

Larysf Pedersen

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HETEROGLOSSIA AND AUTHORIAL VOICE IN ELIOT'S "THE WASTE LAND"

The article sets out an analysis of the relationship between heteroglossia and authorial voice in Eliot's "The Waste Land". The many-voicedness of the poem is built up on the basis of separate "heaps of broken images", overheard in solitude in eternity. Structurally, the poem is not a narrative as conventionally conceived, but evidently presents a bewildering sequence of the speech acts. Eliot skillfully integrates them into the fused continuum by means of the "uniting voice".

The textuality of *The Waste Land* perfectly exemplifies the modernist text. Modernist poetry breaks the coherence of the syntagmatic chain, ruins well-formed structures with indentations, lacunae, and fissures; opens the text to a polysemic interplay of meanings in which no syntagmatic chain achieves automatic privilege. Thus, through these means, modernist poetry refuses to provide a speaker represented as "really" present; it denies a position to the reader in apparent identification with the position of a transcendental ego and compels the reader to encounter the text and its representations from and in a place that is relative rather than absolute. As a modernist text *The Waste Land* fuses isolated quotations, half-lines, broken phrases, snatches of song, citations from foreign languages, interjections, truncated dialogue, onomatopoeic bird-song, unexplained juxtapositions, incomplete scenes, with disruptions and lacunae of all kinds.

The text releases word from its prison in any determinate context, surrounds it with space on the page and leaves it to attract a multitude of overtones, connotations, resonances. The gaps in the text become silences which amplify the meanings, the possible contexts for the words on their side. Almost every line and image thus becomes free to associate with almost any other in the poem through a network of floating fragments and synaptic connections. Modernists believed that poetry is a reinvestigation of the traditions of intellectual, emotional and spiritual life, activated not by the scholar's desire to pin down the past but the poet's need to find himself and belong to what he has inherited.

In *Creative Evolution* (1907) Henri Bergson states that 'memory conveys something of the past into the present'. Mental state, advancing

on the road of time, accumulates past: 'it goes on increasing - rolling upon itself as a snowball on the snow' [4, 2].

Eliot accepted Bergson's idea that the present contains nothing more than the past and developed it in his essay 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' (1919):

... the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with 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 [7, 4].

Eliot went on to argue that 'the poet must develop or procure the consciousness of the past...' [7, 6].

The Waste Land was published in 1922 in the opening issue of 'The Criterion', the major magazine edited by Eliot between 1922 and 1939; it was to become his most famous work. The poem, which has 433 lines, divided into five sections, with an extensive list of added notes, changed once and for all the idea of what contemporary readers should expect of a modernist poem and a modernist poet.

When Eliot first began work on the poem he titled it as 'He Do the Police in Different Voices'. His original typescript was shaped by Ezra Pound, who shortened it and so turned it 'from a jumble of good and bad passages into a poem' [10, 161]. Straightaway, Pound changed the original title to *The Waste Land*. Eliot accepted Pound's corrections in nearly every instance. When Pound examined the draft, he underlined

that the text was the collection of 'cinematographic' technique and the poem represented 'a calculated piece of mosaic... designed to produce a certain series of poetic effects' [10, 172]. The poem demonstrated the universality of Eliot's thinking and it produced a feeling of shock, a sense that 'the poetic tradition was being upturned' [5, 181].

Since its publication in 1922, *The Waste Land* has inspired a large amount of commentary at different levels: allusions used in the poem, the connection with tradition, the historical context. Among those critical responses regarded the cultural, intellectual, emotional disposition of the poem, there were the other major critical issues as well: that of the existence or non-existence of a single speaker; of the nature or purpose of the evident fusion of voices. The poem's 'many-voicedness' resulted in the use of a wide variety of terms to describe its effect: heteroglossia, polyphony, collage of voices, quotations, bricolage, melange aduiter de tout, etc. All these terms are the names for one aspect of the poem - its fragments of captured speech.

So, we come to Tony Pinkney's viewpoint: "Though heteroglossia - different voices, styles, genres - so productively enters the poem, we must also recall that crucial endnote where Eliot claims that Tiresias is 'the most important personage, uniting all the rest'". In the light of this quotation my essay sets out to discuss the relationship between heteroglossia and authorial voice in *The Waste Land*.

The Waste Land has often provoked critics to ask the obvious but important question: "Is it Eliot who speaks the work (or speaks in it)?" Bradbury considers Eliot as 'a masked poet, ... a poet of mocking disguises, a dramatic poet, a poet not of one but many voices' [5, 183]. The poem is not narrative as traditionally conceived, but it achieves its movement much as a film does by cutting images into one another, to suggest development in the mind of the reader. Undoubtedly, the many-voiced drama of *The Waste Land* leads the readers through a world of fragments, a world of chatter, chance, collisions, noise and syncopations, office blocks, gramophones, pubs, and streets. Eliot's aim is to integrate these fragments, and to assemble them in a variety of separate scenes, modifying and amending transformations, so that the

poem 'does the police in different voices'. The author is always growing into new selves with new ideas, catalyzed by the changing experience, and the distorted penetrations of his personality by the echoes of human thoughts, though not the entry of the "real voice": he apprehends no final truth, enters no relationship.

It can be argued in detail, in the closest listening to the text, that there is a single presiding consciousness in the poem, that of a poet who is "dramatizing" the history of his own religious awakening, then the metaphysics of the poem, its relation to the past and to contemporaneity, to the silence, to the possibility of salvation, indeed its very nature as a poetic performance and structure, could perhaps be determined with more exactness than has been demonstrated before.

In any text, the author is a key figure who organizes certain events within a text, as well as installs their transformations, distortions, and their various modifications. The author constitutes a principle of unity in writing where any unevenness of production is ascribed to changes caused by evolution, maturation or outside influence.

Calvin Bedient insists that "all the voices in the poem [*The Waste Land*] are performances of a single protagonist - not Tiresias but a nameless stand-in for Eliot himself - performances, indeed, of a distinctly theatrical kind" (2, ix). Bedient traces the origins of such performing in the primitive cultures, dating back to pre-Oedipal mimesis and uncertainty, Oedipal phobias, and historical hyperconsciousness.

The protagonist performs the illusion of "being someone", he attempts to put a mask on his real identity. As the protagonist acquires the power of the speaker, he changes his "voices" so rapidly that the reader's objective is to construct constantly the pieces of broken images, variety of the utterances.

Eliot's protagonist is the "hero with a thousand faces" who is fully aware of his Almighty disposition. However, he disguises his identity, fearing to reveal the true face that could be interpreted as the expansion of Eliot - the author on to the poem.

In *The Waste Land* Eliot's protagonist creates his own myth of the devastated land. It dis-

tances the readers from the putatively actual, secular, mythic city of Eliot's poem, with its London Bridge, Saint Marry Woolnoth's, honking horns, gramophones, cigarette ends, 'Shakesperian Rag', etc.

In the poem the "confusion as to who is speaking is greater than the difficulty of understanding what is being said" [2, 10]. Gradually, identities begin to emerge, the more readily under the hypothesis of a protagonist who "does" other voices as well as speaks in his own voice. Still, the sheer number of voices and hence of styles, discourses, verbal ideologies, and even languages, is overwhelming in such a short space as the 434 lines of the poem.

Barbara Everett points out that *The Waste Land* has "neither 'story' nor 'narrator' nor 'protagonist' nor 'myth' nor 'themes' nor 'music' nor 'locale': these are exact and technical terms which the poem includes only to fragment and deny" [9, 14]. John Cohen emphasizes the fact that *The Waste Land* is 'free both of story-telling and of any temporal sequence of events' [6, 140]. The elements of the poem consist of a number of states of mind, presented by characters, events, quotations, allusions, and references to legends. Bernard Bergonzi emphasizes that *The Waste Land* 'is a dramatic poem: the voices may weave in and out in an elusive way, but they have names and recognizable intonations and even, sometimes personal identities' [3, 118].

Eliot in his essay 'The Three Voices of Poetry', among the three voices of the poet heard within the text, distinguishes a voice of the poet who 'attempts to create a dramatic character speaking in verse; when he is saying, not what he would say in his own person, but only what he can say within the limits of one imaginary character' [7, 89]. Thus, Eliot establishes at least two roles in the poem, as the author, who is pursuit of the authentic speech, and the speaker's role, who articulates imaginary consciousness or 'amalgamates disparate experiences'.

Heteroglossia, as a fundamental concept of this essay, reveals the full play of meanings potentially available in language. Every poetic work is an encyclopedia of all strata and forms of literary language, depending on the subject being represented. In poetic genres, artistic con-

sciousness - understood as a unity of all the author's semantic and expressive intentions - fully realizes itself within its own language. Bakhtin is very emphatic about this:

The language of the poet is his language, he is utterly immersed in it, inseparable from it, he makes use of each form, each word, each expression according to its unmediated power to assign meaning (as it were, 'without quotation marks'), that is, a pure and direct expression of his own intention. No matter what agonies of the word the poet endured in the process of creation, in the finished work language is an obedient organ, fully adequate to the author's intention [1, 285-86].

The text orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with 'whose help heteroglossia can enter the text; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships' [1, 263].

The language in a poetic work embodies the thought through the feelings, images, and symbols. In this aspect everything that the poet 'sees, understands and thinks, he does through the eyes of a given language, in its inner forms' [1, 286].

Eliot suggested that 'the poet's mind is a receptacle for seizing and storing up numberless feelings, phrases, images' [7, 8].

The work of the poetry is always illumined by one unitary and indisputable discourse. The poet is not able to oppose to his own poetic consciousness, his own intentions to the language that he uses, for 'he is completely within it and therefore cannot turn it into an object to be perceived, reflected upon or related to...' [1, 286]. Language has a constant tendency towards variation and change, so Bakhtin coins the word 'heteroglossia' to allude to the multiplicity of actual languages, and 'heteroglossia can be introduced into purely poetic genres, primarily in the speeches of characters' [1, 287]. Elements of heteroglossia enter here not in the capacity of another language carrying its own particular points of view, about which one can say things

not expressible in one's own language, but rather in the capacity of a depicted thing. Even when speaking of alien things, the poet speaks in his own language. Heteroglossia is another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way. Thus, the poetic word has a double, even multiple meaning, though one voice, a single-accent system, is fully sufficient to express poetic ambiguity.

At any given moment, languages of various epochs and periods of civilization interact with one another. Language represents a complete fusion of voices. That is why, at any given moment of its historical existence, language is 'heteroglot': it represents the co-existence of contradictions between the present and the past, and between tendencies, schools, circles, etc.

"Common language" - usually the average norm of spoken and written language - is taken by the author precisely as the common view. The author distances himself from this common language, he steps back and objectifies it, forcing his own intentions to refract and diffuse through the medium. This medium must be embodied in language.

Consequently, in *The Waste Land* in the first lines there is an evident authorial voice that informs readers that he and his companion:

... stopped in the colonnade,
And went on in sunlight, into the Hofgarten
And drunk coffee, and talked for an hour.
[9-11]

The relationship of the author to a language in the text is not static - it can be found in a state of movement and oscillation, or the author can completely merge his own voice with the textual voices. It creates an impression of a chorus of speakers on the form of the concealed speech of characters. The act of authorial unmasking, which is openly accomplished within the boundaries of a single simple sentence, merges with the unmasking of the character's speech.

In other words, heteroglossia is a collection of voices repeating and varying and mimicking one another and literature generally.

In *The Waste Land* the protagonist can be identified as a chameleon and bricoleur of styles, who constructs the unbroken view from a diverse range of available things. He is almost

never free of echoes of others, and we know him best by his "purified" directness, as when he says, "I sat upon the shore / Fishing..." [8, 423-4]. Eliot gathered different voices like specimens of a world that, because of its own unreality rather than for any active evil, is about to vanish.

The Waste Land begins with the vernal word "April" and at once subjects it to an almost hysterical destruction. It is the "cruellest month", breaking up the comfortable oblivion of winter, the month which produces in men a momentary flowering of intuitive life in a soil that has no nourishing qualities. 'Memory' of a past which is no longer there mingles with the pressures of an ambiguous 'desire', which may be either an impulse dedicated to its immediate satisfaction or a wish for something difficult to define and, apparently, difficult to attain. Then, as the voice of the poet becomes the voice of the poem, we clearly identify it as the voice of "the waste land". Hindsight shows us that this speaker is already the exceptional representative of this waste land; he is profoundly apart, quick with potential, full of the spiritual promise of agony. The protagonist evidently decides to make the most of a collective disillusionment, enjoying its melancholy and resignation. He is aware of the really poignant mixture of nostalgia and boredom; he experiences the tussle between inertia and the great annual stirring of nature:

April is the cruellest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory and desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain.
Winter kept us warm, covering
Earth in forgetful snow, feeding
A little life with dried tubers.

[1-7]

These opening lines echo the beginning of *The General Prologue of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*

Whan that April with his shoures soote
The droghte of March hath perced to the roote,
And bathed every veyne is swich licour
Of which vertu engendred is the flour.

[1-4]

Chaucer's beginning denotes a natural, spiritual force of nature, power that descends into the world to effect a kind of incarnation; *The Waste Land* reverses the positive, fertile sentiments of *Canterbury Tales* by portraying April as "cruel", setting the tone of the entire poem.

After the introductory paragraph the speaker gets into the mantle of the prophet Ezekiel to pronounce a final truth, a scene in which he will show us "fear in a handful of dust". Framed by quotations from Wagner, the passage begins with "the hyacinth girl" recalling a moment of love in the hyacinth garden. But what matters to the speaker is what he sees afterwards in the act of love, on the way back:

... I could not
 Speak, and my eyes failed, I was neither
 Living nor dead, and I knew nothing,
 Looking into the heart of light, the silence.
 [38-41]

The speaker has encountered something ultimate and transcendent. In the act of sexual intercourse he knew nothing and felt what Dante expressed in the *Inferno* when he saw the Devil:

.... I write it not
 Because all speech would fail to tell,
 I did not die, and did not remain alive...
 [XXXIV, 23-25]

The 'voices' of the poem begin to speak: they speak, appropriately, in disconnected, recalled fragments of conversation. None of "characters" in this poem - the poet informs us in his notes - exists as a separate and self-sufficient entity. All of them merge gradually into one another, until they eventually concentrate (in the third central section of the poem 'The Fire Sermon'), on the figure of Tiresias, the blind prophet, who is unable to use his experience to modify or change the endless series of repetitive events of which he is the forewarned spectator. In effect, Tiresias 'sees' what Eliot tells us is 'the substance of the poem' [I, 218n].

The Waste Land is nothing but words, nor are many of the words new - they make other voices, texts, sounds again, increasing the din of art. On the other hand, the words are arranged reticently; silence is invited to take up quarters in the gap between blocks of lines. The reading of *The Waste Land* will claim that the poem is not simply to be read as an endlessly open play of intertextuality but it is also, at the same time, mimetic, having a provisional and qualified centre in the "emotions" of a protagonist. The poem obviously contains distinct voices, usually set off as such by quotation (Marie, the "hyacinth" girl, Madame Sosostris, the cock-

neys in the pub, the three Thames-daughters). It is arguable that a represented speaker in *The Waste Land* has no name, he acquires at different points the roles of others and speaks in their voices: Ezekiel ("Son of man") and Iachimo in Imogen's bedroom, Phlebas the Phoenician and a Vedic seer. Each has adopted for temporary, local reasons, including the mask of Tiresias, put on while the speaker is a voyeuristic witness to the sexual encounter between a typist and a young man [II. 214-56].

The first person singular ("I" is used twenty-nine times, "me" - twice) is used throughout *The Waste Land* to identify a single voice and a single subject. Throughout the poem this voice might have been subdued by the 'Shakespearean Rag', the drunken voices in the pub, the noise of rattling bones, "the sound of horns and motors", the gramophone, the shoutings and the cryings, the sound of spring thunder over distant mountains...

The speaker of *The Waste Land* mingles "memory and desire", recalled perception and fantasy. Though hardly linear in the strict sense, there is a narrative development in the poem from the speaker's crucial moment of vision on the way back from the hyacinth garden to the image of the typist and 'the young man carbuncular man' and then on to the end. *The Waste Land* offers itself as one man's consciousness: "I will show you fear", "I had not thought...", "I saw one I knew ...", "I remember...", "I Tiresias...", "I look ahead up the white road...", "I sat upon the shore...." [II. 30, 63, 69, 115, 218, 228, 361, 423].

In *The Waste Land* rapid juxtapositions between the contemporary and the ancient, between modern London and London of Elizabeth and Leicester, contrive to suggest some unchanging condition of human nature. With this condition the represented speaker is wholly solitary.

In "A Game of Chess" the speaker's inner speech continues but he thinks only silently to himself ("we are in rat's alley") in reply to "Speak to me.... Speak" (line 112).

The social world is meaningless, inexplicable. The city is "Unreal" [II. 60, 207], the office-workers crossing London Bridge to the City from London Bridge Station on the south bank are like zombies, the walking dead:

I had not thought death had undone so many...
 [63]

The protagonist has been remarkably indifferent to a linear presentation of his "story", to narrativity as an emplotment of time. Bedient argues that "the poem is emerging as a monologue" so *The Waste Land* is then "montage trope, in Eisenstein's term: dispensing with detailed, explanatory, stepwise development of action and feeling; presenting, instead, isolated individual stages of them, the total sum of which is the equivalent of a narrative, a concept" [2, 50].

Certainly, the original working title, *He Do the Police in Different Voices*, implies the presence of a single speaker in the poem who is gifted at "taking off" the voices of others - just as the foundling named Sloppy in Dickens's *Our Mutual Friend* is, according to Betty Higden, "a beautiful reader of a newspaper. He do the police in different voices" (Chapter XVI, 244).

The protagonist loiters along the streets of the polluted city and among unsavory memories of polluted love: and the contaminated river bears

... empty bottles, sandwich papers,
Silk handkerchiefs, cardboard boxes, cigarette
ends
Or other testimony of summer nights.

[177-179]

The speaker's cultural straying along the banks of the historical Thames parallels both psychological and cultural wanderings. In his essay *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948) Eliot writes about a total decline of present culture, as "cultural disintegration is a matter of concern in the modern society as all tend to become isolated areas cultivated by groups in no communication with each other" (26). In this aspect, *The Waste Land* is "an epic of collective consciousness ... unfolded in an All-knowing mind, total rather than omniscient" [2, 129].

Tiresias represents "nondirect speaking" - not *in* language but *through* language, through the linguistic medium of another - and consequently through a refraction of authorial intentions. In Eliot's endnote Tiresias is described as "a mere spectator and not indeed a 'character'" he is "the most important personage in the poem, uniting all the rest....What Tiresias sees, in fact, is the substance of the poem". Eliot infuses his use of language itself with quite remarkably nuanced "male" and "female" overtones: this means that the text's portrayal of

male and female forces in juxtaposition, and the narrator's attempts to restore Tiresias's suppressed female dimension, cannot properly work through to the level of language, remaining instead a matter merely of imagery and of thematics. Stan Smith argues that the poem has no "unifying principle" and no represented speaker at all, Tiresias is the only, unsuccessful, candidate: "Who was Tiresias? A man who had also been a woman, who lived for ever and could foretell the future. That is to say, not a single consciousness, but a mythological catch-all, and as a unifying factor of no effect whatever" [11, 132].

The mask of Tiresias fits the speaker when he feels himself to be spiritually blinded by his vision after the hyacinth garden and because it provides a rationalised impersonality through which he can re-work and re-live his own experience by observing it projected onto the intercourse between the typist and the clerk. At the moment of sexual climax they are displaced as the speaker interposes himself to say he has "foresuffered all", not so much as Tiresias at Thebes but after the hyacinth garden when like Dante at the end of the "Inferno" he 'walked among the lowest of the dead' [11. 243-247].

Tiresias's reach towards a mythological past, like his reach towards an apocalyptic present/future, is defined by voices heard around him. It does not matter that they are distant in time: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Shakespeare's plays, and so forth. Observing a given reality, the protagonist then recalls a mythological context, most often in the form of either direct or indirect quotation. This leads to a reminiscence of different passages that forced their way into Eliot's memory. This triad of voices stimulates their fusion: voices, distanced from their authors, meditated by layers of language poetic and ordinary. The speaker does not attempt to confine these voices in order to take them over. At this stage Eliot cannot be accused of plagiarism, rather his style is reminiscent of pastiche, a kind of writing that mixes modes in order to create a new image. With Pound's assistance, Eliot has crafted the text of *The Waste Land* in an exquisite way, posing clues to the reader in search of the relationship between authorial voice and heteroglossia.

The poem presents a bewildering sequence of voices, some only realized very briefly. The

reader has difficulty in trying to distinguish all these disparate voices. But behind this obvious level of puzzlement lies another tension which seems to lead the reader closer to the text's subtler and more profound concerns with language. Language becomes an object of manipulation and articulation in the narrative. All speech acts in *The Waste Land*-whether lament, persuasion, prophesy, indictment, seduction, conversion hailing, insult, reproach complaint, or confession-involve a third party, who should communicate them. In 'What the Thunder Said' this third party is named explicitly:

Who is the third who walks always beside you?
When I count, there are only you and I together
But when I look ahead up the white road
There is always another one walking beside you
Gliding wrapt in a brown mantle, hooded
I do not know whether a man or a woman...

(359-365)

What Eliot, as the author, sees in the wilderness of the city, the narrator describes in his choice of words, he echoes those writers of the glorious past, ranging from Ovid to Jules Laforgue and Paul Valérie. So, when the narrator decides to escape from the urban despair, there is no need to go far as lost hope, depression are spread all over:

Murmur of maternal lamentation
Who are those hooded hordes swarming
Over endless plains, stumbling in cracked earth
Ringed by the flat horizon only
What is the city over the mountains
Cracks and reforms and burst in the violet air
Falling towers
Jerusalem Athens Alexandria
Vienna London
Unreal

(366-376)

Eliot himself compares this with Herman Hesse's *Blick ins Chaos*, to a passage where Hesse describes how "half of the Europe... is driving itself into chaos, moving drunkenly in a holy delusion on the verge of disaster...".

The author does not only manifest himself and his point of view in his effect on the narrator's speech and language. Behind the narrator's story we read a second story, the author's story: he is the one who tells us how the narrator tells stories, and also informs the reader about the narrator himself.

We acutely sense two levels at each moment in the story; one, the level of the narrator, a belief system filled with his objects, meanings

and emotional expressions, and the other, the level of the author, who speaks by means of this story and through this story. The narrator himself, with his own discourse, enters into this authorial belief system along with what is actually being told. The narrator's story or the story of the posited author is structured against the background of normal literary language, the expected literary horizon.

Every moment of the story has a conscious relationship with this normal language and its belief system, is in fact set against them, and set against them dialogically: one point of view opposed to another, one evaluation opposed to another, one accent opposed to another [1, 314]. This interaction, this dialogic tension between two languages and two belief systems, permits authorial intentions to be realized in such a way that we can acutely sense their presence at every point in the work.

The author is not to be found in the language of the narrator, not in the formal literary language to which the story opposes itself - but rather, the author utilises now one language, in order to avoid giving himself up wholly to either of them; he makes use of this verbal give-and-take, this dialogue of languages at every point in his work, in order that he himself may remain as it were neutral with regard to language. All forms involving a narrator or a posited author signify to one degree or another by their presence the author's freedom from a unitary and singular language, a freedom connected with the relativity of literary and language systems. Such a refracting of authorial intentions take place in forms of the narrator's tale, the tale of a posited author or that of one of the characters; it is therefore possible to have in them 'a variety of different distances between distinct aspects of the narrator's language and the author's language: the refraction may be at times greater, at times lesser, and in some aspects of language there may be an almost complete fusion of voices' [1, 314-15].

The narrator cannot grasp the different fragments of life, behind him the author stands. It illuminates the narrator's/author's position in the text vis-a-vis language: throughout the poem there are at least two competing strategies to articulate him as a narrative experience: first, Eliot's attempts to appropriate the narrator by means of high-flown rhetoric borrowed from Ovid, Virgil, Spenser, Shakespeare, Dante

and other classical authors; second, the narrator's approach, based on "common" language from which Eliot has so fatefully distanced himself that it became, for him, relegated to the domain of silence. Thus, heteroglossia orchestrates the author's linguistic consciousness and enters the poem primarily in the quotations, monologues, and extracts from different texts.

In this case, the narrator is most consciously present through the authorial voice. Eliot's increasing isolation, in and through language, dominates all the later moments of the text. The important point comes when the author to be isolated from, and even actively to withdraw from language forcing the narrator to intervene more openly on his behalf and in his place. The poem is pushed to the extremity where everyday language begins to dissolve into mythological utterances.

As the poem advances and a new glimpse illuminates a few new passages, tunnels within the all-encompassing labyrinth of the text and language, the author cannot find his path.

The Waste Land oscillates between narrative past and present/future, between a "reality" which the author/narrator shares with "characters" surrounded him, some of those "characters" may be a mental projections: Marie, the hyacinth girl, the typist, the women in the pub. Quite often the narrator and the observer may appear to occupy the same space; but from the outset it is clear that there are two separate functions involved.

In "A Game of Chess" the speaker fantasises while watching the woman brush her hair; he pictures her as Cleopatra, Imogen, and Dido, and so enters the roles of Antony, Iachimo, and Aeneas. But as the sexual drift becomes obvious in the idea of Philomela, who 'was so rudely forced', it breaks down into thoughts of rape, death, obscenity, and vulgarity. In Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Philomela's tongue was cut out with Tereus's cruel sword. The remaining stump quivered in her throat; Tereus 'in his guilty passion often took his pleasure with the body he had so mutilated' (p. 149). In *The Waste Land* Philomela wants to tell to the speaker about her humiliation, but he can hear nothing but the 'quivering of her tongue':

.... yet there the nightingale
Filled all the desert with inviolable voice
And still she cried, and still the world pursues,
"Jug Jug" to dirty ears.

(100-103)

To sum up the arguments, it worth mentioning that *The Waste Land* demonstrated the search for a new way of structuring poetic experience. The poem's aim was to convey, beyond one man's personal intuition, nothing less than the state of a civilization. To achieve this Eliot had to work through "a heap of broken images". He accepted this need because it was, in reality, a world of fragments he was setting out to explore, because he had nothing else on which he could honestly build. The fragmentary voices, heard within the poem, represent heteroglossia which alludes to the multiplicity of actual languages. *The Waste Land* evidently demonstrated the fusion of different voice, styles, genres, where 'voices' smoothly take up each other. The various "characters" or "voices", who succeed one another in the course of the poem and tend to merge into the shadowy central figure of the blind prophet Tiresias, are as "broken" as shifting as the images which convey such identity. The quotations are fragments of a great and constantly enriched tradition which, even in the broken form as they are offered to a contemporary poet, may yet serve to give meaning to what otherwise presents itself as a broken, fragmentary chaos. The poem is built on two great themes, represented by the "broken" pieces which constitute human experience as it is offered to us in *the present and the significant tradition of the past*, itself seen in 'broken' form from a standpoint which can only be that of the present.

As the modernist poem, *The Waste Land* consists of a collage of perspectives, voices, snatches of German poetry, Hindu and Christian scripture, allusions to Homer, Ovid, Dante, Milton, Marvell, Shakespeare, Wagner, Verlaine, juxtaposed with visions and sounds from 1920s Europe. Only at the end the reader is revealed the truth:

These fragments I have shored against my ruins
(430)

The poem is not narrative as traditionally conceived, but it projects its development and movement in the mind of the reader. Eliot actually made dramatic monologues of his paraphrases from the utterances of ancient poets by intruding into them a modern consciousness. He set up the speaker in an unusually relation to the implied listener, so that, the speaker could comment on some events within the poem. Eliot

used Tiresias as a speaker in the poem with a contemporary setting and in contemporary idiom.

The Waste Land was a poem for its times, the immediately postwar years. It created a dark

and agonized vision of spiritual loss which belonged not to a single individual but to contemporary culture, the modern city, and the postwar world.

1. *Bakhtin M.M.* 'Discourse in the Novel' in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* / Ed. by Michael Holquist; Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist-Austin. Chicago: the University of Texas Press, 1992. - P. 259-422

2. *Bedient C.* *He Do the Police in Different Voices: The Waste Land and Its Protagonist.* - Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

3. *Bergonzi B.* *The Myth of Modernism and Twentieth Century Literature.* - Brighton: Harvester, 1986.

4. *Bergson H.* *Creative Evolution* / Transl. by Arthur Mitchell. - London: Macmillan, 1960.

5. *Bradbury M.* *The Modern World: Ten Great Writers.* - London: Seeker & Warburg, 1988.

6. *Cohen J.* *Poetry of This Age, 1908-1959.* - London: Hutchinson, 1960.

7. *Eliot T.S.* *Selected Essays.* - New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1938.

8. *Eliot T.S.* *The Waste Land and Other Poems.* - London: Faber, 1980 (1st published - 1972). - P. 21-49 (all citations in the text refer to this edition).

9. *Everett B.* *Eliot in and out of The Waste Land* // *Critical Quarterly.* - 1975. - № 17. - P. 7-50.

10. *Partridge A.* *The Language of Modern Poetry: Yeats, Eliot, Auden.* - London: Andre Deutch, 1976.

11. *Smith S.* *The Origins of Modernism: Eliot, Pound, Yeats and the Rhetorics of Renewal.* - London: Harvester, 1994.

Лариса Педерсен

СПІВВІДНОШЕННЯ ГЕТЕРОГЛОСІЇ ТА АВТОРСЬКОГО ГОЛОСУ В ПОЕМІ Т.С.ЕЛІОТА "БЕЗПЛІДНА ЗЕМЛЯ"

Стаття є спробою розглянути взаємозв'язок між гетероглосією та авторським голосом у поемі Т.С.Еліота "Безплідна земля". Багатоголосся поеми вибудовується з поодиноких "уламків розщеплених образів", підслуханих у вічності. Текст поеми не вкладається в рамки традиційної наративної структури, оскільки є лише послідовною констатацією розрізнених мовних актів. Еліот майстерно інтегрує їх у зливу текстову єдність за допомогою "єднаючого голосу".