songs to a large audience, such as Morrison, goes back to ancient times, "to the Greek poets who in their dithyrambic songs celebrated the death and rebirth of the god Dionysus." (Fowlie 1993, p. 7). The Doors's concerts fronted by Morrison were like modern Dionysian rites.

Jones was certainly interested in Pan and drew parallels between himself and the mythological creature. During a ritual he witnessed at Joujouka, a goat was led in front of him and his company. A companion recalls "how Brian leapt up and shouted, 'That's me!' Then the goat was taken away to be slaughtered." (Trynka 2014, p. 289). "To Brian, Pan embodied the spirit of rock 'n' roll" (Trynka 2014, p. 160), explains a friend of his. Pan is the satyr who entered the musical battle with Apollo. With the tantalizing and syncopated music of his flute, King Midas chose his music over the pure exalted melodies of Apollo's lyre. Pan is cheerful and associated with celebration, but he created rebellious, disturbing music, ecstatic and exuberant; some call it 'the music of the devil'.

Dionysus as god of fertility and the annual rebirth of nature bears much resemblance to Adonis, the bucolic hero with which Keats merges in 'Adonais'. Pan is the "patron god of pastoral and of elegy" (Sacks 1987, p. 2). The protagonist of early pastoral elegies finds an attenuated echo in Morrison's poem through Romanticism: not as from the pure Adonis, but as a creature from the retinue of his dubious equivalent, Dionysus. The receding of the gods and mythological figures from Shelley's elegy, is not yet completed in Morrison's ode – a figure like Pan or a satyr is probably too much linked to rock 'n' roll to definitely leave behind.

[25] Fowlie 1993, p. 7, 96, 97 and 122.

And not only linked to rock 'n' roll, but to music in general, thanks to Nietzsche, one of Morrison's favourite philosophers. Nietzsche, who was influenced by romantic aesthetics, built his art theory on the contradiction between two drives, the Apolline and the Dionysiac, named after two Greek Gods. The essence of the Apolline is best described by the word 'dream'; the essence of the Dionysiac by the word 'intoxication'. Dionysiac feelings "awaken either under the influence of narcotic drink (…) or at the approach of spring when the whole of nature is pervaded by lust for life." (Nietzsche 2007, p. 17). Dionysian *music* aroused fear and horror in the more serene Homeric-Greek world, which tried to ward off the element which defines its Dionysiac character: "the power of its sound to shake us to our very foundations, the unified stream of melody and the quite incomparable world of harmony." (Nietzsche 2007, p. 21). In the ecstatic hymn to Dionysus "man is stimulated to the highest intensification of his symbolic powers; something that he has never felt before urgently demands to be expressed (…)." (Nietzsche 2007, p. 21). No wonder Morrison felt attracted to that.

The romantic go-between

Besides the evolution of Adonis into a satyr, there are more elegiac characteristics that are present in Morrison's ode, but which first have gone through the romantic mill. The exoticism that resonates in the passage about Marrakesh, for example, is reminiscent of the fact that several of Keats' poems are related to ancient Greece – in line with which Shelley places his elegy for Keats in such a setting. Moreover, this fits in with the tradition of pastoral elegy. Both Morocco and Greece evoke antiquity, tradition, mystery and natural environment. Morrison involves nature further in words like "under the falls / the wild storm", "horned-toads", according to the characteristics of the pastoral, and of romantic poetry.

The 'cause of death'-theme is also present. Both Shelley and Morrison suggest 'murder'. Through the allusion to Ophelia's death and to the snake involved in the death of Hamlet's father, Morrison hints at speculation surrounding Jones's cause of death. Did Jones have enemies? He was an outlaw, a 'maverick', who acted egoistically and individualistically, which could have made enemies, but not, it would seem, necessarily. In any case, this feature does fit the image of the romantic artist, an image to which Shelley's 'Adonais' contributed so much.

Among the very striking resemblances here are nothingness and silence. They quite literally express the emptiness already penetrating Shelley's revision of the elegy. Shelley hollows out the tropes of pastoral elegy, leaving them empty; they subtly become nothing. Morrison continues this romantic journey until the hollow deserves a name, evolve into im-

ages of emptiness: Nothing, Silence. No more weeping figures at all – not even incompetent mourners – next to a dead body. Nihilism has made its appearance. What is left, is Nothing next to Shakespeare's theatre-in-a-theatre woven into a poem.

At the beginning of the poem, Morrison has to play the Prince of Denmark, while he assigns the (suggested) former actor of this lead role – Jones – the role of Ophelia. Morrison succeeds Jones and wants to prevail over him, dethrone him. Moreover, Morrison identifies with Dionysus and puts Jones, as a satyr, in his shadow. This is reminiscent of Shelley's attitude towards Keats: the surviving poet who takes care of the memory of the deceased one who by death gets a malleable image.

Through these power-shifts, plays a mix of real persons with literary and mythical characters. There is also biographical *mixing*. We can see that the mourner is partly hiding behind the deceased, like Shelley behind Keats. Morrison attributes fascinations and characteristics to the one he honours that may equally apply to himself: the interest in primitive cultures and in Pan-like creatures, the dual nature of the artist, and the Nothing(ness) of a successful rock star's life. Morrison, the successor, models his interests, image and even his fate upon Jones, like Shelley did upon Keats.

But there is an important difference, which nevertheless looks like a similarity at first sight. Morrison identifies partly with Jones, like Shelley identified part of his ego with Keats. In Shelley's case it led to melancholia, which he eventually transfers to Urania. Morrison solves the problem *theatrically*. Shelley knew and acknowledged that the whole tradition of the elegy was theatre, insufficient to express authentic feelings. And Morrison fights this 'failure' of the elegy with equal weapons: he plays the game in the play, like a true Hamlet. He takes the romantic dismantlement of pastoral elegy a step further by actually returning the ancient genre closer to its theatrical/performing core. The embeddedness of theatrical roles in his poem provides a safe extra step away from personal involvement of his ego with his love-object. It gives Morrison space – within the poem – to distance himself from his personal engagement with Jones. Thus, he corrects Shelley's romantic misstep to fall into the trap of melancholia.

Shelley struggled with the theatricality of the pastoral elegy, but not with the illusion of an eternal heaven for the genius Poet, the immaterial realm of literary and cultural memory. Morrison is more nihilistic and he denies Jones all of that. Only the metaphor of the satyr survives. That metaphor is what strikes most readers while discussing Morrison's ode to Jones. Anyway, that identification is rooted in Romanticism: implicitly in connection to the figure of Adonis/Adonais, but more directly in the satyrs forever captured on Keats' urn.

Intertextuality

The ancient pastoral elegy as well as 'Adonais' show allusions and citations of the works of the remembered poet. In case of the poem for Jones this is difficult, because he was not a text writer, but a musician. Nevertheless, it gives references to his *appearance*, which in the visual culture of the second half of the twentieth century can be seen as a kind of quoting, like the description "the bleached Sun for TV afternoon" – an image that is etched in the memory of many viewers from those days, certainly for Stones fans.

There are also references to other works: Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and 'The Tempest'. I have also noted reference to Keats' 'Ode to a Grecian Urn'. The fact that Morrison refers to such great writers and works says something about his aspiration and genuine desire to be recognised as a poet. He makes clear that he belongs to the literary tradition and is not 'just' a writer of pop songs. Shelley also shows his literary muscles through his references in 'Adonais'.

Furthermore, the reference to Greek mythology is a form of intertextuality. Morrison chooses a satyr, and the link with the romantic 'Adonais' has already been elaborated. The dithyrambic song of the poet-singer celebrating the death and rebirth of Dionysus also resounds. However, with this poem only death is sung and no rebirth, not even in heaven. Jones is now kind of a dream, a theatrical illusion that disappears if we forget him, but stays as long as we remember him and his music. Morrison adds to the latter possibility. At the same time this commemoration contributes to the image with which he wants so desperately to be identified: Morrison the poet. As a result, he follows in Shelley's footsteps and catches two birds with one stone.

'A normal day for Brian, the man who died every day'

Besides Morrison, Pete Townshend, guitarist of The Who, also took up the pen to honour Jones. On the morning of the 3rd of July 1969, *Daily Press* reporter Peter Cole rang Townshend, confronted him with the news of Brian Jones's death and asked for his reaction. According to Townshend, the conversation went as follows: "'Oh, it's a normal day for Brian, like he died every day, you know,' and he [the reporter] said, 'Thank you very much,' put down the phone and I thought, 'Fucking hell,' then I got a phone call from the Rolling Stones' publicity man, Les Perrin, saying, 'This is terrible,' so on and so on. And I got all upset about it and to back up my words I wrote this song, 'A Normal Day for Brian, the Man who Died Every Day'" (Cott 1970). Townshend published it in *The Times*.

The title

The title of the obituary already points towards Jones's self-destructive lifestyle: drinking, drugs abuse, rejecting friends and colleagues. Townshend was such a friend. In the years 1964-1966 they were rather close. He has good memories of Jones and was "melodramatically upset" when Jones died and says about it: "He was the first person I knew well in my business that died. It seemed to me to be a portent and thus it proved to be." (Townshend 1999). Townshend does not explicitly ask, as Morrison did, whether the dead of Jones prefigures possibly his own dead, but he is prescient like Morrison and Shelley.

The poem

At first sight, the poem is more like a scribbled rhyme. Nevertheless, it says some interesting things.

> I used to play my guitar as a kid
> Wishing that I could be like him
> But today I changed my mind
> I decided that I don't want to die
> But it was a normal day for Brian
> Rock and roll's that way
> It was a normal day for Brian
> A man who died every day

Although Townshend is only three years younger than Jones, he was once "as a kid" in comparison to Jones, whom he looked up to. Concerning the breakthrough of their bands, The Rolling Stones were only a year or so ahead of The Who. Townshend, however, always remained a 'fan' of the Rolling Stones as he proclaimed at the induction speech for the Rolling Stones for the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame twenty years after Jones's death: "I'm really an absolute stone fan of the Stones, and always have been." In this speech he also mentioned his relation to Jones: "And Brian Jones hurt me by not bothering to take a cure. Because I loved him a lot. He was very, very important to me. He was the first real star who befriended me in a real way (…)."[26] So, the kid who admires his example, is not a fictional image in the poem; it is how Townshend really used to understand his relation to Jones. He too had a tendency to be self-destructive. But Jones's death undermines the attitudes of admiration and imitation. Townshend "changed his mind" and does not want to

[26] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WfFtACFYULU: respectively 1.50 and 1.09 minutes.

die like his Stones-hero. Paradoxically, the famous rock line "I hope I die before I get old" is Townshend's own![27] As writer of The Who-song 'My Generation', Townshend formulated this line as protest against the older generation who did not understand the younger one. But to life a life like Jones and consequently die that young, went too far for The Who's guitarist. He realized that Jones died every day, explored the boundary between life and death again and again, and one day crossed it. Jones's addictions, his way of life, his music, and above all his excesses make him an ultimate example of what rock 'n' roll embodied for the young Stones-fan Townshend: "rock and roll's that way".

Traces of the romantic pastoral elegy

Does this obituary recall the tradition of (pastoral) elegy? And in what way is it 'romantic', or in accordance to the romantic changes Shelley made?

Townshend points to the exemplifying role of Jones and that is a way to 'praise the deceased'. This is an element of the pastoral elegy and a romantic characteristic as well. Romanticism goes even a step further: it introduces the idea of putting the genius artist on a pedestal, like Shelley did with Keats. Fandom arises in the romantic era. Townshend belongs to that fandom-tradition: he is a Stones and Jones 'fan', he idolizes them. The characteristically elegiac 'contrast between past and present' is clear and very sharp. In the past Townshend followed Jones' example; now he has changed his mind.

Furthermore, the short poem is very personal and individualized. "Brian", is mentioned by name in the title, like in Morrison's ode, but this short poem is also written directly from the 'I', which is romantic. It does not use metaphors or tropes from the tradition of the elegy. This was already announced in Romanticism, by Shelley, who dismantled the traditionally meaningful metaphors and tropes as empty ones.

Townshend does not mix the one remembered and the one who remembers. The obituary is not melancholic in the sense discussed above. Townshend used to identify with the self-destructive Jones, but now he has died, the identification has stopped. He distances himself as a healthy mourner from his adored love-object. Death is presented as definitive, and afterlife is not mentioned, not even in a negative sense.

What is, however, certainly reminiscent of the tradition of pastoral elegy, is the reference to an eternal cycle of life and death. Jones "died every day", as Townshend puts it, which indicates also a daily rebirth. This calls

[27] For the parallel with Romanticism, see Van der Leest 2018, p. 27.

to mind a parallel with Adonis, the young beloved hunter who dies every autumn and is reborn every spring. Jones as a rock star *lives* much faster than a vegetation deity and as a consequence *dies* much faster: every day instead of every year.

This, finally, complicates 'the description of the last day' – another characteristic of the genre. Because of Jones's returning death, namely, every day is his last day. He lives life like there is no tomorrow. It is not at all presented as something to be melancholic about, but it does say how difficult Jones's *life* was, and that the people around him let it happen: they let him die day after day. This conclusion seems like self-reproach aimed at Townshend himself, as well as to Jones's fellow bandmembers and to the people in rock 'n' roll business in general. It appears to be a downside of rock 'n' roll that it is accepted to let someone slowly slip away until death follows – the neglect of the problems of the idol. In this obituary Townshend does not, like Shelley, blame a specific person or incident, but he blames in general and rather implicitly all the world witnessing how Jones drank himself to death. Later he explains – and here he specifically mentions 'the press' in line with Shelley: "I've become angry about a business in which people, especially the press, sneer if someone tries to save their skin by going into rehab after raising hell. (…) Brian should have been sectioned into a mental hospital like a street drunk, not allowed to flounder about in a heated swimming pool taking fucking downers. (…) But let no-one pretend it is part of the pop myth. I told Jim Morrison he was turning into a fat drunk in 1971. I could tell from his stunned expression that until then no-one had indicated they might even care." (Townshend 1999).

The downside of stardom initiated in Romanticism, not in the least by Shelley's 'Adonais', is this inhuman distance between the genius and often misunderstood artist on the pedestal on the one hand and the rest of the world on the other hand – be it critics, fans or even colleagues, who cannot help but neglect, and who are too far from this myth come to life.

Bibliography

Bennett, Andrew.
2004. *Romantic Poets and the Culture of Posterity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Callaghan, Madeleine.
2019. *The Poet-Hero in the Work of Byron and Shelley*. London/New York: Anthem Press.

Campbell, Lee & Debra Jacobs.
2009. "Sinks, Snakes, Caves w/Water": Floridian Imagery in the Poetry of Jim Morrison. In April Van Camp & Claudia Slate (Eds.), *Natural Florida: Proceedings of the 2008 Annual General Meeting of the Florida College English Association* (pp. 215-224). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cott, Jonathan.
1970, May 14. Tea with Townshend: A Post-'Tommy' Chat on Rock 'N Roll, Recording. *Rolling Stone*. Retrieved 15 February 2021, from https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/tea-with-townshend-a-post-tommy-chat-on-rock-n-roll-recording-101952/

Davis, Gregson.
2010. Introduction. In *Virgil's Eclogues*, Translated by Len Krisak. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Davis, Stephan.
2004. *Jim Morrison: Life, Death, Legend*. London: Ebury Press.

Epstein, Andrew.
1999. "Flowers that Mock the Corse Beneath": Shelley's "Adonais", Keats, and Poetic Influence. *Keats-Shelley Journal, 48*, 90-128.

Everest, Kelvin.
2007. Shelley's *Adonais* and John Keats. *Essays in Criticism, 57*(3), 237-264.

Fowlie, Wallace.
1993. *Rimbaud and Jim Morrison: The Rebel as Poet*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Garrett, Martin.
2013. *The Palgrave Literary Dictionary of Shelley*. Bastingstoke, Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hühn, Peter (Ed.).
2016. *Facing Loss and Death. Narrative and Eventfulness in Lyric Poetry*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Keats, John.
1988. *The Complete Poems*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Magistrale, Tony.
1992. Wild Child: Jim Morrison's Poetic Journeys. *The Journal of Popular Culture, 26*(3), 133-144.

Nagy, Gregory.
2018. Ancient Greek Elegy. In Karen Weisman (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook*

of the Elegy. Oxford Handbooks Online: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199228133.013.0002

Nietzsche, Friedrich.
2007. *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Pattison, Robert.
1987. *The Triumph of Vulgarity: Rock Music in the Mirror of Romanticism*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Race, William H.
1988. *Classical Genres and English Poetry*. London/New York/Sydney: Croom Helm.

Shakespeare, William.
1993. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Edited, with a glossary by W.J. Craig,* M.A., London: Henry Pordes.

Sacks, Peter.
1987. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe.
1994. *The Works of P.B. Shelley*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.

Swann, Karen.
2019. *Lives of the Dead Poets, Keats, Shelley, Coleridge*. New York, Fordham University Press.

Townshend, Pete.
1999 July. "A friend of mine" Pete Townshend reflects on the Brian Jones he knew and pop's myth of romantic self-destruction. *MOJO*, *68*. Retrieved 15 February 2021, from https://members.tripod.com/~redrooster_2/petequotes.html

Trynka, Paul.
2014. *Brian Jones: The making of the Rolling Stones*. New York: Viking.

Theocritus.
2015. *Theocritus. Moschus. Bion*. Edited and translated by Neil Hopkinson, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press.

Turner Sharp, Michelle.
2000. Mirroring the Future *Adonais*, Elegy, and the Life in Letters. *Criticism, 42*(3), 299-316.

Van der Leest, Janneke.
2018. Romanticism in the Park: Mick Jagger Reading Shelley. In James Rovira (Ed.). *Rock and Romanticism: The Classic Rock Edition* (pp. 19-34). Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Wolfson, Susan.
1995. Keats Enters History: Autopsy, *Adonais*, and the Fame of Keats. In Nicholas Roe (Ed.), *Keats and History* (pp. 17-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

YouTube
Rock & Roll Hall of Fame
29 January 2010. Pete Townshend inducts Rolling Stones at Rock and Roll Hall of Fame inductions 1989. Retrieved 15 February 2021, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WfFtACFYULU

The pastoral elegy rocks
Shelley's revisions of an ancient genre open the way to honour brian jones

In this article the attention is focused firstly on the ancient genre of pastoral elegy and Percy Bysshe Shelley's romantic revisions in his ode to John Keats. What do these revisions mean? Secondly, the article will concentrate on two twentieth century elegies. Jim Morrison and Pete Townshend each wrote a poem in remembrance of Rolling Stone Brian Jones, respectively *Ode to LA while thinking of Brian Jones, Deceased* and the obituary *A Normal Day for Brian, the Man who Died Every Day*. Do those twentieth century examples follow the ancient genre and its romantic changes? And if so, how?

Further, with their poems the writers place themselves as mourners in a specific relation to the deceased who is pictures as a colleague, an example, or a friend. Sometimes the images of the mourned and the mourner intertwine. The pastoral elegy is a matter of representation of the deceased as well as representation of the ones left. And the romantic image of the (misunderstood) genius continues to plays a major role in the game of representation to this day.

KEYWORDS: elegy | mourning | Percy Bysshe Shelley | Jim Morrison | representation