CONCLUSION
T.S.Eliot speaks of the continuous development of a writer's mind and attributes the writer's universal appeal to his assessment and consciousness of his times. If one goes by this criterion laid down by T.S.Eliot for adjudging the significance of the theoretical principles and poetry of Shelley and Keats, then one cannot hesitate in claiming that both have fairly succeeded, although Shelley would not fare as well as Keats. Yet his progression from the 18th century ratiocinative attitude to the Romantic vision of lonings, his quests for an apocalyptic phase and a world of Imagination all point to his growth and evolution. Similarly his awareness of the potential for tragedy so closely related to Romantic visionary ideals makes him an example of what Eliot called an infinitely malleable writer.

What emerged in the chapters entitled The Theoretical Foundations of Shelley and Keats and The Poetic Idiom of Shelley and Keats is the picture of a poet clinging desperately to his unbridled idealism to bring about a radical transformation of the world. These chapters also reveal how his idealistic impulse was gradually frustrated and the mundane reality suppressed initially by his apocalyptic expectations came to the surface. Yet his earnestness and fascination to remove evil from the society was never blotted
out completely and this view that poetry cannot be understood independently of the social situation that engenders it was to lay the groundwork for much of the most important contemporary critical thought as elucidated in Chapter IV of the thesis.

Shelley's apocalyptic hopes for absolute happiness were dashed by the time he wrote *The Triumph of Life* and it would be a matter of speculation (not the task of a true literary critic) to foresee what he would have been, had he lived longer. He remained committed to a universal and democratic community of free individuals. His belief in untrammeled inspiration led him to slouch off the accepted disciplines of poetry writing. In his attempt to expound a coherent theory of art directed, of course, towards the amelioration of society, Shelley's theory and practice of art remain a reflection of contrary tendencies. He explained and defended these views because they expressed most closely his own imaginative experience as a creator. Yet, towards the end of his poetic productivity, he becomes aware not so much of the limitation of his views on poetry but rather the dominating impulse on which these views were founded.

On the other hand, Keats's field of investigation in his critical writings is restricted to the work of art itself.
Keats's critical thinking challenged the validity of the fundamental Romantic notions about literature and definitely surpasses what he achieved as a practitioner of art. His particular direction remained to stay clear of absolute Vulgar subjectivism which often froze into egotism. Keats's definition of the true poet stems out of his own evolution as a poet from one given to the sensuous beauties and delights of the physical world to one who viewed life in its painful and pleasurable aspects and finally the higher experience of commiserating with the misery of mankind by loosing his own self after having attained the ability to see into the selves of others.

Keats's critical tools like 'Negative Capability' and his categorization of artists as 'Men of Genius' and 'Men of Power' reassessed the basic assumptions of the literary theory of the Romantic era and anticipate the ideas of Impersonal art in the Twentieth century. Unlike Shelley's obsession with apocalyptic dreams and zest for unfettered expression of emotion and inspiration, the present project reveals how Keats attempts to come to terms with human mortality, accepting human condition with all its limitations. As has been elucidated in the thesis it is an extension of his central thought worked out in Endymion besides being a
reflection of his complete openness to a wide range of experience.

Both Shelley and Keats towards the end of their poetic career felt doubts about the efficacy of the scheme they had propounded and practised throughout. Is this an indication of their ineptitude to frame a comprehensive definition of the poet and poetry or is it a revelation of the protean nature of poetry which defies any settled definition. In the latter case one can say that Shelley and Keats are not the only poets who find it difficult to define poetry. One may mention a large number of poets who have turned out poetry but, the moment they are constrained to define it they cut a sorry figure. St. Augustine asked to define God said that it was impossible to define Him although he knew God without being asked to define Him. It is the same with poetry. A poet practices poetry but cannot define it. Wordsworth stated that poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings and that it is emotions recollected in tranquillity and this is hard to reconcile with his theories of diction. Emily Dickinson was not a Romantic poet yet she defined poetry in Romantic terms. Eliot held that poetry is not an expression of feelinos and even personality but an escape from them.
Poetry in Eliot's view writes itself -- it is an objective phenomenon. Yet we see Eliot violating his canon at times.

In fact, the two approaches to literature, termed by Bradley as 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic', have been present throughout the history of literature right from the times of classical antiquity. A consideration of the formulations of various thinkers and literary theorists about the nature and function of poetry reveals that their concentration on either of these has led to a lop-sided view. An integrated formula of the nature and function of poetry is possible only when the literary thinker preoccupies himself both with the literariness of literary works and is cognizant of the extra-formal considerations. Keats was quick enough to recognize the limitations of his lop-sided attitude and therefore sought to explore the usefulness of the poem in terms of social and moral values. Whether he would have been able to maintain a balance between these two approaches and whether he would have been able to keep up the distinct identity of poetry is simply a matter of conjecture. Shelley remained devoted to a particular approach to accomplish through poetry a revolutionary transformation of the human condition.