
Pound, Eliot, and the Rhetoric of The Waste Land

Author(s): Marshall McLuhan

Source: *New Literary History*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Anniversary Issue: I (Spring, 1979), pp. 557-580

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/468929>

Accessed: 08/04/2009 00:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jhup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *New Literary History*.

Pound, Eliot, and the Rhetoric of *The Waste Land*

Marshall McLuhan

I

IN 1949 Hugh Kenner and I visited Ezra Pound at St. Elizabeth Hospital. On that occasion we discussed poetry, and I recall particularly his talking about the difference between his "Portrait d'Une Femme" and Eliot's "Portrait of a Lady." He stressed the fact that he had managed to get a good many things into his Portrait that Eliot had missed. If one turns to his "Portrait d'Une Femme": "Your mind and you are our Sargasso Sea," the poem immediately opens out as a sort of vortex of inclusive consciousness, with the lady serving as a kind of catalyst:

Oh, you are patient, I have seen you sit
Hours, where something might have floated up.
And now you pay one. Yes, you richly pay. . . .
Trophies fished up; some curious suggestion; . . .
Pregnant with mandrakes, or with something else . . .¹

The pattern of the London vortex which she manifested to Pound reappears structurally in the *Cantos* themselves. Both Pound's "Portrait" and Eliot's constitute a kind of *epyllion* which, we shall see, is a pattern they used a great deal—the parallel actions function as a plot and counterplot which enrich each other by their interplay. Poe's "Descent into the Maelstrom" has structurally much in common with the vortices of the *Cantos*. Similarly, the "Sargasso Sea" is a vortex that attracts multitudinous objects but which also tosses things up again in recognizable patterns which serve for survival. Survival for Poe's sailor had meant attaching himself to one of the recurring objects in the whirlpool. The same strategy applies to Pound's readers who need to be alert to the resonance of recurring themes. Apropos the same kind of awareness, Lewis wrote in *Blast* magazine that the vorticists defined their art as an art of the energized present, an art which has captured the point of maximum intensity. It is the presentation of "an

intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time."² Pound, in his note on Gaudier-Brzeska, described the "radiant node or cluster . . . from which, and through which, and into which, ideas are constantly rushing."³

Baudelaire, admirer of Poe, in his "Envoy to the Reader" said: "Hypocrite lecteur, mon semblable, mon frère." This became a key line in *The Waste Land* itself, pointing to the vortex created by the encounter of author and reader. Muriel Bradbrook comments on the musical vortices of *The Waste Land* and *Four Quartets*: "For instance, each of the poems is concerned with one of the four elements—*Burnt Norton* with air, *East Coker* with earth, *The Dry Salvages* with water and *Little Gidding* with fire. The four elements are brought together at the beginning of the second movement of *Little Gidding*, where they are seen to be symbols of multiple meaning."⁴

Since these four-element structures (which include the four seasons) are a major Eliot vortex, it is strange that no one has remarked on the original four-part division of *The Waste Land* before Pound started to work on it.

Both the contention and collaboration between Pound and Eliot about the four levels of traditional exegesis in *The Waste Land* go deep into the theories of communication of each poet. Everyone is familiar with Eliot's declaration in *For Lancelot Andrewes*, which, he says, he made

to refute any accusation of playing 'possum. The general point of view may be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion. I am quite aware that the first term is completely vague, and easily lends itself to clap-trap; I am aware that the second term is at present without definition, and easily lends itself to what is almost worse than clap-trap, I mean temperate conservatism; the third term does not rest with me to define. The uncommon reader who is interested by these scattered papers may possibly be interested by the small volumes which I have in preparation: *The School of Donne*; *The Outline of Royalism*; and *The Principles of Modern Heresy*.⁵

The third of these three books appeared as *After Strange Gods* where Eliot comments on the relation between Pound's religious and poetic views:

But Confucius has become the philosopher of the rebellious Protestant. And I cannot but feel that in some respects Irving Babbitt, with the noblest intentions, has merely made matters worse instead of better.

The name of Irving Babbitt instantly suggests that of Ezra Pound (his peer in cosmopolitanism) and that of I. A. Richards: it would seem that Confucius is the spiritual adviser of the highly educated and fastidious, in contrast to the

dark gods of Mexico. Mr. Pound presents the closest counterpart to Irving Babbitt. Extremely quick-witted and very learned, he is attracted to the Middle Ages, apparently, by everything except that which gives them their significance. His powerful and narrow post-Protestant prejudice peeps out from the most unexpected places: one can hardly read the erudite notes and commentary to his edition of Guido Cavalcanti without suspecting that he finds Guido much more sympathetic than Dante, and on grounds which have little to do with their respective merits as poets: namely, that Guido was very likely a heretic, if not a sceptic—as evidenced partly by his possibly having held some pneumatic philosophy and theory of corpuscular action which I am unable to understand. Mr. Pound, like Babbitt, is an individualist, and still more a libertarian.⁶

This passage goes far to elucidate both the collaboration and conflict between Pound and Eliot. Their contention led to the making of *two* (complementary) poems, which we have learned to call *The Waste Land*—one with four and one with five divisions. Eliot, as we shall see, was veered away from the original four-division *Waste Land* by Pound's editorial stress on "craft," and on the rhetorical five divisions. His "victory" over Eliot was signaled by the wry dedication "to Ezra Pound: *il miglior fabbro*." Pound had already asserted the classical status of the five-division structure for poetry in his "Homage to Sextus Propertius" and his "Mauberly" as early as 1915 and 1917.

In his 1919 review of Pound's *Quia Pauper Amavi* (which contains three *Cantos*) entitled "The Method of Mr. Pound," Eliot echoes his earlier sentiments concerning the simultaneity of the historical vortex in "Tradition and the Individual Talent":

The historical method is, of course, the one which suits Mr. Pound's temperament; it is also a conscious and consistent application of a procedure suggested by Browning, which Mr. Pound applies more consciously and consistently than Browning did. Most poets grasp their own time, the life of the world as it stirs before their eyes, at one convulsion or not at all. But they have no method for closing in upon it. Mr. Pound's method is indirect and one extremely difficult to pursue. As the present is no more than the present existence, the present significance, of the entire past, Mr. Pound proceeds by acquiring the entire past; and when the entire past is acquired, the constituents fall into place and the present is revealed. Such a method involves immense capacities of learning and of dominating one's learning, and the peculiarity of expressing oneself through historical masks. Mr. Pound has a unique gift for expression through some phase of past life. This is not archaeology or pedantry, but one method, and a very high method of poetry. It is a method which allows of no arrest, for the poet imposes upon himself, necessarily, the condition of continually changing his mask; *hic et ubique*, then we'll shift our ground.⁷

This is a statement of a theory of communication shared by Pound and Eliot in 1919. It implies the further statement that Eliot presented in his 1921 essay on "The Metaphysical Poets": "It is not a permanent necessity that poets should be interested in philosophy, or in any other subject. We can only say that it appears likely that poets in our civilization, as it exists at present, must be *difficult*. Our civilization comprehends great variety and complexity, and this variety and complexity, playing upon a refined sensibility, must produce various and complex results. The poet must become more and more comprehensive, more allusive, more indirect, in order to force, to dislocate if necessary, language into his meaning."⁸

II

Pound and Eliot assumed as true for their time what Dante had assumed in his time. The medieval assumption of the poet as learned (*difficult*) is stated by E. R. Curtius: "Access to the Comedy can be gained—could and should be gained, the poet would have it—only by study. For Dante and for the Middle Ages, the basic plan for any education of the intellect is, in general, the reading of books, the 'luno studio' (Inf., I, 83)—in contradistinction to the conversational method (*διαλέγεσθας*) of the Greeks."⁹ Evidence of the role of erudition in medieval poetry is stressed by Robert Hollander in his study of *Allegory in Dante's Commedia*. The approach to fourfold exegesis requires encyclopedic erudition at any time—a fact that loomed large in Eliot's study of Dante before Hollander: "Essentially, however, the importance of Dante's borrowing of the technique of fourfold exegesis was lost to the critics until the twentieth century. The whole problem is densely complex when it is considered in a historical perspective."¹⁰

Contemporary linguistics has recovered the multileveled study of language in our time. However, Eliot had earlier developed his own approach to the four levels by his long and loving study of the learned grammarian Bishop Andrewes and his contemporaries. The parallel of Andrewes and Eliot is plain: "but the voice of Andrewes is the voice of a man who has a formed visible Church behind him, who speaks with the old authority and the new culture. It is the difference of negative and positive: Andrewes is the first great preacher of the English Catholic Church" (*Selected Essays*, p. 344). Eliot adds: "Andrewes may seem pedantic and verbal. . . . Andrewes takes a word and derives the world from it; squeezing and squeezing the word until it yields a full juice of meaning which we should never have supposed

any word to possess ” (pp. 347–48). An instance of this occurs in the passage from Bishop Andrewes that Eliot uses in *Gerontion*:

I add yet farther; what flesh? The flesh of an infant. What, *Verbum infans*, the Word an infant? The Word, and not be able to speak a word? How evil agreeth this! This He put up. How born, how entertained? In a stately palace, cradle of ivory, robes of estate? No; but a stable for His palace, a manger for His cradle, poor clouts for His array. This was His beginning. Follow Him farther, if any better afterward; what flesh afterward? *Sudans et algens*, in cold and heat, hungry and thirsty, faint and weary. Is His end any better? that maketh up all: what flesh then?¹¹

Referring to his own training, Andrewes begins a discussion of typical exegetical method:

Our books tell us, the Scripture will bear four senses; all four be in this, and a kind of ascent there is in them.

1. First, after the letter and in due consequence to the word immediately next before this, the last word of the verse, which is Sinai. It is a report of Moses' ascending thither. For he, from the bottom of the Red Sea, went up to the top of Sinai, leading with him the people of Israel that long had been captive to Pharaoh; and there "received gifts," the Law, the Priesthood, but above all, the "Ark of the covenant," to be the pledge of God's presence among them. This is the literal.

2. This of Moses, by analogy, doth King David apply to himself; to his going up to mount Sion, and carrying the ark up thither. For all agree, this Psalm was set upon that occasion. The very beginning of it, "Let God arise," &c., sheweth as much;—the acclamation ever to be used, at the ark's removing, as is plain by the tenth of Numbers, verse thirty-five. Now this was done immediately upon his conquest of the Jebusites; whom a little before he had taken captives and made tributaries there. What time also, for honour of the solemnity, *dona dedit*, he dealt "bread" and "wine to all the people," gift-wise, as we find, the first of Chronicles, sixteenth chapter, and the third verse. This is the analogical; as Moses to Sinai, so David to Sion.

3. From these two we arise to the moral sense, thus. That, as whensoever God's people are carried captive and made thrall to their enemies; as then God seemeth to be put down, and lie foiled for a time, that one may well say, *Exsurgat Deus*, to Him: so when He takes their cause in hand and works their deliverance, it may well be said, *Ascendit in altum*, "He is gone up," as it were, to His high throne or judgment-seat, there to give sentence for them. Ever the Church's depressing is, as it were, God's own humiliation; and their deliverance, after a sort, His exaltation. For then He hath the upper hand. And this is the moral.

4. Now from this we ascend to the Prophetical sense, "to the testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of all prophecy."¹²

Bishop Andrewes, Eliot's mentor, had "behind him" centuries of fourfold exegesis. Somewhat more succinct in St. Bonaventure, in the thirteenth century: "Finally, there is depth in the Scriptures, deriving from their several figurative meanings. Many Scriptural passages have, besides the direct sense, three other significations: the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical. Allegory consists in this: that one thing signifies another thing which is in the realm of faith; moral teaching, or tropology, in this: that from something done, we learn another thing that we must do; anagogy, or lifting up, in this: that we are given to know what to desire, that is, the eternal happiness of the elect."¹³ Andrewes cites Ovid frequently, as well as the other classics, ancient and medieval. In the ancient writers the four levels were also pervasive. Writing in the secular tradition, the grammarian Varro (first century B.C.) reports:

Now I shall set forth the origins of the individual words, of which there are four levels of explanation. The lowest is that to which even the common folk has come. . . . The second is that to which old-time grammar has mounted, which shows how the poet has made each word which he has fashioned and derived. . . .

The third level is that to which philosophy ascended, and on arrival began to reveal the nature of those words which are in common use. . . . The fourth is that where the sanctuary is, and the mysteries of the high-priest: if I shall not arrive at full knowledge there, at any rate I shall cast about for a conjecture.¹⁴

As the four levels of understanding and exegesis are found in both the secular and patristic traditions, they would seem to bridge the worlds of Paul and Apollo. Bishop Andrewes makes such an observation: "Why then, will some say, one of these two inconveniences will follow, that hereby we shall think the Scripture is of the devil's side, as well as of Christ's side, and so divided; as in like sort they make a division of Christ, when one holds with Paul, another with Apollos. No, it is not so, Christ allegeth not this Scripture in that sort, as one nail to drive out another; but by way of harmony and exposition, that the one may make plain the meaning of the other."¹⁵ The four levels of meaning are simultaneous and not sequential, save for the accident imposed by narrative commentary and analysis. Because these matters of exegetical procedure were as familiar to Dante's time as to the age of Andrewes, Dante does not enlarge on this technique so basic to his work. Dante was near the middle of an unbroken tradition of exegetical practice that lasted sixteen hundred years. He alludes to the four senses in his letter to Can Grande as casually as a musician

might mention the key signature of his composition: "In evidence, then, of what should be said, let it be known that the sense of this work is not simple; nay, it may be said to be polysemous, which is to say, of a number of senses; for the first sense is that which is understood by the letter, another, that which is understood by those things signified by the letter. And the first is called literal, the second, to be sure, either allegorical, or moral, or anagogical."¹⁶ Dante, then, uses multilevel meanings in his poem:

Once we grasp these facts, it is manifest that the subject, around which the senses run, one after the other, is of necessity twofold. And that such is the case concerning the subject of this work ought to be clear, as it is first to be understood literally, and then expounded allegorically. Thus the subject of the whole work, so far as it is to be understood in the literal sense, taken simply, is the state of the souls after death; for the process of the entire work situates itself in this and around this. If, to be sure, the work is to be understood allegorically, the subject is man, as he is liable to rewarding or punishing justice, according as he is worthy or unworthy in the exercise of the freedom of his will.¹⁷

Like Andrewes, Dante makes the distinction between Paul and Apollo, between theology and secular poetry, as Hollander explains: "Dante does not combine in any way at all, the allegory of the poets and the allegory of the theologians. The *Divine Comedy*, the epistle informs us, is to be understood through the techniques of allegory which are specifically and only Christian, not, as was the *Convivio*, by means of the allegory of the poets. Here there is no reference to Orpheus, only to Scripture."¹⁸ As a close student of Dante, these analogical approaches were very familiar to Eliot. In a talk on "What Dante Means to Me" Eliot acknowledged, "I still, after forty years, regard his poetry as the most persistent and deepest influence upon my own verse."¹⁹ Eliot goes on to explain the comprehensive scope of Dante's influence on his work and how it has shaped his theory of communication: "The *Divine Comedy* expresses everything in the way of emotion, between depravity's despair and the beatific vision, that man is capable of experiencing. It is therefore a constant reminder to the poet, of the obligation to explore, to find words for the inarticulate, to capture those feelings which people can hardly even feel, because they have no words for them; and at the same time, a reminder that the explorer beyond the frontiers of ordinary consciousness will only be able to return and report to his fellow-citizens, if he has all the time a firm grasp upon the realities with which they are already acquainted."²⁰ In relation to passing "beyond the frontiers of ordinary consciousness," it might be relevant to consider St. Paul's

discussion of “speaking in tongues.” It is applicable to both the obscurities of modern poetry and to the levels of traditional exegesis:

- 2 For he that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no man understandeth *him*; howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries.
- 3 But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort.
- 4 He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the church.
- 5 I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied; for greater *is* he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying.
- 6 Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?

(1 Cor. 14:2–6)

Applying these observations of St. Paul to the first version of *The Waste Land* (now available in Valerie Eliot's *Facsimile and Transcript*),²¹ many would say that in the first version of the poem Eliot had begun to speak in “an unknown tongue,” and was speaking “not unto men but unto God.” There was always some basis for this charge in Eliot's poetry. Years later, in an interview with Donald Hall in the *Paris Review*, Eliot remarked that the lack of experience and maturity often leads a poet to be obscure: “That type of obscurity comes when a poet is still at the stage of learning how to use language. You have to say the thing the difficult way. The only alternative is not saying it at all, at that stage. By the time of the *Four Quartets*, I couldn't have written in the style of *The Waste Land*, I wasn't even bothering whether I understood what I was saying.”²²

Pound, by his knowledge and “craft,” transformed the poem from “an unknown tongue” to the level of prophecy and exhortation for men. Eliot, in turn, responded with the suggestion of placing *Geron-tion* at the opening of *The Waste Land* as an interpretive prologue. Pound vetoed the idea; but later Eliot, possumlike, put the *Notes* at the end, for explanatory effect.

Explaining further his idea of communication in his essay on *Charles Whibley*, Eliot adapts St. Paul to his own use:

In attaining such unity, and indeed in attaining a *living* style, whether in prose or in verse, the practice of conversation is invaluable. Indeed, I believe that to write well it is necessary to converse a great deal. I say “converse” instead of “talk”; because I believe that there are two types of good writers: those who

talk a great deal to others, and those, perhaps less fortunate, who talk a great deal to themselves. It is two thousand and hundreds of years since, that the theory was propounded that thought is conversation with oneself; all literary creation certainly springs either from the habit of talking to oneself or from the habit of talking to others. Most people are unable to do either, and that is why they lead such active lives. But anyone who would write must let himself go, in one way or the other, for there are only four ways of thinking: to talk to others, or to one other, or to talk to oneself, or to talk to God. (*Selected Essays*, pp. 500–501)

There is a deep sense in which all of the versions and parts of *The Waste Land*, including the *Notes*, and including all the commentaries ever since, are simultaneous, and form a single poem or text.

This seeming paradox may be elucidated by Eliot's various remarks about the meaning of poems. It is also elucidated by Aquinas's classic text concerning the simultaneity of the meanings of Scripture in relation to the intention of the author and also of his commentators:

... not to force such an interpretation on Scripture as to exclude any other interpretations that are actually or possibly true: since it is part of the dignity of Holy Writ that under the one literal sense many others are contained. It is thus that the sacred text not only adapts itself to man's various intelligence, so that each one marvels to find his thoughts expressed in the words of Holy Writ; but also is all the more easily defended against unbelievers in that when one finds his own interpretation of Scripture to be false he can fall back upon some other. Hence it is not inconceivable that Moses and the other authors of the Holy Books were given to know the various truths that men would discover in the text, and that they expressed them under one literary style, so that each truth is the sense intended by the author. And then even if commentators adapt certain truths to the sacred text that were not understood by the author, without doubt the Holy Ghost understood them, since he is the principal author of Holy Scripture. Consequently every truth that can be adapted to the sacred text without prejudice to the literal sense, is the sense of Holy Scripture.²³

This provides a sidelight on the matter of the levels of meaning and signification, and accords entirely with Eliot's idea of the "function of meaning" in poetry. In her study, *T. S. Eliot: The Making of The Waste Land*, Muriel Bradbrook remarks that "in the early 1930s, he conceded on behalf of drama, 'Its meaning to others is as much a part of it as what it means to oneself', and that 'the existence of a poem lies somewhere between the reader and the writer.'²⁴ Nine years later, in *The Music of Poetry*, he allowed that 'the reader's interpretation may not only differ from the author's and be equally valid—it may even be better. There may be much more in a poem than the author was

aware of. The different interpretations may all be partial formulations of the one thing” (*On Poetry and Poets*, p. 31).²⁵

Another nine years, Miss Bradbrook notes, and the wheel has come full circle, with: “If the word ‘inspiration’ is to have any meaning, it must mean just this, that the speaker or writer is uttering something which he does not wholly understand—or which he may even misinterpret when the inspiration has departed from him. . . . A Poet may believe that he is expressing only his private experience; his lines may be for him only a means of talking about himself without giving himself away; yet for his readers what he has written may come to be the expression both of their own secret feelings and of the exultation or despair of a generation.”²⁶

This simultaneous and prophetic aspect of modern poetry and language has eluded even so able a student as R. P. Blackmur, who remarked, in interpretation of Eliot and Yeats, that “in these various orders which Eliot has used, there is no recognizable principle of composition. Even the Sibyl and Tiresias are not enough.”²⁷ Blackmur is more useful in relating analogy to the simultaneity of poetic structures:

Analogy is also the deep form of reminding that there is always something *else* going on: the identity which is usually a mystery apprehended in analogy; what is lost in “mere” logic, but is carried along in the story.

Analogy is like the old notion of underplot, or second plot in Elizabethan drama. Sometimes these underplots were only two logics, sometimes one and sometimes another; but sometimes they were a multiplying process. One times one equals one, but a one which is also a third thing, which is fused in the mind, in the looking of one working on the other. Emotions can be like plot and underplot. If we put two emotions of the established sorts in association (like love and hate) we get an artistic emotion differing from either but with attributes common to both. In association, emotions are fruitful, and we get a sense of living action where there had been sets of abstraction: as in the *Mass*.²⁸

Eliot’s difficulties in shaping *The Waste Land* are rehearsed in his analysis of the reason for Ben Jonson’s failure in *Catiline*: “*Catiline* fails,” he says, “not because it is too laboured and conscious, but because it is not conscious enough; because Jonson in this play was not alert to his own idiom, not clear in his mind as to what his temperament wanted him to do” (*Selected Essays*, p. 149). These difficulties shine through the *Facsimile and Transcript* in the way in which Pound conducted the “Caesarean Operation” of delivering *The Waste Land*.

Pound supplied just those qualities which Eliot notes as absent in the composition of *Catiline*. He whimsically wrote:

These are the poems of Eliot
 By the Uranian Muse begot; . . .
 If you must needs enquire
 Know diligent Reader
 That on each Occasion
 Ezra performed the Caesarean Operation.²⁹

III

The Waste Land that Eliot first showed to Pound was a four-part poem, both seasonal elegy and city pastoral. Embedded in this text was a dramatic ode to London written in the terza rima of Dante (*Facsimile and Transcript*, p. 37). Eliot's original four-part structure of *The Waste Land* is an anticipation of the four divisions of the *Four Quartets* in respect to the four seasons, the four elements, and the four analogical levels of exegesis. All of these are musical and simultaneous rather than sequential. Pound modified this liturgical pattern by desacralizing it. He was alienated by the religious aspect of Eliot's four levels, which as a medievalist he, too, understood very well. He had an alternative classical pattern in mind, which we will come to presently.

Looking more closely at Eliot's original four-part poem, we first encounter the heading from *Our Mutual Friend* of the great Londoner, Charles Dickens. The title of the novel has the sinister overtone of the devil himself, everybody's friend. Eliot's title phrase, "He Do the Police in Different Voices," refers to the lad Sloppy, who reads to Betty Higden. She says: "I do love a newspaper. You mightn't think it, but Sloppy is a beautiful reader of the newspaper. He do the Police in different voices."³⁰ The nonliterate Betty has a special appreciation of the subtleties of oral performance. At the same time, Eliot's highly literate awareness of multileveled nuances of meaning in "voices" ("Three Voices of Poetry") evokes the idea of the levels (different voices) of interpretation. Taken in order, the four parts of the first *Waste Land* move through the four seasons in sequence.

First, "The Burial of the Dead" (Spring): "April is the cruellest month" (*Facsimile and Transcript*, p. 7, l. 55). Then, "In the Cage," with summer showers; followed by "The Fire Sermon" (Autumn):

The rivers tent is broken and the last fingers of leaf
 Clutch and sink into the wet bank.

(P. 25, ll. 1-2)

Finally, "Death by Water" (Winter) occurs in northern latitudes where the ship ends up in the Arctic ice pack:

And dead ahead we saw, where sky and sea should meet,
 A line, a white line, a long white line.
 . . . towards which we drove
 My God man there's bears on it.

(P. 61, ll. 75–78)

The four elements and the four levels also resonate in this structure. “The Burial of the Dead” is in the “earth” of the city, beginning with the pub crawl through the cultural labyrinth of the town. This is followed by

. . . breeding
 Lilacs out of the dead land.

(P. 7, ll. 55–56)

Next, “In the Cage” (air) includes the strange synthetic perfumes and the play of “the wind under the door” (p. 11, l. 42), with accent on the social “airs” of the two women. The third element is “The Fire Sermon” itself, and the fourth is drowning (“Death by Water”).

Parallel to the elements and the seasons are the four levels, beginning with the burial of the spiritually dead, as the literal basis of the poem which is exhibited in a variety of vignettes of perversity:

I read, much of the night, and go south in the winter.

(P. 7, l. 72)

“In the Cage” affords the allegory of the two complementary women, the one representing Asian opulence, the other embedded in lower-class Western squalor. “The Fire Sermon” is an eloquent presentation of the moral level—of the lusts of the flesh, from Fresca’s affairs to the typist’s teatime fling. “Death by Water” attains the anagogic level, where the ascent is to the pure and ethereal regions of Arctic snow and ice, and death.

To these same four levels or aspects of the Books of Man and Nature, Ernst Robert Curtius devotes an entire section of *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. From the ancient world through Shakespeare there is a continuous study of the two Books. For example there is “the philosophical speculation of a Plotinus”: “Writing affords him comparisons intended to serve cognition, not literary effect. Thus, the stars for him are ‘like letters forever being written in the sky, or like letters written once and for all and forever moving’ (II,3,7; Müller, 1,93,8). The motion of the stars serves to maintain the universe but it also has another use: ‘If they are regarded as letters

(*γράμματα*) he who knows that alphabet (*γραμματική*) reads the future according to the figures they form.' Concerning the seer, Plotinus says that his art is 'to read the written characters of Nature, which reveal order and law.'³¹

For centuries men turned their eyes to the page of Nature as well as to the *sacra pagina*, using the grammars of the trivium and the quadrivium respectively to read them. St. Bonaventure was working in the midst of this flourishing tradition which had in his time persisted for over one thousand years, a tradition of which all educated men, including Dante and Chaucer, were fully aware. Etienne Gilson summarizes Bonaventure's approach:

Since the universe was offered to his eyes as a book to read and he saw in nature a sensible revelation analogous to that of the Scriptures, the traditional methods of interpretation which had always been applied to the sacred books could equally be applied to the book of creation. Just as there is an immediate and literal sense of the sacred text, but also an allegorical sense by which we discover the truths of faith that the letter signifies, a tropological sense by which we discover a moral precept behind a passage in the form of an historical narrative, and an anagogical sense by which our souls are raised to the love and desire of God, so we must not attend to the literal and immediate sense of the book of creation but look for its inner meaning in the theological, moral and mystical lessons that it contains. The passage from one of these two spheres to the other is the more easily effected in that they are in reality inseparable.³²

In the same way, each theme of *The Waste Land* resonates allegorically with all of the others, and includes them, just as Tiresias is the corporate embodiment of all the characters. The novella *In the Cage*, by Henry James, is most helpful for understanding the role and function of Tiresias. The novel opens: "It had occurred to her early that in her position—that of a young person spending, in framed and wired confinement, the life of a guinea-pig or a magpie—she should know a great many persons without their recognizing the acquaintance. That made it an emotion the more lively—though singularly rare and always, even then, with opportunity still very much smothered—to see any one come in whom she knew outside, as she called it, any one who could add anything to the meanness of her function."³³

The girl in the telegraph cage is described as having "a whimsical mind and wonderful nerves; she was subject, in short, to sudden flickers of antipathy and sympathy." James tells us, "What she could handle freely, she said to herself, was combinations of men and women," and Eliot originally had the lines,

And we shall play a game of chess:
The ivory men make company between us.

(*Facsimile and Transcript*, p. 13, ll. 62–63)

James's heroine is a kind of Madame Sosostris, who, he tells us, observed "Ladies wiring to different persons under different names. She had seen all sorts of different things"—like Tiresias—"and pieced together all sorts of mysteries."³⁴ "How did she guess all sorts of impossible things, such as, almost on the very spot, the presence of drama at a critical stage and the nature of the tie with the gentleman at the Hotel Brighton? More than ever before it floated to her through the bars of the cage that this at last was the high reality, the bristling truth that she had hitherto only patched up and eked out—one of the creatures, in fine, in whom all the conditions for happiness actually met, and who, in the air they made, bloomed with an unwitting insolence."³⁵ Like Tiresias, she reads the book of the world.

Having said in his (later) "Notes": "What Tiresias *sees* in fact, is the substance of the poem," Eliot adds, "The whole passage from Ovid is of great anthropological interest." He then gives the episode from Ovid in full, in which Ovid's four levels are clearly manifested. At the *literal* level is the encounter with the snakes—Tiresias "knows" their knowing. Representing the *figurative* level, he is punished by being made an allegory—a "knower" of both man and woman. As the *moral* mode, he is blinded for not "knowing better" than to take a playful dispute seriously. Finally (*anagogically*), in return for his loss of sight, Jove gave him the power to "know" the future. This quotation is one of the several ways which Eliot uses to train the perceptions of the reader in multilevel awareness. Mythic "narrative" is not sequential but simultaneous, requiring prolonged meditation.

IV

When Pound confronted Eliot's *Waste Land* manuscript, he moved quickly to alter the four-part structure, which his secular bias told him was loaded with spirituality and mysticism. His aversion to the mode of meditational four-level exegesis prompted him to urge a five-division pattern of classical oratory. The poem, which Eliot had begun as a four-part meditation, emerged as a five-division oration. Pound's bias was towards the manifesto and public declaration, as appears in "Hugh Selwyn Mauberly":

The age demanded an image
Of its accelerated grimace. . . .

(*Personae*, p. 188)

This "classic" poem has the claim to be truly classic in respect to its structural use of the five divisions of classical rhetoric. Seven years before the appearance of *The Waste Land*, Pound had developed the style of classical eloquence in contemporary poetry. He divided "Mauberly" into five numbered sections which are simultaneous, rather than sequential, resonant rather than logical, as are the five divisions of classical oratory as understood by Cicero and Quintilian. The importance of this simultaneity concerns the classical claim to embody the Logos in the resonant interplay of these divisions.

Pound's five divisions are: invention, or the finding of the theme or matter: "For three years, out of key with his time" (*Personae*, p. 187); the arrangement (disposition) of that matter: "The age demanded an image" (p. 188); elocution or ornament in accord with the occasion: "What god, man, or hero/ Shall I place a tin wreath upon" (p. 189); memory: "frankness as never before . . . trench confessions" (p. 190); and delivery: "There died a myriad, . . ./For a botched civilization, . . ./Quick eyes gone under earth's lid" (p. 191). Not only did Pound develop this structure of eloquence for his own poetry, but he communicated it to W. B. Yeats, who was persuaded to use it in some of his major poems.

In May, 1914 (*Poetry* IV), Pound reviewed Yeats's *Responsibilities* under the heading, "The Later Yeats,"³⁶ in which occur several poems structured by the five rhetorical divisions including "Beggars to Beggars Cried," "A Song from 'The Player Queen,'" and "The Magi." The latter uses the five divisions within the single stanza, as also occurs in some of the later poems, such as "The Circus Animals' Desertion." Here there are five stanzas, with also the five divisions *within* each stanza. It is easiest to see Pound's insistence on using the five divisions in such "later" five-stanza poems as "Under the Round Tower," "The Wild Swans at Coole," and "Byzantium."

Just as "later Yeats" of course owes a great deal to Pound, so does the "later Eliot." Once he had published *The Waste Land*, finally firmed up by the structural use of classical rhetoric, Eliot made this form his own immediately in "The Hollow Men" (1925). As M. C. Bradbrook points out, in the early twenties "Eliot is concerned to defend rhetoric, and the 'artificial style' in drama."³⁷ In his essay on Ben Jonson (1919), Eliot defines the advantages of formal rhetoric: "And you may say: rhetoric; but if we are to call it 'rhetoric' we must subject that term to a closer dissection than any to which it is accustomed. What Jonson has done here is not merely a fine speech. It is the careful, precise filling in of a strong and simple outline, and at no point does it overflow the outline . . . they do not exhibit prolixity or redundancy or the other vices in the rhetoric books; there is a definite

artistic emotion which demands expression at that length" (*Selected Essays*, p. 150).

As preparation for viewing the structural changes that Pound effected in *The Waste Land*, we can look back from the form given to *Four Quartets* where Eliot made a wedding of the diverse patterns of the four levels of exegesis on the one hand, and of the five divisions of classical rhetoric on the other. As already remarked, both patterns are synchronic and simultaneous, rather than diachronic or sequential. The simultaneity of the four levels, as used by the grammarian, constitutes the resonance of the Logos, just as the five divisions, when used by the orator, constitute the presence of the word. This is what the linguists now call *la langue*, and Eliot calls "the auditory imagination." The "auditory imagination" includes both the four levels and the five divisions: "What I call the 'auditory imagination' is the feeling for syllable and rhythm, penetrating far below the conscious levels of thought and feeling, invigorating every word; sinking to the most primitive and forgotten, returning to the origin and bringing something back seeking the beginning and the end. It works through meanings, certainly, or not without meanings in the ordinary sense, and fuses the old and obliterated and the trite, the current, and the new and surprising, the most ancient and the most civilized mentality."³⁸

That inclusive consciousness, which the ancients called eloquence, emanated from encyclopedic knowledge, and is central to the work of both Pound and Eliot. Pound evokes it by vortices, and Eliot by the "auditory imagination." As cited before, in Eliot's (1919) review, "Mr. Pound proceeds by acquiring the entire past," at which point "the constituents fall into place and the present is revealed." This is the Pound "vortex," and also the key to Mr. Eliot's idea of Tradition: "a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional" (*Selected Essays*, p. 14).

In Book I of *The Institutes of Oratory*, Quintilian sets forth the program for schooling in eloquence, which includes the study of languages and the cultivation of both grammar and rhetoric:

This profession may be most briefly considered under two heads, the art of speaking correctly and the interpretation of the poets; but there is more beneath the surface than meets the eye. For the art of writing is combined with that of speaking, and correct reading precedes interpretation, while in

each of these cases criticism has its work to perform. . . . Nor is it sufficient to have read the poets only; every kind of writer must be carefully studied, not merely for the subject matter, but for the vocabulary; for words often acquire authority from their use by a particular author. Nor can such training be regarded as complete if it stop short of music, for the teacher of literature has to speak of metre and rhythm: nor again if he be ignorant of astronomy, can he understand the poets; for they, to mention no further points, frequently give their indications of time by reference to the rising and setting of the stars. Ignorance of philosophy is an equal drawback.³⁹

In Book III, following Cicero (who, in turn, continued the program of Isocrates), he presents the divisions of rhetoric and their basic characters:

The art of oratory, as taught by most authorities, and those the best, consists of five parts:—*invention*, *arrangement*, *expression*, *memory*, and *delivery* or *action* (the two latter terms being used synonymously). But all speech expressive of purpose involves also a *subject* and *words*. If such expression is brief and contained within the limits of one sentence, it may demand nothing more, but longer speeches require much more. For not only what we say and how we say it is of importance, but also the circumstances under which we say it. It is here that the need of arrangement comes in. But it will be impossible to say everything demanded by the subject, putting each thing in its proper place, without the aid of memory. It is for this reason that memory forms the fourth department. But a delivery, which is rendered unbecoming either by voice or gesture, spoils everything and almost entirely destroys the effect of what is said. Delivery therefore must be assigned the fifth place.⁴⁰

It was in accordance with the structure indicated by these traditional five divisions, still current in classical training in Pound's day, that Pound shaped *The Waste Land*.

For compression and to enhance discontinuity and intensity (the "Caesarean operation"), Pound and Eliot began by cutting out the narrative sections. These were: the first fifty-five lines of the "Burial of the Dead" (*Facsimile and Transcript*, p. 3), the seventy-two lines (Fresca's morning toilette) of "The Fire Sermon" (pp. 23,27), and eighty-three of the ninety-three lines of "Death by Water" (pp. 55–61), leaving only the Phlebas passage which had itself been retrieved from the earlier poem "Dans Le Restaurant." This last cut destroyed Eliot's original four-part structure: with the canceled lines went the fourth season and the fourth level; the fourth element (water) alone remained. Pound also persuaded Eliot to add a fifth section, using for the purpose some untitled additional lines Eliot had written, but not marked for inclusion (pp. 71–81). This became the part now called "What the Thunder Said."

The switch from the private narrative to the public declamation appears immediately in the contrast between the openings of Eliot's and Pound's "Burial of the Dead": "First we had a couple of feelers down at Tom's place" is personal, narrative recollection, and contrasts with the rhetorical thrust of "April is the cruellest month, breeding . . ."

Another way of detecting the change of form and tone is to note the shift from the Conrad to the Petronius epigraph, from "The horror! The horror!" to Latin and the Greek cry of the Sibyl, "I want to die." The context for "The horror! The horror!" provided by Eliot, is that of a tragic narrative of replay and recall of an entire life: "Did he live his life again in every detail of desire, temptation, and surrender during that supreme moment of complete knowledge? He cried in a whisper at some image, at some vision,—he cried out twice, a cry that was no more than a breath—"The horror! The horror!" (*Facsimile and Transcript*, p. 3).

These echo the themes of memory, drowning, death, and an inclusive moment of knowledge and (spiritual) recognition, all of which are consonant with the original four-level meditational scheme. In this regard, Eliot wrote to Pound, commenting on the Conrad epigraph, "Do you mean not use the Conrad quote or simply not put Conrad's name to it? It is much the most appropriate I can find, and somewhat elucidative" (*Letters*, p. 171).

The difference between the context of the Conrad epigraph and that of Petronius is between the "Uranian" muse of theology and the satiric muse, between tragedy and comedy. The death in Conrad echoes Phlebas's sudden clairvoyance, whereas Petronius's Sibyl blends with Madame Sosostriis and satire. At the wealthy Trimalchio's Menippean banquet, all is frivolous:

Needless to say, we pointedly applauded all of Trimalchio's sallies.

"But tell me, my dear Agamemnon," continued our host, "do you remember the twelve labors of Hercules or the story about Ulysses and how the Cyclops broke his thumb trying to get the log out of his eye? When I was a kid, I used to read all those stories in Homer. And, you know, I once saw the Sybil of Cumae in person. She was hanging in a bottle, and when the boys asked her, 'Sybil, what do you want?' she said, 'I want to die.'"⁴¹

Whereas the context for Conrad's "The horror! The horror!" is gloomy and sinister, the context of the Cumaean Sibyl is boisterous and festive:

*We think we're awful smart, we think we're awful wise,
but when we're least expecting, comes the big surprise.*

*Lady Luck's in heaven and we're her little toys,
so break out the wine and fill your glasses, boys!*⁴²

The tone of bizarre and disheveled frivolity is mimed in Eliot's Madame Sosostriis, who "had a bad cold" (World War I slang for venereal disease) "nevertheless/Is known to be the wisest woman in Europe,/With a wicked pack of cards."⁴³ These tarot cards are the contemporary form of Sibyl's leaves.

As contrasted to the devotional pattern of the exegetical levels, satire is usually focused on an audience which is itself in part the target of the satire. Again, we have the change from passive meditation in a melancholy mood, to active penetration of the foibles of the time: in other words, a shift from the mode of Mr. Eliot to the mode of Ezra Pound. In this matter, one need go no further than Pound's annotations on the original *Waste Land* manuscript to discover the contrast between the somewhat mournful Eliot and the energetic Pound. Pound's sprightliness naturally favored vigorous assertion and playful teasing of the audience. In other words, Pound liked to "put on" his public. Pound always favored the rhetorical thrust of art. Apropos the great opening passage of *A Game of Chess*, "The Chair she sat in, like a burnished throne," with its overtones of Cleopatra, Pound punctures Eliot's solemnity with "Too tum-pum at a stretch" (*Facsimile and Transcript*, p. 11). And, further down, "Too penty" (p. 11), referring to the full-blown pentameter. And, later, "verse not interesting enough as verse to warrant so much of it" (p. 45), showing a typical rhetorical concern for the attention of the audience.

In the final version of the poem "imposed" by Pound, the five numbered sections strongly manifest the characteristic modes of the five divisions of rhetoric. Taking them in order, "The Burial of the Dead" (*Inventio*) designates the themes and the matter of the entire poem "mixing memory and desire," the rootless "living dead," and the "unreal city." "A Game of Chess" (*Dispositio*)—the new title points entirely to the world of "games people play," and concerns the humors, whims, and indispositions of the two women, upstairs and downstairs, bad nerves on the one hand, and an abortion on the other. *Elocutio* is the eloquence of "The Fire Sermon" and presents the mask of Tiresias, who embodies all the figures of the poem. As Eliot describes him in the "Notes," he is "the most important personage in the poem, uniting all the rest. . . all the women are one woman, and the two sexes meet in Tiresias. What Tiresias sees, in fact, is the substance of the poem."

Like a good classical oration, "The Fire Sermon" includes memorable exempla. The fourth section, "Death by Water," is entirely concerned with Memory. It opens: "Phlebas the Phoenician . . ./Forgot

...” Then he recalls “the stages of his age and youth” in a synchronic moment, as remarked earlier. The section’s rhetorical function is succinctly stated by R. P. Blackmur: “it is a lyric interlude put in to remind you what the rest of the poem is about.”⁴⁴ Of the fifth section, “What the Thunder Said,” the “delivery” or “action” of the poem, Eliot wrote to Bertrand Russell (1923): it “is not only the best part, but the only part that justifies the whole, at all.” This remark to Bertrand Russell indicates Eliot’s awareness of rhetorical pattern in the poem and his acceptance of Pound’s artistic judgment and his midwifery.

V

Eliot was far from passive in his initial response to Pound’s editing. Eliot’s attachment to the four-part structure involved his devotion to *Grammatica* and its *figure/ground* structure included in the text itself. By contrast, Pound’s insistence on the primacy of the public outside the poem as the real *ground*, led him to prefer the use of rhetoric.

Eliot had tried several ploys to veer the poem back into the orbit of *Grammatica*. First he had suggested to Pound that they print his editorial comments as a marginal (grammatical) gloss to the poem. Pound refused: “My squibs are now a bloody impertinence. I send ’em as requested; but don’t use ’em with *Waste Land*. You can tack ’em onto a collected edtn, or use ’em somewhere where they would be decently hidden and swamped by the bulk of accompanying matter. They’d merely be an extra and wrong note with the 19 page version” (*Letters*, p. 169).

Alternatively, Eliot suggested adding “Gerontion”: “Do you advise printing ‘Gerontion’ as a prelude in book or pamphlet form?” (p. 171). To which Pound replied, “I do *not* advise printing ‘Gerontion’ as preface. One don’t miss it *at all* as the thing now stands. To be more lucid still, let me say that I advise you NOT to print ‘Gerontion’ as prelude” (p. 171). Had Eliot managed to get “Gerontion” into the poem as prelude, he would have obviated Pound’s rhetorical structure.

Eliot next asked whether he had “Perhaps better omit Phlebas also???” (p. 171). Had Phlebas—that is, “Death by Water”—been omitted, the poem would have reverted to the four-part structure. This would have had the effect of restoring almost all of Eliot’s original scheme: “What the Thunder Said” would serve to present the element of water (as it rains) and also the final or spiritual “levels.” It omits only the season (winter). Pound’s response was decisive: “I DO advise keeping Phlebas. In fact, I more’n advise. Phlebas is an integral

part of the poem; the card pack introduces him, the drowned phoen. sailor. And he is needed ABSOLOOTLY where he is. Must stay in" (p. 171).

Eliot made further gestures for evading the five-part rhetorical structure. In *T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound*, Donald Gallup reported that Eliot continued, after Pound's editing, to think of the work as a series, and even suggested "to Scofield Thayer that the poem could go into as many as four issues of the *Dial*. Even as late as 21 September 1922, Eliot was planning to print *The Waste Land* in two instalments in his own *Criterion*—Parts I–II in October 1922 and Parts III–V in January 1923. It was only Pound's 'howling to high heaven that this was an outrage' that kept the poem from being split in this fashion in its original periodical appearances."⁴⁵

Had Eliot published *The Waste Land* in four issues of the *Dial*, he would have restored his favorite pattern of four. On the other hand, had he broken the poem in half, in his own *Criterion*, he would again have bypassed Pound's rhetorical structure, and would have had instead a two-part pastoral epyllion. Much the same epyllion effect would have resulted from using "Gerontion" as preface.

The discontinuous epyllion, or mythic, structure, as Marjorie Crump explains,⁴⁶ requires a plot and digression, or a double plot, which constitutes a metamorphic structure of *figure* in interplay with *ground*—necessary to the etiological epic, a study of origins and causes. Eliot explicitly discusses the epyllion structure in his celebrated review of "*Ulysses, Order and Myth*":

In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue after him. They will not be imitators, any more than the scientist who uses the discoveries of an Einstein in pursuing his own, independent, further investigations. It is simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history. It is a method already adumbrated by Mr. Yeats, and of the need for which I believe Mr. Yeats to have been the first contemporary to be conscious.⁴⁷

Yeats's "adumbration" appears in his short (1903) note on "Emotion of Multitude,"⁴⁸ which he begins by explaining why he dislikes "the clear and logical construction which seems necessary if one is to succeed on the modern stage. . . . The Shakespearian drama gets the emotion of multitude out of the sub-plot which copies the main plot, much as a shadow upon the wall copies one's body in the firelight." After illustrating from *Lear* and *Hamlet*, he adds, "It is so in all the plays . . . the sub-plot is the main plot working itself out in more

ordinary men and women, and so doubly calling up before us the image of multitude." In 1934, writing on John Marston, Eliot distinguishes the epyllion perceptual experience from the merely allegorical and conceptual:

It is possible that what distinguishes poetic drama from prosaic drama is a kind of doubleness in the action, as if it took place on two planes at once. In this it is different from allegory, in which the abstraction is something conceived, not something differently felt, and from symbolism (as in the plays of Maeterlinck) in which the tangible world is deliberately diminished—both symbolism and allegory being operations of the conscious planning mind. In poetic drama a certain apparent irrelevance may be the symptom of this doubleness; or the drama has an under-pattern, less manifest than the theatrical one. (*Selected Essays*, p. 229)

The "Notes" Eliot put in apposition to *The Waste Land* are not only a grammatical gloss and an analogy to the poem, but they constitute a second plot, "a shadow of the main plot" which, as Yeats points out, evokes an emotion of multitude, or the sense of universality. Of course, this epyllion, this parallel structure, is not only mythic but pervasive in the work of Pound, Eliot, Yeats, and Joyce. In one perspective, the "Notes" evoke the whimsical and multitudinous image of a "simultaneous order" of innumerable grammarians and commentators, past and present.

Eliot at last published the poem in the form preferred by Pound (in the *Criterion*, and in the *Dial*, October and November, 1922, respectively). Ezra later remarked that the poem's obscurities were reducible to four Sanskrit words, three of which are "so implied in the surrounding text that one can pass them by . . . without losing the general tone or the main emotion of the passage. They are so obviously the words of some ritual or other."⁴⁹ This was a characteristic rhetorical gesture of contempt for the meticulous solicitude of grammarian Eliot.

Old Possum, having been overruled many times, got in the last word . . . with the "Notes." These, added some months after the first publication, finally turned the poem away from rhetoric and back into the world of *Grammatica* and multilevel exegesis and learned commentary. Pound's reaction to the "Notes" is a testimony to the fact that there had been two poems in the process of making from the start, one by Eliot, the *Grammaticus*, and one by Pound, *Rhetor*. Pound resolutely brushed aside the "Notes" as irrelevant:

For the rest, I saw the poem in typescript, and I did not see the notes till 6 or 8 months afterward; and they have not increased my enjoyment of the poem one atom. The poem seems to me an emotional unit. . . .

I have not read Miss Weston's *Ritual to Romance*, and do not at present intend to. As to the citations, I do not think it matters a damn which is from Day, which from Milton, Middleton, Webster, or Augustine. I mean so far as the functioning of the poem is concerned. One's incult pleasure in reading *The Waste Land* would be the same if Webster had written "Women Before Woman" and Marvell the *Metamorphoses*.⁵⁰

As Kenner remarks, Pound's "parting shot deserves preservation": "This demand for clarity in every particular of a work, whether essential or not, reminds me of the pre-Raphaelite painter who was doing a twilight scene but rowed across the river in day time to see the shape of the leaves on the further bank, which he then drew in with full detail."⁵¹

Four Quartets requires a separate essay, but the student of classical rhetoric need look no further than the fifth (delivery) section of each quartet to find a full treatment of language and poetics. The four-part structure of the poem, "the complete consort dancing together," was Eliot's triumphant marriage of Paul and Apollo, of theology and art, that capped the years of Pound's masterly tuition.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

NOTES

- 1 Ezra Pound, *Personae* (New York, 1926), p. 61 (hereafter cited in the text as *Personae*).
- 2 Wyndham Lewis, ed., *Blast: Review of the Great English Vortex*, No. 1 (20 June 1914), p. 154. The words are Pound's.
- 3 Pound, *Gaudier-Brzeska: A Memoir* (London, 1960), p. 92.
- 4 M. C. Bradbrook, *T. S. Eliot* (London, 1950), p. 28.
- 5 T. S. Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* (London, 1928), pp. ix-x.
- 6 Eliot, *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy* (London, 1934), pp. 41-42.
- 7 Eliot, "The Method of Mr. Pound," *The Athenaeum* (24 Oct. 1919), p. 1065.
- 8 Eliot, *Selected Essays* (1932; rpt. London, 1972), p. 289 (hereafter cited in the text as *Selected Essays*).
- 9 Ernst R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, tr. W. R. Trask, 1st ed. (New York and Evanston, 1963), p. 327.
- 10 Robert Hollander, *Allegory in Dante's Commedia* (Princeton, 1969), p. 14.
- 11 Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, *Ninety-six Sermons*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford, 1841), I, 92.
- 12 Andrewes, III, 222.
- 13 St. Bonaventure, *The Breviloquium*, in *The Works of St. Bonaventure*, tr. Jose de Vinck (Paterson, 1963), pp. 13-14.
- 14 Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, tr. R. G. Kent (1938; rpt. Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1958), I, 9.
- 15 Andrewes, V, 526.
- 16 Hollander, p. 45.
- 17 *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
- 18 *Ibid.*

- 19 Eliot, *To Criticize the Critic* (New York, 1965), p. 125.
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 134.
- 21 Valerie Eliot, ed., *The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts Including the Annotations of Ezra Pound* (New York, 1971), hereafter cited in the text as *Facsimile and Transcript*.
- 22 *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews, Second Series* (New York, 1965), pp. 104–5.
- 23 St. Thomas Aquinas, *De Potentia Dei. On the Power of God (Quaestiones Disputatae De Potentia Dei)*, tr. English Dominican Fathers (Westminster, Md., 1952), II, 9.
- 24 Preface to G. Wilson Knight's *The Wheel of Fire* (1930) and to *Thoughts after Lambeth* (1932) (Miss Bradbrook's note).
- 25 Bradbrook, *T. S. Eliot: The Making of The Waste Land* (Harlow, Essex, 1972), p. 23.
- 26 "Virgil and the Christian World," *On Poetry and Poets* (1951), pp. 122–23 (Miss Bradbrook's note).
- 27 R. P. Blackmur, "Irregular Metaphysics," in *T. S. Eliot: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Hugh Kenner (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962), p. 63.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 59.
- 29 D. D. Paige, ed., *The Letters of Ezra Pound 1907–1941* (New York, 1950), p. 170 (hereafter cited in the text as *Letters*).
- 30 Charles Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend* (New York: New American Library, 1964), p. 226.
- 31 Curtius, pp. 307–8.
- 32 Etienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*, tr. Dom Iltyd Trethowan and Frank J. Sheed (Paterson, 1965), p. 208.
- 33 Henry James, *What Maisie Knew; In the Cage; The Pupil*, Novels and Tales, Series No. 11 (New York, 1908).
- 34 *Ibid.*, p. 376.
- 35 *Ibid.*, pp. 377–78.
- 36 Included in *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, ed. and introd. T. S. Eliot (New York, 1968).
- 37 Bradbrook, *T. S. Eliot* (London, 1950), p. 35.
- 38 T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London, 1933), pp. 118–19.
- 39 Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, Book I. iv. 1–4, tr. H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1963), I, 63.
- 40 *Ibid.*, Book III. iii. 1–3, I, 385.
- 41 Petronius Arbitrator, *The Satyricon*, tr. William Arrowsmith (New York, 1959), p. 57.
- 42 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- 43 *The Waste Land*, ll. 43–46.
- 44 Blackmur, p. 63.
- 45 Donald Gallup, *T. S. Eliot & Ezra Pound: Collaborators in Letters* (New Haven, 1970), p. 24. The remark is in a letter from Pound to Harriet Monroe. He wrote: "You might also concede the constructive value of my kicking about mutilations. *Propertius* and *Mauberty* were cut, but on the strength of my howling to high heaven that this was an outrage, Eliot's *Waste Land* was printed whole. In which action I also participated. Dragging my own corpse by the heels to arouse the blasted spectators" (*Letters*, p. 230).
- 46 Marjorie Crump, *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid* (Oxford, 1931).
- 47 Seon Givens, ed., *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism* (1948; rpt. New York, 1963).
- 48 W. B. Yeats, *Essays and Introductions* (London, 1961), pp. 215–16.
- 49 Quoted in Hugh Kenner, *The Invisible Poet: T. S. Eliot* (New York, 1959), pp. 151–52.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 152.
- 51 *Ibid.*