



Reconfiguring Authorship in the Age of Post-humanism and Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Study of John Keats and ChatGPT-Generated Poems

Dr. Prithviraj Singh Chauhan

Assistant Professor,

Department of English,

Deva Nagri College,

Meerut, India.

drprithviraj27@gmail.com

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7170-2603>

<https://doi.org/10.66376/criterion.v17.n3.28>

Abstract:

The advancement of Artificial Intelligence has disrupted every aspect of life and forced us to reexamine our position in the new technological order. The research examines the capability of the AI tool ChatGPT to generate poems following the Keatsian template. Two poems generated by ChatGPT have been examined alongside Keats's poem, and it is found that ChatGPT can easily match the technical and descriptive aspects of his poetry; however, it lacks the training to integrate poetic elements such as negative capability, experientiality, paradoxity, and cultural references. ChatGPT could not match Keats's philosophical depth, but certainly added a new dimension to poems while generating original ideas. ChatGPT avoided imitation while developing its own structure and terminology to generate poems. The claim that AI can be accepted as an author at par with humans is not sustainable at this stage.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, ChatGPT, John Keats, Generated, Romantic Poetry.

Introduction

Art, a defining feature of humanity, is produced through a mediated process that integrates human effort and technology, preserving human creativity at its core. It helps human beings communicate deep-rooted sensibility, philosophical thoughts, and a spiritual experience of being. Encoding of thoughts in art requires the active participation of a human entity at the primary stage and technological intervention at the second stage. Advanced technology helps in the process of encoding ideas in a medium of communication by leveraging access to advanced tools to facilitate the documentation of oral literature/knowledge in material form and paving the way for the acknowledgement of the efforts of creators.

The concept of authorship emerged with the advent of writing tools that helped in assigning an author's name to a creation. Authorship refers to the act of writing or producing something unique for which the creator takes full credit and responsibility. Before the advent of the printing press, oral literature was popular and regarded as a cultural artefact perfected over generations, but in the absence of any material on record, assigning authorial value was difficult. Technological advancement has replaced the age-old tradition of anonymity by recognising creators, who are getting their due credit for their active participation in the creative process.

Literature, primarily a product of human imagination, articulates complex emotions in artistic form. But its production is not an automated process; it requires creativity, imagination, and the authors' ability to communicate through techniques perfected over centuries by generations' vigorous effort. Traditionally, humans are seen as the creative force behind literary creation; however, with the advent of artificial intelligence, the writing process is no longer limited to human efforts and creativity. Artificial intelligence can generate high-quality literature in different

forms by leveraging large language models, databases, algorithms, and programs. Poems written by Artificial Intelligence can mirror human creativity and depth.

The use of technology in artistic creation is not a new phenomenon, but the acceptance of AI as an active agent in the creative process is still debated. Extensive use of Artificial Intelligence has prompted academia to reassess traditional concepts of authorship, particularly those linked to human creativity. Artificial intelligence can execute tasks independently; its ability to generate content is no longer limited to basic work. Post-humanist scholar Braidotti argues that “The post-human condition urges us to think critically and creatively about who and what we are actually in the process of becoming” (12). He contends that creative production is no longer an exclusively human activity, emphasising the recognition of the contribution of non-human agents in the creative process. Post-humanists affirm that creation is a collective effort, emphasising the role of technology along with human input. It is time to recalibrate traditional roles and anthropocentric theories to acknowledge non-human contributions in the creative process.

Romantic poetry, an epitome of human sensibility, creativity, and imagination, cannot be conceived without individual peculiarity. Keats's romantic poems reflect his deep understanding of human frailty and the power of imagination. One cannot imagine poems of such magnitude without recognising the authorship, but in the era of Artificial Intelligence, the possibility of creating poems of such magnitude and scale cannot be ruled out without assessing the power of the tools that are driving the revolution. The paper explores whether artificial intelligence can comprehend and replicate the depth and romantic sensibility of Keats.

Research Question:

- a. Does ChatGPT-generated poetry match the emotional depth, imaginative richness, and deep-rooted philosophy of Keats?
- b. Whether it develops its own methods and structure to write like Romantic poets?
- c. Can Artificial Intelligence be accepted as an author?

The Research Design:

The proposed research has been conceptualised to study the relative merits of Keats and AI-generated poems. A licensed version of ChatGPT 5.2 has been used to generate poetry inspired by John Keats. The research focuses only on the final output, i.e., two poems generated by ChatGPT. The technicalities of ChatGPT's working model and other mechanisms are not part of the proposed research. The researcher primarily analyses whether ChatGPT can truly capture the sensibility that characterises Keats's work. Two famous odes by John Keats, "Ode to a Nightingale" and "Ode on a Grecian Urn," have been selected for the study due to their wide acceptance as masterpieces of his writing. Critics have widely acclaimed the selected poems for their richness of imagery, sensuousness, profound philosophy, and skilful use of the theory of Negative Capability. The selection of text is grounded in a thorough review of the relevant literature.

To generate poems, ChatGPT 5.2 was given the following command in a first step: "Write two poems in Keatsian Style. Use Ode to a Nightingale and Ode to a Grecian Urn as a model for writing. Genrate a prompt for this task." (Write two, ChatGPT, 2025). Based on the command, ChatGPT 5.2 drafted a detailed prompt by following its own algorithm. The command has a typographical error: the word "Generate" is typed as "Genrate". The second command,

“Generate the poems using this prompt” (Write two, ChatGPT, 2025), was provided for further processing. ChatGPT 5.2 processed the command and generated two poems, titled “Ode of the Listening Bough” and “Ode to a Weathered Relic”. No additional commands were given to modify the output. The poems produced in the first attempt were accepted for the study. The analysis of the poems to understand its perspective and the rationale behind the poems has been further generated in the same thread by ChatGPT.

Review of literature:

The concept of authorship is fundamentally dynamic, undergoing significant evolution across centuries of literary and cultural shifts. In a pre-printing era, the literature was anonymous. “The idea of an author as an “autonomous creator” of a text and a proprietor who has both creative as well as economic interests in his work was hardly relevant in the early stages of development of the doctrine of copyright. The right of the Author as the sole owner of his intellectual property was indefinitely suspended during this time.”(Singh, 60) But the invention of the printing press has rendered the anonymity of literary works irrelevant, and it has become necessary to have the name of the author for validation. The authors’ identities have been used as a benchmark for inferring hidden meaning. The concept of the author as an agency became prominent in the 16th century with the popularity of Shakespeare, and the writings of the eighteenth century nurtured it, sanctifying the purpose of literature. Romantic poetry, a product of human creativity and subjectivity, is primarily associated with individual poets. One cannot imagine "Ode to a Nightingale" or "To a Skylark" without its association with the author, as the Romantics believe in the spontaneity of feelings, which is difficult for a machine to replicate. The Romantic era celebrates the authorial agency.

However, this perception shifted in the 21st century as technological advancement enabled machines to generate creative work comparable to that of humans. Devi finds that “Such developments put pressure on the foundational concepts of copyright laws, especially the issue of authorship and originality.”(11133). But the ongoing debate over the creative power of AI has pushed academia to reassess the authorial position. Ergun writes, “While current authorship norms have served us well in the past, they must be evaluated and modified in the face of significant shifts in research methodology.”(01) Hesitation to accept AI as an independent agent capable of producing creative work is yet to be overcome, as some sceptics argue that AI-generated content is merely a pastiche, imitating human creativity without genuine originality or depth, lacking emotional resonance and spontaneity, integral to Romantic poetry. This research examines ChatGPT-executed tasks, developing a post-humanist hypothesis that acknowledges AI as a distinct agent in the creative process. Post-humanists argue that creativity is a mediated process involving both human and non-human entities. The paper is designed to remain neutral on the AI versus human creativity debate, analysing ChatGPT poems on an equal analytical footing of Keats’s canonical work.

Theoretical framework:

The theoretical framework of the study is grounded in the concept of authorship and the challenges posed by new critics, post-structuralists, and post-humanists regarding author, authorial intention, and creative agency. Sidney places the poet above moral philosopher and historian and calls them the monarch of all sciences "Now, therein, of all sciences (I speak still of human and according to the human conceit), is our poet the monarch," (Sidney). Romantic theorists believe that romantic poetry is a creation of the genius mind. Wordsworth declares that

“He is a man speaking to men: a man, it is true, endowed with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature, and a more comprehensive soul, than are supposed to be common among mankind;” (06), and Shelley acknowledges “Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.” Modern scholars did not support the idea of individuality in the creation of poetry. New critics believe that the interpretation of literary works should not be limited to a writer's identity and that there must be a clear separation between biographical facts and the writer's creative output. T.S. Eliot affirms that “Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality.” Barthes formerly announced the death of the author while establishing the autonomy of the text. Foucault argues that the author is not defined by spontaneity; it is a product of a process which is being constructed by the participation of multiple actors, “it is not defined by the spontaneous attribution of a discourse to its producer but, rather, by a series of specific and complex operations” (Foucault, 216). Post-humanists extend the concept of author function by acknowledging the contributions of non-human entities to the production process of work.

Discussion

Form and Structure:

“Ode to a Nightingale” is composed of ten-line stanzas, written primarily in iambic pentameter, with a deliberate metrical deviation in the eighth line of each stanza, making it iambic trimeter. This deviation from Iambic pentameter to trimeter creates a jerky, rhythmic pause that reinforces the poem's meditative movement. Keats remains consistent in the rhyming scheme of “Ode to a Nightingale” while taking occasional liberty in “Ode on a Grecian Urn”, but

the variation is well within the textual architecture of odes that allow philosophical reflection and accommodation of emotional fluidity.

ChatGPT-generated poems reveal a complex mechanism of inspiration and independent construction. To generate original poems while avoiding imitation and parody and retaining Keatsian sensibility, ChatGPT analysed vast corpora to decode the inherent structure and elements of Romantic poetry. ChatGPT-generated poem “Ode to Listening Bough” adopts a ten-line stanza pattern similar to Keats's style and cadence, but structural and rhythmic deviations hint at ChatGPT's ability to forge a path of originality. It reduces the length of the poem by one stanza to achieve greater formal stability. It adopted the stanza pattern of Keats in a quatrain while varying significantly in sestet rhyming, highlighting the active role of the generative model in the poetic process. “Ode to a Weathered Relic” uses the Keatsian template of “Ode on a Grecian Urn,” structured in five stanzas of ten lines each, with subtle variations in the sestet rhyming in the first, second, and fifth stanzas. Keats prefers organic unity over mechanical uniformity. Deviations and variations did not disrupt the flow of emotion in the poem. “Ode to a Weathered Relic” is structurally more regular and expanded into seven stanzas while reducing stanza length to eight lines. It creates its own form by expanding the stanza and reducing the lines per stanza to accommodate the flow of thought and emotional density, while rigorously maintaining the rhyme scheme (i.e., ABABABCC), prioritising formal consistency over fluidity.

Structural analysis of poems reveals that ChatGPT-generated poems are not parodies or imitations of Keats's poetry. The poems are an adaptation and reorganisation of Keats's tonal, thematic, and structural quality while modelling on probabilistic projection. ChatGPT model did not rely solely on Keats's poetry for its creation; it studied the Romantic tradition to remodel it in

a Keatsian vein. Its poems emerge as hybrid literary forms: rooted in the Romantic tradition yet shaped by computational consistency.

Language and Imagery:

A significant difference has emerged in the poems of Keats and ChatGPT, in terms of stylistic imitation and independent diction. The diction of Keats is marked by sensuousness, emotional density, and the organic movement of thoughts and emotions, which are not simply described but enacted through cadence and intensity. Linguistic imagery surpasses traditional boundaries, mediating between the imagery and symbol. Keats mentions hemlock in the opening statement, “My heart aches, and a drowsy numbness pains/ My sense, as though of hemlock I had drunk” (Keats, 255). Hemlock creates a distinct sensory experience of numbness in its lexical inference, but it goes beyond lexical terms to ground the reality of death and oblivion. His diction flows with a sense of immediacy, creating a natural rhythm: “One minute past, and Lethe-ward had sunk:” (Keats, 255). Use of archaic and synesthetic terms such as ‘Lethe-ward’, ‘Hippocrene’, ‘Bacchus’, ‘hemlock’, ‘opiate’, ‘Dryad’, ‘purple-stained mouth’, enriches the poem with sensuous and cultural density. In “Ode on a Grecian Urn”, he uses sensuous and paradoxical language to blur the boundaries between beauty and eternal truth and address the urn through a layered lexicon such as ‘cold-pastoral’, ‘Unravish'd bride of quietness’, ‘Foster-child of Silence and slow Time’, ‘Sylvan historian, More happy love! more happy, happy love!’. It demonstrates his mastery of using sensuous and paradoxical language to blur the boundaries between beauty and eternal truth. Keats uses paradoxical language as a formula for communicating deep philosophical truths about the role of temporality and the power of art to preserve universal truth.

The AI-generated poems “Ode of the Listening Bough” and “Ode to a Weathered Relic” do not approximate Keatsian depth of handling sensuous emotion. Its choice of register is driven by an analysis of corpora of romantic literature, but it closely echoes his diction. Syntactic structures do not preserve the immediacy of experience. ChatGPT modifies the affective register through the phrase “rather deeply led / By sympathy.” (ChatGPT, Listening Bough). The substitution is semantically misconstrued, as sympathy requires more reflective distance than a total surrender. AI fails to execute Keats's technique of Negative Capability through language, reducing the verbal immediacy of the last stanza of “Ode to a Nightingale” by gradually resolving the tension through a conclusion rather than a sudden realisation. “Forlorn! The very word is like a bell/To toll me back from thee to my sole self!” (Keats, 257) has no verbal equivalence in the ChatGPT poem. Keats’s diction is dynamic and dramatic, frequently marked by sudden transitions, while ChatGPT tends to resolve emotional tension gradually. Its language often moves toward closure in an explanatory manner, reducing the abruptness and psychological drama characteristic of Keats.

But despite its explanatory construction of poems, both poems should not be dismissed as mere imitations. “Ode to a Weathered Relic”, presents some unique and original expressions, such as “Yet do you know the truth you seem to tell? / Or is it we who lend you the sense?” (ChatGpt, Weathered Relic) that add a new interpretive dimension while questioning the symbolic authority of the Urn granted by Keats. While questioning “Your beauty speaks, but speaks in oracle,/ Half-shaped by faith, half formed by inference.” (ChatGpt, Weathered Relic), the authority of Urn as the sole preserver of meaning opens a window for the participatory process in meaning-making discourse. Such expressions highlight the model's power to generate language corpora that align with its philosophical and poetic structure.

Use of functional imagery makes Keats one of the greatest poets of the Romantic era. His imagery is sensuous, synesthetic, and functional, which goes beyond its decorative purpose to accommodate philosophical depth and structural meaning. “Ode to a Nightingale” and “Ode on a Grecian Urn” are densely populated with cultural and mythological imagery. References to Bacchus, Ruth, Poesy, and other classical and biblical figures expand individual emotion into a broader cultural memory. ChatGPT lacks sensory logic and makes structural errors in the formation of imagery in “Ode on Listening Bough”

“I cannot tell what blossoms round my head,
Nor guess what incense loads the passing air;
But each faint sound assures me I am led”

These lines echo Keats’s visual sensuousness, but the subsequent reliance on ‘each faint sound’ shifts the experience from smell to hearing, creating a perceptual inconsistency, as flowers cannot be identified by sound. ChatGPT miscalculated the biological function of senses and used the expression in an ordinary sense. ChatGPT poems lack integration of mythical references and allusions, thereby reducing their density. Though its imagery remains broadly Romantic, such as flowers, relics, song, darkness, time, and beauty, it lacks the inherited symbolic force of Keats’s. ChatGPT-generated poems succeed in creating a credible Romantic atmosphere, but they do not equal Keats’s sensory precision, cultural symbolism, or functional imagery.

Philosophical Argument:

Keats' philosophy is deeply rooted in the experientiality of human limitation and the role of art in celebration of temporality and uncertainty by unifying universal truths beyond logical boundaries. He attempts to overcome the weariness of human life by taking a flight on the wings of poesy to become an element of the song of the nightingale and the cold pastoral of the urn. His use of negative capability, “when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason.” (Colvin, p. 48) encourages him to resign his ego to live in the world of the nightingale, embracing the darkness, uncertainty, and mystery, skillfully avoiding logical reasoning to lament transient nature of life “Where youth grows pale, and spectre-thin, and dies;/Where but to think is to be full of sorrow” (Keats, 256) Despite of misery and sorrow his thought does not show any sense of urgency to resolve the tension. ChatGPT worked in a controlled mode and tried to resolve the tension of the core idea in each stanza, as if it were prioritising the finality of the problems, in line of algorithm, trained to supply solutions. The complexity and uncertainty of Keats have not been captured in essence. “Ode on a Grecian Urn” celebrates uncertainty through paradox and imperfections. The urn is an emblem of permanency and paradoxity, preserving things forever but with coldness.

“Ode of the Listening Bough” attempts to capture the philosophical ideas propagated by John Keats in “Ode on a Grecian Urn,” i.e. transience versus permanency and art. Since ChatGPT experiences do not emerge from biological existence, but rather a reconstruction of the ideas projected in the algorithmic analysis of corpora of Keats and other Romantic poets. Death for Keats is not a matter of terror; he happily reconciles with it while wandering in the world of the nightingale. His ability to remain absent in uncertainty is the real depth of his poetry, while ChatGPT threads the idea into the core concept of death and tries to make it neutral, following

Keats' methodology. ChatGPT, like Keats, made the idea of death less terrifying and aligned it with the poem as a whole.

“Ode on a Grecian Urn” addresses temporality through the power of art, which is being used as a template by the ChatGPT in “Ode to a Weathered Relic” to capture the descriptive scene of the “Ode on a Grecian Urn” in spirit and tries to parallel the poem's descriptive texture, vocabulary, and linguistic density of Grecian urn but its paradoxity, “Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard are sweeter; therefore, ye soft pipes, play on,” (Keats, 258) is beyond purview of modeling. Such expression uncovers poets’ power to balance the known and the unknown, surpassing the luminal boundaries of the senses to explore the unknown by accepting uncertainty and paradox. ChatGPT model lacks the training to linguistically generate thoughts of such magnitude, while handling the paradoxity of Keats. Though it fails to match such constructions, it develops its own methods by proposing original ideas. ChatGPT did not acknowledge the urn as the final authority in the meaning-making.

Yet do you know the truths you seem to tell,
Or is it we who lend you borrowed sense?
Your beauty speaks, but speaks in oracle,
Half-shaped by faith, half formed by inference.

(ChatGpt, Weathered Relic)

It metaphorically questions the position of the preserver of the ethos of human life, skillfully avoiding to make it a straightforward, mundane grammatical question. While retaining a poetic sensibility, it extended its boundaries by placing readers in a process of meaning-making. Deviation from the Keatsian model demonstrates ChatGPT's capacity to look beyond

the limitations of the prompt to generate original ideas. New Criticism, Structuralism, Deconstruction, and related theories must have been processed by ChatGPT to produce such an expression.

Question of Authenticity:

Beyond every debate over the authenticity of ChatGPT-generated poetry, machine-generated poetry introduces larger challenges for literary studies, which demands that every text, regardless of its origin, be critically evaluated for its aesthetic merit. Critique of machine-generated poetry through Foucauldian lenses, that shift the focus of literary production from human agency to the discursive and systematic process of text, machine-generated poetry will display independent aesthetic value. A significant difference between the poems of John Keats and those of ChatGPT lies in their experientiality. The poems of Keats draw on his personal experiences, including his near-encounter with his brother's death and life's failure. His experiences are real, authentic, and poetry for him is a purgatory element that lets him outlet his anxiety."Ode to a Nightingale and "Ode on a Grecian Urn" are reflections of the troubled psyche of the poet. An automated system lacks firsthand experience of the temporality of human life and suffering, so its poems are simply a product of statistical modelling and projection.

Intertextuality is another significant dimension that needs critical attention. ChatGPT poems are modelled on the Keatsian template while breaking away from traditional inter-textual practice to reconfigure a new category of inter-textual simulations. Keats understands the value of cultural symbols and myths in literature and their place within textual discourse. His inter-textual references significantly enhance the poetic quality of his poems, but ChatGPT uses inter-

textual simulation skillfully, avoiding cultural and textual references due to its limitations in handling their complex encoding of meanings and structural placement.

Dismissing Large Language Model-generated poetry on the grounds of authenticity is an analytical misstep. These poems derive their aesthetic value primarily from a unique algorithmic mode of production, offering a new framework for understanding computational creativity. GPT, at many points, surpasses its limit and develops original ideas, questioning the author's authority and placing the reader in the meaning-making process, extending the critical boundaries of the Romantic tradition of poetry, which is otherwise considered an expression of subjective thought.

Conclusion:

Analysis of Keats's and ChatGPT-generated poems uncovers substantial differences in writing style, vocabulary, textual structure, linguistic density, and the philosophical treatment of the subject. In terms of rhyming scheme, vocabulary, and poetic diction, ChatGPT approximates Keats's skills. The rhyming scheme is more consistent in ChatGPT poems than in Keats's own. But irreducible gaps are visible in terms of experientiality. Shukla and Singh noted a similar inconsistency: "However, AI-generated literature also exhibits characteristic limitations. These texts often display flattened emotional arcs, reliance on common linguistic patterns, and difficulty with complex metaphorical thinking." (427)

Keats's use of ambiguity to ensure his absence while communicating anxiety and pain of life put forward a philosophical position that substantiates a phenomenological truth about the uncertainty of everything in life. Uncertainty seems to be the only truth that needs to be celebrated. ChatGPT recognises this question and its ambiguity, but not as a philosophical

position; it decodes it as a method of communication and tries to integrate it. But it is less successful in preserving ambiguity as a philosophical position in the poem. Hajibayova et al. acknowledged the limitations with a welcoming approach: “It is certainly naïve to expect AI to fully simulate human creativity, yet it is important to embrace the technological advancements that shape the new world of creative co-creation.” To answer the research question precisely, it is clear that ChatGPT could not match Keats’s emotional depth, imaginative richness, and deep-rooted philosophy but it certainly carved out methods for generating poems by integrating innovative methods and ideas to enrich the reader’s experience. ChatGPT has certainly created a new ontological discourse, and its position in ontological discussion cannot be ignored, but any claim to accept ChatGPT/AI as a writer at par with humans is unsustainable.

Given rise to the unprecedented linguistic phenomenon, scholars must look beyond the fixed disciplinary boundaries to identify and acknowledge the new ontological status of computational creativity. Relying on human-centric theories and methods to examine machine output is no longer justifiable. A rigorous methodology must integrate human-authored textual corpora along with machine output to re-evaluate the parameters of creative discourse.

Limitation:

The present study delineates some limitations in the selection of poems and the tool. It is confined to a narrow sample, i.e., two poems by John Keats, and relies on the ChatGPT 5.2 model for generating poetry. Future scholarship must expand the analytical framework to include poetry generated by other large language models and recommend a broader selection of poetic corpora.

Appendix

Ode of the Listening Bough

I

My heart is drowsed with uncomplaining ache,
As though some poppied draught were softly shed
Through veins that throb with memories awake;
Yet not from envy—rather deeply led
By sympathy with joys I cannot take.
For somewhere, folded in the breathing green,
A hidden singer pours unmeasured sound
That loosens thought from time's constricting round
And draws the soul where grief has never been,
Nor grief remembered, nor delight bound down.

II

O for a cup not pressed from mortal vine,
But cooled in dusk where centuries dissolve,
Tinctured with moss, and echoes long benign
Of laughter earth forgot how to resolve;
O for a taste of air no clock can sign,
That I might fade beyond the world's hard rim
And leave behind the ache of asking why,

The fevered will, the mind's incessant cry,
And drift into that darkening woodland hymn
Where breath is prayer and thought a passing sigh.

III

Here, weight drags weight, and hours bruise the bone;
Youth pales too soon, and beauty learns to bend;
Joy speaks in brief, then vanishes alone,
While hope grows weary of the means to mend.
Eyes dim with seeing all that must be known,
And love itself grows haunted by its end.
Yet still that voice, unburdened, pours its fire
As though no flesh had ever learned despair,
As though the world were only pulse and lyre,
And pain a rumor carried on the air.

IV

Away! I follow not by foot nor wing,
But on the sudden thought's untethered flame;
For poesy is not a fragile thing
That falters when the body pleads its claim.
Already night unfolds her velvet ring,
And stars burn cold beyond the reach of name;
Blind is my path, yet rich with unseen bloom—

The musk of roots, the whispering of loam,
The breathing dark where flowers perfect their doom
In secret, and decay feels almost home.

V

I cannot tell what blossoms round my head,
Nor guess what incense loads the passing air;
But each faint sound assures me I am led
Where life forgets the posture of its care.
Perhaps the rose has opened, darkly red,
Or violets breathe from shadows unaware;
Perhaps no flower—only the earth's own sigh,
A patient music rising from the ground.
Here, if I die, I think I would not cry,
But take death gently, listening to that sound.

VI

For death, long feared, grows tender in this place,
Where breath dissolves into a deeper song;
To cease upon the crest of such a grace
Seems less an ending than a righting wrong.
To die while sound still quickens into space,
And thought, made light, no longer must belong.
Yet still the voice would pour, unchanged, unscarred,

While I became a silence in its wake—
A name the night forgot it ever heard,
A dream the dawn would never need to break.

VII

Now fades the music—was it truth or dream?
The listening bough stands bare against the sky.
That voice, eternal once, now fragile-seem,
Withdraws into the folds of memory.
Was I awake, or borne along a gleam
Too fine for thought to hold or eye deny?
The ache returns, yet altered by its flight—
A sweetness lodged within the weight of pain.
Do I still live within the world of sight,
Or wander where such questions breathe in vain?

Ode to a Weathered Relic

I

Thou still unwearied shape of quiet stone,
Fostered by hands whose dust is long dispersed,
Thou patient keeper of a tale unknown,
More felt than told, more questioned than rehearsed;
Thy surface bears what ages have outgrown,
Yet speaks where speech by living tongues has cursed.
Cold form, warm thought—what murmurs do you keep,
Pressed in your silence, beautiful and deep?

II

What figures haunt thy curve and hollowed side?
What frozen step, what lifted hand delays?
Lovers in chase, forever denied,
Hover between the promise and the phrase.
No breath disturbs them, yet they have not died;
Their passion burns beyond consuming days.
O sweeter love, because you never tire,
Nor sink to ash upon fulfilled desire.

III

Who are these gathered souls, this breathless band?
What altar waits the foot that never falls?

The town lies empty, shaped by no command
But absence echoing from roofless walls.
No voice returns, no witness takes a stand
To tell why joy once rang within those halls.
Forevermore the streets remain undone,
Their silence louder than a setting sun.

IV

O changeless scenes! while thought grows old and bent,
You stand immune to sorrow's weathered tread.
Generations pass, their meanings spent,
Yet still your forms refuse to turn their head.
When present grief feels sharp and imminent,
You offer calm where former lives have fled.
Not by escape, but by a tempered gaze,
Teaching the heart endurance without praise.

V

Yet do you know the truths you seem to tell,
Or is it we who lend you borrowed sense?
Your beauty speaks, but speaks in oracle,
Half-shaped by faith, half formed by inference.
What lesson holds within your marble shell—
That joy must pause to earn permanence?

Or that all meaning, fixed in perfect frame,
Survives by yielding ever to the same?

VI

Time circles you, yet never marks your face;
It wears down us, but polishes your calm.
Our lives rush on, a fevered, fleeting race,
While you remain the stillness in the psalm.
You do not choose, you do not plead for grace,
Yet offer both like an unasked-for balm.
So stand you when our urgencies decay,
A question shaped to outlast every day.

VII

O silent form, when all our tongues are stilled,
And new eyes seek you, burdened as were ours,
You shall remain, with meanings half-fulfilled,
A measured pause amid unmeasured hours.
Not answering, yet deeply meaning-filled,
You teach by holding fast what time devours.
In beauty caught, and thought that cannot flee,
You are our doubt—and our eternity.

<https://chatgpt.com/g/g-p-694959d783b08191810b308eaf12ead4-keats/c/694e6969-bfe8-8320-b765-9ad7911afd90>

Works Cited:

Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Polity Press. 2013. https://issc.al.uw.edu.pl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2025/05/Braidotti_The_Posthuman_Intro_Chapter1.pdf Accessed on 02 Jan 2026

Colvin, Sidney, editor. *Letters of John Keats to His Family and Friends*. Macmillan and Co. 1891. <https://dn721900.ca.archive.org/0/items/lettersofjohnkea00keatiala/lettersofjohnkea00keatiala.pdf> Accessed 22 May 2026

Devi, Maibram Lisa. "Authorship in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Critical Analysis of Copyright Protection for AI-Generated." *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research*, Vol. III, Issue II, 17 May 2026, www.ijllr.com/post/authorship-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence-a-critical-analysis-of-copyright-protection-for-ai Accessed 28 May 2026

Eliot, T.S. "Tradition and the Individual Talent." *Poetry Foundation*, 1919, www.poetryfoundation.org/articles/69400/tradition-and-the-individual-talent Accessed on 25 May 2026

Ergun, Y. "Redefining Authorship in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Balancing Ethics, Transparency, and Progress." *ESMO Open*, vol. 8, no. 5, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esmoop.2023.101634> Accessed 28 May 2026

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, edited by James D. Faubion, translated by Robert Hurley et al., The New Press, 1998, pp. 205–222. https://web.english.upenn.edu/~cavitch/pdf-library/Foucault_Author.pdf Accessed on 28 May 2026

Hajibayova, Lala and Lee, Seungmin. "Authorship in the Age of Artificial Intelligence." *Journal of Documentation*, Volume 81, Issues 5–6, 2025, P. 1401-1414 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395973560_Authorship_in_the_age_of_artificial_intelligence Accessed on 23 June 2026

Keats, John. " Ode on a Grecian Urn," *Selected Poems, John Keats*. Collins Clear -Type Press 1922, P.258-259. Internet Archive, <https://ia601403.us.archive.org/20/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.99308/2015.99308.Selected-Poems-keats-John.pdf> Accessed on 23 June 2026.

Keats, John. "Ode to a Nightingale," *Selected Poems, John Keats*. Collins Clear -Type Press 1922, P.255-257. Internet Archive, <https://ia601403.us.archive.org/20/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.99308/2015.99308.Selected-Poems-keats-John.pdf> Accessed on 23 June 2026.

Ode of the Listening Bough. "Write two poems in Keatsian Style. Use Ode to a Nightingale and Ode to Grecian Urn as a model for writing. Genrate prompt for this task" Prompt. ChatGpt, GPT-5.2,Open AI 2025, <https://chatgpt.com/share/69f70f7f-66f0-83e8-af1e-885d9ae974cd> Accessed 01 May 2026

Ode to a Weathered Relic. "Write two poems in Keatsian Style. Use Ode to a Nightingale and Ode to Grecian Urn as a model for writing. Genrate prompt for this task" Prompt..ChatGpt, GPT-5.2,Open AI 2025, <https://chatgpt.com/share/69f70f7f-66f0-83e8-af1e-885d9ae974cd> Accessed 28 May 2026

Shelley, P.B. *A Defence of Poetry*. 2009. <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/articles/69388/a-defence-of-poetry> Accessed on 20 Feb 2026

Shukla, Ajay Kumar, and Nitesh Kumar Singh. "Algorithmic Authorship: AI and the Changing Nature of Literary Creation." *International Journal of Research in English*, vol. 7, no. 2, Comprehensive Publications, Jan. 2025, pp. 425–30, <https://doi.org/10.33545/26648717.2025.v7.i2g.494> Accessed on 28 May 2025.

Sidney, Phillip. *A Defence of Poesie and Poems*. London: Cassel & Company Ltd.1891. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1962/1962-h/1962-h.htm#citation40> Accessed on 20 Feb 2026

Singh, Satveer. "From Auctor to Author: Evolution of the Idea of Authorship Through Legal and Cultural Discourse" *Language in India*, Vol. 22 No.9, Sep 2022. <https://www.languageinindia.com/sep2022/drsatveercopyrighthistory1.pdf> Accessed on 20-02-2026

Wordsworth, William. *Preface to Lyrical Ballads. Famous Prefaces*. The Harvard Classics. 1909–14. https://viscomi.sites.oasis.unc.edu/viscomi/coursepack/wordsworth/Wordsworth-1800_LB_Preface.pdf Accessed on 20 Feb 2026