

“Mature Poets Steal”: Voice, Appropriation, and *The Waste Land*

Jason Wiens

Head of the Department, Teaching Professor, Department of English, Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts, University of Calgary

Abstract: The multiplicity of voices, which enter *The Waste Land*, and the conditions of modernity, which not only enabled, but demanded such heteroglossia, in modernist politics, have been widely noted and discussed, and has the influence of *The Waste Land* on subsequent polyphonic long forms in Anglophone poetry through the following century. Newly established recording and playback technologies led to a dissociation of voice from the human subject as point of origin; it also a labelled new politics of voice appropriation, which the wasteland inaugurated, and which today's realise in more extreme appropriations of conceptual politics. The appropriative nature of modernist poetics was recognised by contemporary such as William Carlos Williams, who decried “the traditional is of plagiarism,” as well as Eliot himself, who famously argued that “mature poets steal.” Attending to the archival evidence of the poem’s composition as well as Eliot’s own voicings of the poem in audio recordings, my paper will consider *The Waste Lands* appropriations in the light of what contemporary arguments concerning voice appropriation might say about Eliot’s deployment of “voices” in the poem from different gender, class, and racial positions than his own.

Keywords: Poetics, Heteroglossia, Gender, Class, Race

This paper has its origins in teaching; specifically, in an assignment I developed several years ago which I call an “e-locution project.” This project asks students to record themselves reading a poem, or sections of a poem, we are studying in class, and then write a paper discussing the interpretive decisions they made in their performance of the poem. We then listen to the various recordings in class when we turn to the poems, and the students who made the recordings share their findings and prompt discussion. In a class surveying 19th and 20th

century literatures in English, students who read from sections of *The Waste Land* inevitably commented in their papers on why they decided to “do the poem in different voices,” to modify the poem’s working title. More recently I deployed this e-locution assignment in a cross-listed senior undergraduate and graduate course on “Sounding Canadian Poetry,” and asked students to complete the assignment on the work of contemporary poets, all of whom were BIPOC writers including M. NourBese Philip and Jordan Abel, both are well-known for their work in appropriative or citational poetics. I explicitly asked in the assignment that students consider questions of voice appropriation in their performances, or rather “deformances,” following Jerome McGann and Lisa Samuels’ concept¹. Two graduate students, both of whom were white, refused to record themselves reading the poems by BIPOC writers over concerns around voice appropriation. As one student wrote in her paper, “this project requires the performance of a voice that does not align with my subject position, and in fact, is so radically disparate from my lived experience, that to embody that experience would be to inhabit a space that I am not meant to engage in” (Van Dyk 3). Their solution to this dilemma was to write poems themselves, employing the procedural process of the poets in question, and then record and discuss those poems. These different pedagogical experiences have led me to consider the question of voice appropriation in *The Waste Land* more specifically. While most contemporary readers of the poem, in an academic context or not, may not share the same anxieties over voice appropriation as the current generation of graduate students, the ethics of Eliot’s deployment of voices in the poem from subject positions not his own does seem to me to be a question worth considering.

The multiplicity of voices which enter *The Waste Land*, and the conditions of modernity which not only enabled but demanded such heteroglossia in modernist poetics, have been widely noted and discussed, as has the influence of *The Waste Land* on subsequent polyphonic long forms in anglophone poetry through the century which has passed since its publication.

Jed Rasula, for instance, argues *The Waste Land* marked the emergence of a new concept of poetic “voice”: rather than a single discernible, reliable “speaker” of a poem, “[t]here is, instead, a field of operations open (and exposed) to a spectrum of consciousness surpassing any putative individual perspective” (219). Rasula links the emergence of this poetics to the rapidly changing social conditions of modernity: “*The Waste Land* is a paradigmatic collage poem, published when collage in the visual arts was being recognized as reflecting a natural aptitude of the harried metropolitan citizen: perception in a state of distraction, Walter Benjamin called it” (220). Although Rasula insists Eliot “was not a conceptualist like Marcel Duchamp, much as he too wrangled ‘found’ objects” and that “*The Waste Land* is not, to poetry, what Duchamp’s urinal bearing the signature R. Mutt is to visual art. Eliot’s *findings* are integrated into an overall composition” (219-220), I contend that *The Waste Land*, along with Ezra Pound’s *Cantos*, inaugurated a poetics of citation and appropriation that today extends to the more extreme appropriations of conceptual poetics as represented by the work of U.S. poet Kenneth Goldsmith, for example². Marjorie Perloff notes that literary and art historians have placed Eliot and Duchamp “at opposite poles of the modernist aesthetic,” with Eliot as an “elitist poet who believed in the autonomy of the work of art” and Duchamp as “a Dadaist iconoclast whose object was to demolish the very notion of the ‘art work’ and break down the distinction between ‘art’ and ‘life’ (177). Perloff counters by suggesting Eliot and Duchamp share more similarities than might be supposed in terms of their understanding of the autonomy of art and the diminishment of the significance of an author’s biography to the meaning of the work, but I hope to demonstrate how Eliot’s citational poetics do, in fact, parallel Duchamp’s “readymades” and his use of *objet trouvé*. It is “appropriate,” for instance, that Perloff opens her 2010 study of citational poetics *Unoriginal Genius: Poetry By Other Means in the New Century* with a brief discussion of *The Waste Land*; more specifically, Edgell Rickword’s 1923 review of the poem for the *Times Literary Supplement*, in which he

“expressed admiration for Eliot’s ‘sophistication’ but could not condone *The Waste Land*’s extensive use of citation” (Perloff).

That the citation of different sources, styles, and voices would be among *The Waste Land*’s most significant legacies for 21st century poetics should not be surprising, given the poem’s working title *He Do the Police in Different Voices*, itself a citation from another literary source: an excerpt of dialogue spoken by the character Betty Higden in Charles Dickens’ *Our Mutual Friend*, and differentiated as a unique voice by the grammatical disagreement between subject and verb in the first two words which marks Betty’s lower class position. The appropriative nature of modernist poetics was recognized by Eliot himself, who famously argued that “mature poets steal” (125), as well as contemporaries such as William Carlos Williams, who decried “The Traditionalists of Plagiarism” with Eliot in mind in *Spring and All*, published the same year as *The Waste Land* (Williams 10). Indeed, Eliot reflected in 1956 that he had included the references in the later printing of the poem as an effort to forestall such accusations: “I had at first intended only to put down all the references for my quotations, with a view to spiking the guns of critics of my earlier poems who had accused me of plagiarism” (Eliot 533). This collision of a deployment of multiple voices of alterity with a poetics of appropriation raises a question: how might we read *The Waste Land*’s appropriations in light of contemporary arguments concerning voice appropriation, and what such arguments might say about Eliot’s deployment of “voices” in the poem from different gender, class, and racial positions than his own? This seems especially urgent given contemporary misgivings about Eliot’s gender and racial politics, as discussed at length, for example, in a recent forum in *Modernism/Modernity* organized by Megan Quigley on #metoo, Eliot, and Modernist scholarship, in which Quigley writes, “Eliot’s posthumously published racist verses...may be reason enough to topple his still-towering status.” Some contemporary positions may regard the voices of others, “So rudely forced” (100) into the poem by a white,

middle-class, male poet, as “inviolable” as the voice of Philomel’s nightingale filling the desert (101). But I am less concerned with condemning work written a century ago based on values and concerns of the present, than with inquiring into how this foundational document of modernism inaugurates an appropriative practice which Delmore Schwartz in 1954 described as the “method of the sibylline or subliminal listener,” a method which would appear “to be no method at all precisely because it is the method which permits all other methods to be used freely and without predetermination; and which allows no particular method to interfere with the quintessential receptivity which opens itself to any and all kinds of material and subject matter” (Schwartz 237).

Consider the wider context of Eliot’s famous observation from his essay on Philip Massinger:

One of the surest of tests is the way in which a poet borrows. Immature poets imitate; mature poets steal; bad poets deface what they take, and good poets make it into something better, or at least something different. The good poet welds his theft into a whole feeling which is unique, utterly different from that from which it was torn; the bad poet throws it into something which has no cohesion. (125)

Eliot here is considering the work of other writers from which both immature and mature, bad and good poets borrow, rather than the “voices” which are my focus here. But the intertextual matrix that he alludes to is capacious enough to contain all; what matters is Eliot’s emphasis on the responsible use of such appropriations. He acknowledges that such a recontextualization of voices can be done poorly or irresponsibly, and he recognizes the disjunctive power of these recontextualizations. Moreover, in a 1919 *Athenaeum* review of Edmond Rostand’s *Vol de la Marseillaise*, contemporary with the composition of *The Waste Land*, Eliot would make a case for polyphony: “if we are to express ourselves, our variety of

thoughts and feelings, on a variety of subjects with inevitable rightness, we must adapt our manner to the moment with infinite variations” (Eliot 665). Here, Eliot makes a case for a polyphony of styles in order to authentically express individual subjectivity; in *The Waste Land*, Eliot would employ “infinite variations” in order to authentically express collectivity. As Rasula puts it, “If a whole city could speak all at once, it would be omnianonymous—or so we learn by reading Joyce, and even more distinctly by reading *The Waste Land*” (Rasula 20).

In her recent book *Appropriate: A Provocation*, an intervention into contemporary debates about voice appropriation, Paisley Rekdal describes the method of *The Waste Land* as “appropriate[ing] the language of a variety of texts by collaging them into a new but unified work” (Rekdal 20), and suggests the poem is an example of literary “adaptation” rather than appropriation. Building upon the argument of critic Julie Sanders in her book *Adaptation and Appropriation*, Rekdal argues “[a]ppropriation may be part of adaptation, but while they are similar, the two are different from each other based upon the degree of difference from their original source” (21). Rekdal’s argument is not “worried about artistic influence or postmodern collage or adaptation so much as about what constitutes cultural appropriation” (22); in other words, the decision of some writers to write from imagined identity positions—especially racialized and/or gendered positions—not their own. In their introduction to the collection *The Racial Imaginary: Writers on Race in the Life of the Mind*, Claudia Rankine and Beth Loffreda argue that we must shift our thinking about cultural appropriation in terms of rights to thinking about it in terms of desire:

Are we saying that Asian writers can’t write Latino characters? That white writers can’t write black characters? That no one can write from a different racial other’s point of view? We’re saying we’d like to change the terms of that conversation, to think about creativity and the imagination without

employing the language of rights and the sometimes concealing terms of craft. To ask some first-principle questions instead. So not: can I write from another's point of view? But instead: to ask why and what for, not just if and how? What is the charisma of what I feel estranged from, and why might I wish to enter and inhabit it? To speak not in terms of prohibition and rights, but desire. (Rankine and Loffreda 17-18)

From this perspective, and perhaps paradoxically, Eliot's deployment of the voices of alterity in *The Waste Land*, voices Schwartz insisted in 1954 that "the poet has listened to and quoted and recorded" (235), constitutes less of an objectionable appropriation from a contemporary perspective than imagining such voices out of whole cloth.

When considering the question of voice appropriation in *The Waste Land*, I focus on the "voices" that are most clearly removed from Eliot's own subject position, namely, working-class voices, women's voices, and the Hindu references and chants in "What the Thunder Said." To me, these latter elements operate in the poem as signs of alterity, the fragments of Sanskrit shored against the ruins of Western civilization the poem otherwise documents. A. David Moody asserts that "a recognition of differences, Eliot would maintain, is the necessary basis for any genuine cross-cultural understanding" (Moody 19). Moody proceeds to absolve Eliot of any accusations of cultural appropriation in his poetic texts:

Such recognition is also one necessary safeguard against the Western tendency, so thoroughly exposed by Edward Said in his *Orientalism*, to appropriate Eastern cultures and make of them something all our own. In Eliot's poetry the Upanishads, and the *Geeta* especially, are not Westernised—their function in the poetry is precisely to represent a non-Western and wholly other tradition. Nor to my sense are they exoticised, attended to simply for their strangeness and curiosity-value. For they

introduce into Eliot's 'European' poetry a primitive wisdom which he found still valid, though superseded, for him, in the Christian revelation. He turned to it, in *The Waste Land* and *The Dry Salvages*, as a way of reapproaching and rediscovering the basis of a Christian vision for a secularised Western society. (19)

The Sanskrit words which close the poem are granted prominence in the text by virtue of concluding it. They also occur as the culmination of a kaleidoscopic vortex of different languages, as a frantic culmination of the poem's heteroglossia. Listening to Eliot read these lines, we can hear him modulate his voice, in one of the few times in his recordings, to emphasise the irreducible difference—what Leonard Diepeveen calls “the aggressively individual texture” (124)—of this language. In a different and intriguing reading, Henry Michael Gott suggests of the closing Sanskrit chants that “[t]he pleas made by the consciousness of Eliot's poem tend to be elucidative of a relationship not only between human and divine but also between the text and other texts. As quotations they address themselves not only to the divine object of their original context, but also to literary tradition—tying expressly the protagonist's crisis of faith to the artist's dearth of inspiration” (89). The rich, and in fact potentially infinite matrix from which the poet may draw his citations paradoxically suggests not a plenitude of reference but its diminishment. Eliot's citational poetics throughout the poem, then, extending Gott's reading, reflect the sterile and barren waste land of an inescapable intertextual condition, in which the citational form of the poem supports its thematic emphases on cultural decline and impoverishment.

Michael Levenson has observed that “the concept of voice remains notoriously elusive, largely because it bears the burden of so many interests” (Levenson 87) and suggests “we might better speak of ‘voicing’ rather than ‘voice’ in the poem, since the acts of speech pass too quickly to establish any stable personhood” (90). One of the challenges in discussing voice

in *The Waste Land* are the often indeterminate distinctions between the various voices. In a 1971 essay, Paul LaChance attempts to discern and describe all the voices in the poem, eventually acknowledging “it seems impossible (and probably not worthwhile) to nail down every voice” (112). More recently, a team of computer scientists and a literary scholar at the University of Toronto attempted to use computer-assisted quantitative analysis to distinguish stylistically all the voices in the poem, while acknowledging that although the stylistic contrasts between voices are often clear to many readers, “Eliot does not explicitly mark the transitions, nor is it clear when a voice has reappeared” (Brooke et al 41). The transition from the narrating voice which opens the poem and that of Marie at the beginning of “The Burial of the Dead,” for instance, demonstrates how the voices in the poem as often bleed into each other as not. The evident transition from narrating voice to Marie occurs at line 8: “Summer surprised us, coming over the Starnbergersee / With a shower of rain.” The transition here is marked by an extension of the line which continues for the rest of the stanza—a visual cue that would likely be missed in a hearing rather than a reading of the poem—as well as the reference to “Starnbergersee,” which situates the voice in a particular place as opposed to the more general northern, temperate milieu of the poem’s opening lines. Yet the observation “Summer surprised us” directly echoes and contrasts with “Winter kept us warm” in the narrating voice, suggesting continuity as well as difference. And we don’t discover the gender of the second voice until the reported speech of the arch-duke calling the recollecting speaker Marie: a figure based, according to the newly available letters of Eliot to Emily Hale, on a real person, Marie von Moritz, whom Eliot “had befriended in the summer of 1911 in Munich” (Rogers) and whose recollections, Eliot told Hale, he reproduced “almost word for word” in the poem (Gordon 27). Eliot himself acknowledges the at times lack of clear distinctions between voices in the poem in one of its notes: “Just as the one-eyed merchant, seller of currants, melts into the Phoenician Sailor, and the latter is not wholly distinct from Ferdinand

Prince of Naples, so all the women are one woman, and the two sexes meet in Tiresias” (Eliot 70).

As is often the case, Eliot’s note is misleading if not simply mistaken. Levenson argues:

The speech of women constitutes an original voice in *The Waste Land*. And the primal failures of sexuality, its inhibitions as well as its violence, are the recurrent topic of these micro-scenarios. Women who have been stymied and degraded (“It’s them pills I took, to bring it off”), or trapped in empty erotic tedium (“that’s done”), or lost within marriage (“My nerves are bad tonight”) speak within the pattern Eliot articulates in the *Hamlet* essay; that is, as if their words were “automatically released” by the brief narrative sequences that contain them. The references to past texts and episodes prepare the scene for the moments of cry and call; tradition provides an orchestral surrounding for the searing solitary voices. (92-93)

Far from blending into a universal voice of Woman, the feminine voices in the poem are the most individuated—and their utterances are usually made in a context in which communication is frustrated, with no reply from an interlocutor. Yet despite this individuation, the citation of women’s voices goes entirely uncited, in contrast to the “Notes” provided by Eliot to the poem: all of which, with the exception of Jessie L. Weston’s *From Ritual to Romance*, cite male authors (including the Biblical references). The question of the ethics of voice appropriation, then, weighs heavily on how we might read *The Waste Land* from a feminist perspective. In both foregrounding and frustrating feminine voices in the poem, Eliot intuits the problems of speaking for others.

Eliot’s own voicings of *The Waste Land*, captured on various recordings in the 1930s, 40s, and 50s, suggest that he did not regard the cacophony of voices comprising his poem to be necessarily differentiated. In the 1946 Library of Congress recording, Eliot reads

the entire poem, with the exception of the “nerves” sequence and the pub conversation in “A Game of Chess,” in the consistent tone of his “austere public readings” (Gordon 103)—what Jason Camlot calls Eliot’s “robotic liturgical voice”—a voicing we might hear as an oral embodiment of “dear Mrs Equitone” (57) from “The Burial of the Dead.” Recent scholarship, however, suggests that the 1946 recording actually consists of selections from a number of different takes Eliot made of himself reading the poem in 1933 under the auspices of the “Speech Lab” at Columbia University. Richard Swigg has noted the differences between many of the 1933 recordings and the 1946 recording, in which Eliot reads in the earlier recordings with more “passion and urgency” (Swigg 39), similar to Virginia Woolf’s recollection of hearing Eliot read the poem in a private setting, six months before its publication: “He sang it & chanted it[,] rhythmed it. It has great beauty & force of phrase: symmetry; & tensivity” (Woolf 178). Jason Camlot suggests that the 1946 recording, parts of which sound identical to some of the 1933 takes, “is most likely an edited fusion of the ‘best’ takes...recorded in 1933” (Camelot 144). Rather than a spontaneous reading, then, the 1946 version was constructed quite deliberately by Eliot as a composition of his own “voicings” of the poem—a method of construction analogous to his composition of the poem itself from many voices. Camelot further suggests that “[i]n experimenting in his performance of *The Waste Land*, Eliot worked to figure out how to speak in a voice that did not emanate from a person but from something that captured the nature and import of the medium with which he was engaged. (Camelot 154) and that:

[a]lthough there are obviously different voices to be done in *The Waste Land*, much of the experimentation in the various takes of the 1933 recordings has less to do with sounding the individuated voices of characters in the poem—less to do with *doing* voices—than with sounding the correct tempo, pitch, and incantatory rhythm that would best allow the variety of voices already

written into the poem to cohere as a vocalised movement of poetic composition. (Camelot 158)

That is to say, Eliot's constructed recording works to efface the distinctions between and particularities of the poem's voices, emphasising their absorption into a coherent whole⁴.

Audio recordings, moreover, impacted the poem's composition as well as its reception, in helping establish the conditions for the poetics of appropriated voices. In the early 20th century, I would argue, newly-established recording and playback technologies led to a dissociation of voice from the human subject as point of origin, in a manner analogous to Walter Benjamin's observations concerning the impact of mechanical reproduction on the "aura" of a work of art. Benjamin, of course, viewed this development with optimism, as undermining the authority of tradition which he sees as aligned with fascism, and instead supporting a collective politics: "To pry an object from its shell, to destroy its aura, is the mark of a perception whose 'sense of the universal equality of things' has increased to such a degree that it extracts it even from a unique object by means of reproduction" (223). Reproductive audio technologies forever undermine and destabilise notions of ownership and authenticity of voice, enabling a citational poetics which *The Waste Land* helps establish. At the same time, the poem recognizes such impacts of technology on ideas of human individuality. Consider the scene between the typist and clerk in "The Fire Sermon," for instance, a scene which renders their sexual encounter in terms suggestive of both sexual assault and triviality. After the departure of the "young man carbuncular" (231),

the typist turns and looks a moment in the glass,
Hardly aware of her departed lover;
Her brain allows one half-formed thought to pass;
'Well now that's done: and I'm glad it's over.'
When a lovely woman stoops to folly and

Paces about her room again, alone,
She smooths her hair with automatic hand,
And puts a record on the gramophone. (249-256)

“Her brain” is dissociated from the typist herself, allowing or disallowing thoughts to pass. The “automatic hand” with which she smooths her hair becomes associated by proximity with the automation of the gramophone in the following line. In her solitude, recorded and technologically-mediated voices replace those of another human, such as the departed lover.

While at times Eliot uses “substandard English” grammatical constructions and phonetic spelling to distinguish voices in the poem, notably in the pub conversation which concludes “A Game of Chess,” the manuscript notes suggest he was conflicted on this question. The facsimile and transcript of the poem, which includes Eliot’s, Vivien’s, and Pound’s annotations and notes, shows that Vivien had suggested changing the “g” to “k” in “something” in the line “‘Something of that,’ I said” (Eliot 13). In response to this suggestion, Eliot wrote, “I want to avoid trying to show pronunciation by spelling” (13). Yet the edits to the concluding lines show that line 170 was initially written “Good night, Bill. Good night, Lou. Good night, George. Good night,” but the concluding “d” in each “Good” were stricken—at Vivien’s suggestion, according to Lyndall Gordon (93)—in order to render the inebriated woman’s slurred speech as she left the pub. This is also a line which Eliot reads more dramatically in the 1946 recording to emphasize the woman’s slurring. Matthew Hollis cites Osbert Sitwell as suggesting Eliot drew these lines from speech overheard out his Marylebone window:

The apartment overlooked the boisterous Laurie Arms (now Larrik) public house in what Vivien described as ‘a little noisy corner, with slums and low streets and poor shops close around.’ The noise would bother the Eliots. When Osbert Sitwell visited the flat, he reported that the neighbours below

were two ‘actresses’ who spent the evenings singing around the piano or playing the gramophone loudly or hollering down into the small hours to ‘gentlemen friends’ in the street below. Eliot when he complained was given a patient explanation by the landlord: ‘Well, you see, Sir, it’s the Artistic Temperament.’ Osbert Sitwell would later say that in the calls of the ‘actresses’ and the response from the street he could hear the voices of *The Waste Land*. (Hollis 27)

Sitwell’s report supports Delmore Schwartz’s idea that Eliot is not so much inventing many of the voices in *The Waste Land* as citing voices he hears, or indeed overhears. According to a note on this passage in the 1971 facsimile edition of the poem edited by Valerie Eliot, “Eliot said this passage was ‘pure Ellen Kellond,’ a maid employed by the Eliot’s, who recounted it to them” (127).

Perhaps voice appropriation is more acceptable in a text with many voices: it renders all voices constructions, fictions, rather than an articulation of essential identities. Eliot does not appropriate to himself the authority of any one voice because the poem doesn’t establish any one voice as authoritative, *pace* LaChance’s assertion that “[i]f the many disparate voices suggest the universality of *The Waste Land* condition, the first voice which opened the poem and maintains throughout the poem its central mood or dominant tone suggests the poem’s only hope” (LaChance 111). The question of voice appropriation may ultimately turn on another question that has been debated far longer: is *The Waste Land* best understood as an apogee of high Modernism or as proto-postmodern? If, as Michael Coyle persuasively argues, Eliot in *The Waste Land* is writing pastiche, then is voice appropriation even possible in the “speech in a dead language” of pastiche, in Fredric Jameson’s phrase? (Jameson 17). Consider the occasions in the poem in which the voices Eliot deploys are themselves reported speech, such as the pub monologue, or the layerings of the echo of Ziegfeld’s follies’ “That

Shakesperian Rag," a song "without the slightest traces of ragtime" (Coyle 122). As Coyle puts it, "[f]unctioning as neither parody nor allusion, pastiche in *The Waste Land* summons historical difference and hermeneutic ambiguity without offering grounding for either" (123). Ultimately, I don't think we can accuse *The Waste Land* of committing the ethical breach of voice appropriation for the simple fact that it is difficult to attribute any voice in the poem to Eliot himself; as Diepeveen notes, "the central voice of *The Waste Land* is not so much replaced as it is muffled. This finding and losing is the voice of *The Waste Land*" (Diepeveen 126). When I was considering submitting a proposal to present at the conference at which this paper was first presented, I wasn't sure I would be able to say anything new about *The Waste Land*, one of the most exhaustively discussed texts not just of the 20th century but of all periods. My despair at saying anything new about *The Waste Land* was perhaps a belated echo of Eliot's despair in 1922 of saying anything new at all.

Endnotes

1. Lisa Samuels and Jerome J. McGann, "Deformance and Interpretation." *New Literary History* Vol. 30, No. 1, 1999, pp. 25-56.
2. Goldsmith himself does not acknowledge Eliot as a precursor in his essay "Why Appropriation?", though he does cite as influences "the constructive methodology of Ezra Pound's *Cantos* and the scrivenerlike process of Walter Benjamin's *The Arcades Project*" (Goldsmith 112)
3. Rasula estimates "a plausible count of sixty-six" voices in the poem (219).
4. The reading voice and recordings of such readings were not insignificant to Eliot. In his essay "The Frontiers of Criticism" (1956), he writes of *Finnegans Wake* that "large stretches of it are...merely beautiful nonsense (very beautiful indeed when recited by an Irish voice as lovely as that of the author—would that he had recorded more of it!)" (533-34)

Works Cited and Consulted

- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*, Shocken Books, 1968, pp. 217-251.
- Brooke, Julian, et al. "Clustering voices in *The Waste Land*." *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Literature*, George, 2013, pp. 41-45.
- Camlot, Jason. *Phonopoeics: The Making of Early Literary Recordings*. Stanford UP, 2019.
- Coyle, Michael. "Doing Tradition in Different Voices: Pastiche in *The Waste Land*." *The Cambridge Companion to The Waste Land*, edited by Gabrielle McIntire, Cambridge UP, 2015, pp. 116-129.
- Diepeveen, Leonard. *Changing Voices: The Modern Quoting Poem*. U of Michigan P, 1993.
- Eliot, T.S. "Whether Rostand Had Something About Him." *Rev. of Vol de la Marseillaise by Edmond Rostand*, Athenaeum 4656, 1919, pp. 665-666.
- . *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. Methuen & Co, 1920.
- . "The Frontiers of Criticism." *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 64, no. 4, 1956, pp. 525-543.
- . *The Waste Land: A Facsimile & Transcript of the Original Drafts*. Edited by Valerie Eliot, Faber & Faber, 1971.
- . *Selected Poems*. Faber and Faber, 1990.
- Goldsmith, Kenneth. *Uncreative Writing*. Columbia UP, 2011.
- Gordon, Lyndall. *The Hyacinth Girl: T.S. Eliot's Hidden Muse*. W.W. Norton, 2023.
- Gott, Henry Michael. *Ascetic Modernism in the Work of T.S. Eliot and Gustave Flaubert*. Pickering & Chatto, 2013.
- Hollis, Matthew. *The Waste Land: A Biography of a Poem*. W.W. Norton, 2022.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Duke UP, 1991.
- LaChance, Paul R. "The Function of Voice in *The Waste Land*." *Style*, vol. 5, no. 2, Spring 1971, pp. 101-118.
- Levenson, Michael. "Form, Voice, and the Avant-Garde." *The Cambridge Companion to The Waste Land*, edited by Gabrielle McIntire, Cambridge UP, 2015, pp. 87-101.
- Moody, A. David. *Tracing T.S. Eliot's Spirit: Essays on His Poetry and Thought*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Perloff, Marjorie. *Unoriginal Genius: Poetry By Other Means in the New Century*. U of Chicago P, 2010.

---. "Duchamp's Eliot: The Detours of Tradition and the Persistence of Individual Talent." *T.S. Eliot and the Concept of Tradition*, edited by Giovanni Cianci and Jason Harding, Cambridge UP, 2007, pp. 177-84.

Quigley, Megan. "Reading 'The Waste Land' [sic] with the #MeToo Generation." *Modernism/Modernity*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.26597/mod.0094>.

Rankine, Claudia, et al., editors. *The Racial Imaginary: Writers on Race in the Life of the Mind*. Versa, 2015.

Rasula, Jed. *What the Thunder Said: How The Waste Land Made Poetry Modern*. Princeton UP, 2022.

Rekdal, Paisley. *Appropriate: A Provocation*. W.W. Norton, 2021.

Schwartz, Delmore. "T.S. Eliot's Voice and His Voices." *Poetry*, vol. 85, no. 4, 1955, pp.232-242.

Swigg, Richard. *Quick, Said the Bird: Williams, Eliot, Moore and the Spoken Word*. U of Iowa P, 2012.

Van Dyk, Leah. "(De)Formation: Performance and Subjectivity in Canadian Found Text Poetics." Unpublished paper, 2019.

Williams, William Carlos. *Spring and All*. New Directions, 2011.

Woolf, Virginia. *The Diary of Virginia Woolf II, 1920-1924*. Edited by A.O. Bell and Harcourt Brace, 1920.