Tom and Vivien Eliot Do Narrative in Different Voices: Mixing Genres in *The Waste Land's* Pub

"He do the police in different voices," T.S. Eliot's original title for the poem that became *The Waste Land*, announces the poem's interest in voices and in the types of readerly performance made possible by narrative fiction. Borrowed from Dickens's *Our Mutual Friend* (1865), the phrase is taken from the mouth of "old Betty Higden, a poor widow," who describes the reading practices of Sloppy, a foundling who reads Betty the newspaper out loud: "You mightn't think it, but Sloppy is a beautiful reader of a newspaper. He do the Police in different voices" (198). Eliot's allusive gesture thus describes a specific type of reader—a working-class reader who surprises expectations and who plays with the possibilities of story-telling. Focusing on the aborted title's reference to Dickens allows us to glimpse *The Waste Land's* multiple links to the cluster of associations surrounding nineteenth-century novels and nineteenth-century popular reading practices; the allusion points to a realm bristling with story-telling, with the voices of women and of working-class figures, with popular culture, with narrative techniques, and with the desires and demands of a mass reading audience.

Historically, the poem's significant connections to the cultural province of the nineteenth-century novel and to narrative technique have been obscured by the ways in which the poem has been canonized as the emblematic modern lyric, sculpted by
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Eliot and Pound to reject and exclude just those elements suggested by the cancelled title. Critics like Lawrence Rainey and David Chinitz have importantly revised the tendency of critical history to cast *The Waste Land* as a neoclassical poem that must be read according to the dictates of "Tradition and the Individual Talent," as an "impersonal" poem un-tethered to popular culture and to Eliot's local and personal history.³ For example, Rainey argues that the poem is importantly connected to aesthetic models like the music hall and the popular genre of typist fiction. Building on the recent body of scholarship on a more "popular" version of Eliot, I argue that *The Waste Land* is crucially linked to the narrative modes, the female and working-class voices, and the readerly practices and desires associated by many modernist writers with nineteenth-century novelistic print culture. I read *The Waste Land*’s initial invocation of Dickens’s novel in conjunction with the poem’s later pub scene in "A Game of Chess," in which the speaker’s narrative performance echoes the many-voiced story-telling sensibilities of Sloppy, Dickens’s working-class figure who transforms newspapers into polyvocal narratives.

This essay contends that *The Waste Land*’s composition, content, pre-circulation, and development through drafts demonstrate Eliot’s pervasive engagement with mixing genres, genders, classes, and cultures in the production of his poem.⁴ By revisiting the drafted version of the poem and by focusing on the pub sequence in particular, I recover the mostly obscured collaboration of Vivien Eliot in the making of the poem: I show that Vivien played a crucial role as co-author of the "A Game of Chess" pub sequence and that her revisions helped to develop the poem’s interest in narrative performance and in the cluster of concerns often associated with the nineteenth-century novel. My reading of *The Waste Land* repositions Vivien at the center of the poem’s labor and interprets the pub sequence from "A Game of Chess"—the moment in the published poem that Vivien most heavily annotated and most effectively helped to shape—as a narrative performance crisscrossed by class, gender, and intensified readerly desires. Crucially, the pub sequence is the site of the poem’s most substantial experimentation with narrative form and the moment when Vivien’s voice as collaborator is most transformative. By focusing on the narrative moment in the pub and by recovering the role of Vivien’s voice in shaping the poem, I argue that narrative elements and female voices are central to the making and meaning of *The Waste Land*.

Placing narrative and female voices at the center of our analysis of the poem’s cultural investments allows us to reconsider Eliot’s inclusion of the pub scene as revelatory of his insistent sounding of the possibilities offered by narrative modes of expressing and of understanding modern experience. My reading of the aesthetic and cultural work that narrative techniques perform in *The Waste Land* broadens our understanding of modernist poetry’s response to modernity. Eliot’s inclusion of narrative in the largely lyric landscape of *The Waste Land* suggests his interest in having modernist poetry incorporate narrative technologies, readerly desires, and content, in order to compete with the novel as an appealing and relevant form in the modern aesthetic and commercial marketplace.⁵ In the drafts of *The Waste Land*, Eliot sounds the possibilities—both aesthetic and cultural—offered by narrative; in his titular allusion to Dickens and in the pub scene, Eliot draws upon the cultural associations
linking narrative forms and contents to a realm of nineteenth-century print culture and circulation involving women, the working-classes, and intense readerly desires. Importantly, The Waste Land’s incorporation of the key narrative moment in the pub changes the resonance of its lyric elements and complicates its final gestures toward closure. The voice of the speaker-narrator in the pub-sequence—marked by its sex and class and unique in the poem for its deployment of narrative techniques to build heightened readerly desires for story, character, and plot—refuses to be collapsed into an overarching lyric “I” which could potentially connect the lyric sections of the poem.

Ultimately, I argue that the pub-scene highlights the ways in which Eliot explores the connections between formal techniques and the cultural and material forces through which literary forms are produced, circulated, and understood. My re-reading of The Waste Land focuses on the strange narrative interlude in the pub to recast the production of The Waste Land as a process profoundly preoccupied with gender, with class, with female voices, with the cultural associations clustered around the production and circulation of different genres, and with the limits of lyricism and the promises of narrative.

**NARRATIVE ERUPTS INTO THE LYRIC**

Before proceeding to my reading of “A Game of Chess,” I would like to clarify what I mean by “lyric” and “narrative.” Heather Dubrow acknowledges the three major methodological challenges facing critics who wish to perform genre criticism: critics are stymied by “dubious definitions and the rankings they often encode or justify; that expectation of a combative relationship issuing in a clear victor; and the absence of historical distinctions” (256). Like Dubrow, who evades these potential pitfalls by refusing to place genres within a hierarchy and by considering moments when genres cooperate rather than those when they compete, I hope to avoid these problems by examining how the genres interact in the poem without prioritizing one or the other as inherently more valuable or inevitably victorious (and by historicizing the categories, a strategy I will discuss in more depth later). Dubrow usefully lays out her understanding of the defining qualities of narrative and lyric modes: “Risking the dangers of schematization, one could say that ... narrative often, though of course not always, involves a story that is set in the past (which differs of course from the time of discourse) and located in a mimesis of physical space (‘it happened in this place’) and that lyric is ‘often the mode that focuses on the lyric present or overlapping time schemes and a mimesis of mental space (‘it is happening in my mind’)” (268). For my purposes, Dubrow’s definition works well—the pub scene forms a narrative because it tells a story that is set in the past and that is being narrated at a later time (in the pub) and involves a sense of physical space: the speaker continually refers to being “there” at different points in her story and she concludes by reflecting on her visit to the home of Albert and Lil. Susan Stanford Friedman’s discussion of the differences between narrative and lyric also helps to highlight key elements in the pub scene that stand out from the rest of the poem: she emphasizes
that narrative “foregrounds a sequence of events that move dynamically in space and time” while lyric “foregrounds a simultaneity, a cluster of feelings or ideas that project a gestalt in stasis” (“Lyric Subversion of Narrative” 164). In the pub scene, the emphasis on the temporal sequence of the reported dialogue forms a key element that distinguishes the narrative pub scene from the more lyric sections of the poem as I will discuss later.

As my interest in these generic categories includes the readerly desires that they promote, James Phelan’s rhetorical approach to genre also provides a useful source of clarification. Phelan outlines his definition of “narrativity” with “the phrase ‘something happened’” which “gets at the first layer; the phrase is designed to indicate that narrative involves a sequence of related events during which the characters and/or their situations undergo some change” (634). Additionally for Phelan it is crucial that this “something happened” is told by “somebody” (both narrator and author) to “somebody else” (both the implied authorial audience and the external audience of “flesh and blood readers”). My understanding of the development of the pub sequence has been enriched by Phelan’s discussion of the dual progression involved in narrative structures: “[J]ust as there is a progression of events, there is a progression of audience response to those events, a progression rooted in the twin activities of observing and judging. Thus, from the rhetorical perspective concerned with what is represented and audience response to that representation, narrativity involves the interaction of two kinds of change: that experienced by the characters and that experienced by the audience in its developing responses to the characters’ changes” (634). In the pub scene in *The Waste Land*, this double movement is interestingly complicated by the narrative’s abrupt truncation (which prevents the full development of both changes) and by the parenthetical insertions that gesture toward a later time in which the feelings of the pub speaker-narrator have undergone a transformation. In the pub scene, the readerly interest is piqued by the emphasis on the location in the pub (the event of the telling is constantly being interrupted and rushed toward closure by the barman’s last call), by the reader’s dual inclusion in and exclusion from the reported exchange between the speaker-narrator and Lil, and finally by the suggestion of a meaningful change in the attitudes of the speaker. The pub scene in “A Game of Chess”—as a moment bound up with readerly investment in character, event, dialogue, sequence, climax, and change (both for the speaker and for the authorial audience)—clearly functions as a narrative interlude in the larger lyric landscape of the poem. Unlike the scene in the pub, the lyric sections of the poem place greater emphasis on the internal feelings of the various speakers, on simultaneity, and on figurative and allusive language.

Despite these moves toward definition, it is difficult to determine precisely what counts as “lyric” and also what counts as “non-lyrical” or “narrative” in 1601 as opposed to what qualifies in 2001. Recent criticism, exemplified by Virginia Jackson’s work on Emily Dickinson and lyric reading, has emphasized the need to historicize these generic categories. Jackson agrees with Yopie Prins’s claim that there is no “objective” or eternal definition of lyric and acknowledges the difficulty in recovering the developmental history of the genre: “Still, as Prins implies, the object that the lyric has become is by now identified with an expressive theory that makes it difficult
for us to place lyrics back into the sort of developmental history—of social relations, of print, of edition, reception, and criticism—that is taken for granted in definitions of the novel” (10). Jackson attempts to show “how poems become lyrics in history” (11) and certainly the history of the cultural reception of The Waste Land as the defining poem of modernism and as the exemplar of the modern lyric has influenced how the category of “the lyric” was re-imagined by the modernists and taken up by critics following their lead. In other words, Eliot’s poetic style has come to define what counts as the modern lyric, and yet only certain aspects of Eliot’s style have been canonized in this way—the voice of the speaker-narrator in the pub seems distinct and separate from the “lyric Eliot” demonstrated in the poem’s virtuoso opening lines or even in the earlier half of “A Game of Chess.”

Though generations of critics have mostly accepted The Waste Land as a key defining model for modern lyrics, early critical reviews of the poem suggest that narrative desire and its frustration have also been key components of readerly responses since the poem’s publication. Since the poem’s early reception, critical frames for reading the poem seem to be generated by two readerly impulses: lyric desire and narrative desire. For the purposes of my argument, “lyric desire” refers to the reader’s anticipated pleasure from reading highly stylized, imagistic, rhythmic, and metrical verse and from sharing in the states of mind and feelings of a lyric speaker. “Narrative desire,” on the other hand, describes the reader’s anticipated pleasure from engaging in a narrative: the emotional and personal investment in characters, the witnessing and judging of the development of character and plot, and the hearing of characters’ voices through dialogue.

To attempt to historicize what counted as “lyric” and what counted as “narrative” or even as “readerly desire” in 1922, I will briefly contextualize the poem through some early readerly responses to its publication. In an often quoted early review printed in December of 1922 in The Dial, Edmund Wilson attempts to anticipate and to defend against the critiques he imagines for The Waste Land:

It is sure to be objected that Mr. Eliot has written a puzzle rather than a poem and that his work can possess no higher interest than a full-rigged ship built in a bottle . . . and I suppose it will be felt in connexion with this new poem that if his vulgar London girls had only been studied by Sherwood Anderson they would have presented a very different appearance. . . . Well: all these objections are founded on realities, but they are outweighed by one major fact—the fact that Mr. Eliot is a poet . . . as I say, Mr. Eliot is a poet—that is, he feels intensely and with distinction and speaks naturally in beautiful verse—so that no matter within what walls he lives, he belongs to the divine company. His verse is sometimes much too scrappy—he does not dwell long enough upon one idea to give it its proportionate value before passing on to the next. (T. S. Eliot: The Critical Heritage 142–43)

In this review, Wilson relies on the sublime satisfaction of lyric desire to “outweigh” the unsettling and unfulfilled narrative desire of readers who become frustrated by the “puzzle” and who might desire that the “vulgar London girls” be more fully, sat-
isfyingly narrated by a realist novelist. Even though he describes Eliot’s verse as “scrappy” in the sense that no narrative is fully developed or “valued” before it is dropped, Wilson glories in Eliot’s lyric performance and asserts that his ability to “speak naturally in beautiful verse” should overcome any narrative failures. For Wilson, Eliot fits the definition of a poet because “he feels intensely and with distinction” and because of his ability to speak in beautiful verse; in other words, in his opinion, Eliot unites the content of lyric poetry—the poet’s feelings—with poetic expression (“beautiful verse”). Clearly, for Mr. Wilson, a poem’s ability to stimulate and sate lyric desire should far outweigh any lingering, unfulfilled narrative urges.

However, not all readers felt fully recompensed, and Louis Untermeyer’s scathing review in the “Freeman” in January of 1923 blames the poem’s failure on the poet’s inability to “give form to formlessness” through the “series of severed narratives”—tales from which the connecting tissue has been carefully cut—and familiar quotations with their necks twisted, all imbedded in that formless plasma” (T. S. Eliot: The Critical Heritage 151–52). From Untermeyer’s perspective the severed narratives are meaningless because they cannot be assimilated into a larger narrative or related to one another—his angry dismissal of the poem as irrelevant, pompous, and completely “self-congratulatory,” along with his violent images of severing, cutting, and twisting, speak to the painful frustration of the intense desire for narrative engendered by the poem. As the divergent views of Wilson and Untermeyer demonstrate, what counted as a successful “lyric” in 1922 was hotly contested. Over time Eliot’s poem came to stand for the new standard for the “lyric” and thus most of the naysayers (like Untermeyer) who continued to long for some sort of narrative arc or consistent speaker were eventually silenced, as multiple speakers and lack of narrative fulfillment emerged as new elements of modernist poetics of impersonality. Eliot himself, however, does not dismiss these narrative urges quite as easily as some of his readers have; in the pub sequence in “A Game of Chess” he signals his deep investment in the cultural associations surrounding the production and circulation of narrative forms, in narrative structures of meaning, and in the readerly desires those structures motivate.

LAST CALL: NARRATIVE GOES TO THE PUB

“A Game of Chess” opens with a highly lyrical and allusive description of an upper middle-class marriage and its habitat; the vision of the well-to-do couple and the fractured one-sided dialogue between the neurotic wife and the unresponsive, cynical husband paint a disturbing portrait of a desiccated upper middle-class marriage and of the types of interpersonal communication it allows. The alienated husband and wife are trapped in their artificial and meaningless existence where they must continually go through the motions and “play a game of chess” while they wait for the salvation of death or a less permanent release through interruption: “Pressing lidless eyes and waiting for a knock upon the door” (137–38). The ending of “A Game of Chess” moves from this moment of painful anticipation to a completely different tone and place: the poem violently shifts from the nervous, perfumed “sylvan
scene" of the upper-class boudoir to the conversational, noisy atmosphere of a working-class pub. This abrupt shift from high to low is often read as a conflation of two marriage narratives, showing all marriage as roughly equivalent to death; however, the dramatic shifts in style and in poetic strategy suggest that Eliot chooses to emphasize the profound disjunction between his representation of the classes and of their relative vitalities by expressing them through contrasting generic modes.

Eliot moves from the oft-rhyming and highly allusive first scene with its emphasis on literary and internalized language to the dialect-based and distinctly non-allusive bar-room story. The first few lines of the scene immediately place us within the atmosphere of a pub and within a working-class, intimate narrative: "When Lil’s husband got demobbed, I said— / I didn’t mince my words, I said to her myself, / HURRY UP PLEASE IT’S TIME" (139–41). These lines mark more than a lexical shift in class—they mark a movement from lyrical poetry to a distinctly prosy mode of speech invested in story-telling. The rhythm and meter of these lines, the complete absence of metaphor and allusion, and the shift in the speaker-narrator’s speech from internal feelings to external narration to an audience suggest a new mode of discourse in the poem, perhaps even an anti-lyrical voice.

The sound of these lines is quite distinct from the cadences of the allusive and melodic lyric speakers elsewhere in the poem, including those featured in the upper-class marriage vignette immediately preceding the pub scene. The unique sound of this new voice is even more apparent in the drafted versions of the poem and in the reworking of the speaker-narrator’s first line, which apparently gave Eliot trouble. The line initially read, “When Lil’s husband was coming back out of the Transport Corps,” then the end of this line was cancelled and temporarily replaced with “Discharge out of the army??” and eventually Pound replaced these phrases with the more succinct “demobbed” (Facsimile 13). The poem’s stylistic shift into this strange and different cadence, emphasized in the drafts of this section, indicates that Eliot intended this section of the poem to be distinct from the rest and to stand out as a recognizably different type of voice. Responding to Vivien’s suggestion (penciled into the draft) that he use the word “somethink,” Eliot writes in the margins that he “want[s] to avoid trying [to] show pronunciation by spelling” (Facsimile 13). This marginal comment and the decision to maintain “something” speak to Eliot’s invocation of a more broadly applicable, working-class speech that would not point to a particular people (he avoids the Cockney specificity of Vivien’s suggested “somethink”), but rather to different modes of speaking and narrating. The particular voice that Eliot sculpts in these lines inculcates an intimate, gossipy mood of tale-telling which creates a different sort of readerly desire, distinct from the readerly investments generated by the lyric allusiveness and the expression of interiority that occur elsewhere in the poem.

While the speaker-narrator’s tale focuses mainly on past events, the bartender’s capitalized last call, “HURRY UP PLEASE IT’S TIME,” which is introduced early on in the narrative and almost immediately interrupts the progression of the narrative, emphasizes the present-ness of her narrating act. The meaning of the juxtaposition lies in the anti-narrative force of the last call, which anticipates the bar closing at any minute, as opposed to the methodical, suspense-building, and rather drawn-out
narrative style of the speaker. Eliot’s incorporation of the threat of the anti-narrative bar call heightens the reader’s desire for the development of the narrative by creating the omnipresent sense that it might be unfulfilled and abruptly cut off at any moment.

After the initial interruption of the first last call, Eliot develops the characters and their narrative before the next bar call. In these lines, the speaker can clearly be identified as a woman and the sexual dynamic between her, Lil, and Albert becomes the focus as the narrator reports her direct advice to Lil, upon the event of Albert’s imminent return:

Now Albert’s coming back, make yourself a bit smart.  
He’ll want to know what you done with that money he gave you  
To get yourself some teeth. He did, I was there.  
You have them all out, Lil, and get a nice set,  
He said, I swear, I can’t bear to look at you.  
And no more can’t I, I said, and think of poor Albert,  
He’s been in the army four years, he wants a good time,  
And if you don’t give it him, there’s others will, I said.  
Oh is there, she said. Something o’ that, I said.  
Then I’ll know who to thank, she said, and give me a straight look. (142–51)

Here, the speaker’s narration reveals intimate feelings occurring in a deeply troubled marriage, as well as in a sexually competitive friendship: Albert’s crushing comment about his wife becomes even more insidious through the narrator’s presence because he slighted his wife’s appearance and her claims to his attention in front of her friend and potential rival. The friend’s repetition of the insult and her unsubtle hints that Albert could find a more attractive partner elsewhere seem to be spoken with pride. The speaker-narrator apparently feels both justified and pleased in her blunt attempts to advise her friend; she is proud of her ability not to mince words, both as a character trait and as a means to a good story. The speaker seems to view herself as the consummate narrator—one who can spin a good yarn both in the telling and in the actual acting out of it.

The glimpse that the speaker-narrator provides into her friendship and into her character suggests that this working-class female relationship allows Eliot to describe a companionship based upon a special brand of communication that can be contained in the brief phrases, “Oh is there,” “Something o’ that,” “Then I’ll know who to thank,” and “a straight look.” Between these two friends, a little language goes a long way and this ease of communication between them is emphasized by the speaker’s unabashedly frank tone. In this way, Eliot allows the reader to feel like part of the honest and telling communion between the two women (not needing translation or further explanation) and to be further drawn into the developing story. The inclusion of the reader in this intimate exchange helps to further engender narrative desire and to further satisfy it: by suggesting that the reader shares an understanding of what both Lil and the speaker mean by their words and looks, the poem encourages the reader to develop an interest in the characters and to desire more information about the progression, climax, and ultimate telos of the story.
One of the salient features of the pub narrator’s speech is her repeated emphasis on actually having been present to have heard the words that she narrates: “I didn’t mince my words, I said to her myself” (140). The continual iterations of “I said” and the truth claims whose proof seems contingent on her presence, “He did, I was there” (143), continually emphasize that the narrator derives her authority not from some distant literary source, but rather from first-hand experience. Claims for truthfulness have been the purview of narrative fiction since its origins in early novels (typified by Aphra Behn’s insistence on her status as a witness in her preface to Oronoko) and in epistolary fiction (evident in Richardson’s claims merely to have “edited” Pamela’s letters). In addition to drawing on traditional justifications for fiction/narrative as a worthy genre, the speaker’s implication that meaningful authority comes from one’s actual presence at the moment of Lil’s utterance raises complicated ethical questions in the context of this narration. The speaker’s self-authorizing gestures distinguish herself from her audience—both from her narratees, the imagined audience of fellow pub-goers, and from the readers of the poem—who were not “there” and can only observe and judge based on her narration rather than actually participating in the event with the speaker.

The position of the audience here again reinforces the narrativity of this scene: the speaker’s narratees (her audience in the pub) and the authorial audience cannot participate in the scene without judging the biases of the speaker-narrator’s voice. This filtering creates a distance between the speaker and the author and their respective audiences that might not have been created by a lyric mode of expression. Despite the audience’s apparent intimacy and inclusion within the environment of the bar, they will be unable to repeat this story with the same conversational style, ease, and enjoyment because of the distancing effect of the intervening text (i.e. “she said that she said, I wasn’t there”). Thus, both internal audience (i.e. pubsters) and authorial audience (readers) may recognize a difference from the speaker through the same techniques (the insistence on witnessing and truth claims) that attempt to draw them into the intimate narration of the story. The audiences are put in the position of judging both the content of the story—the speaker-narrator’s past interaction with Lil—and the manner in which she represents it—her style of narration.

The distance between audience and story-teller complicates the ethical positions involved in the retelling and in the audience’s (pub-goers and readers) relationship to the story, to the speaker-narrator, and to the characters. What should the audience’s position be in relation to the narrator and to Lil? Can the narratees and the readers guiltlessly desire to hear all about Lil’s tragedy when the discourse is by necessity only one-sided and thus voyeuristic? These questions speak to the ethical and social positions inherent in all narratives and especially in cross-class fictional encounters. At this moment, in the interruptive narrative interlude in the pub, the poem diverges from its usual lyric mode to offer its audience a readerly experience of the ethical positions brought out through narrative form. The speaker-narrator’s insistence on the novelistic trope of witnessing urges the audience—who cannot directly witness, but who can judge based on the speaker-narrator’s shifting attitudes toward the subject of her narration—to consider their own relationship to the text and to these appealing, but presumably alien “different voices” narrated in the pub.
By raising these ethical questions and by asking the audience to reflect on and to judge the representational strategies of the poem and of the pub speaker-narrator, Eliot emphasizes the unique qualities of the voice of the story-telling, female, working-class speaker-narrator and foregrounds the readerly engagements made possible by narrative form.

GOONIGHT, GOONIGHT: THE ENDS OF NARRATIVE IN THE WASTE LAND

By the moment when the pub scene abruptly ends, the speaker-narrator has already skillfully employed narrative techniques to excite narrative desire in her audience and to pique the reader’s sympathy and curiosity. Then the story is cut off at a heightened moment and the last call reasserts its temporal authority, preventing the full disclosure of the narrative just before it reaches its climax:

HURRY UP PLEASE IT’S TIME
Well, that Sunday Albert was home, they had a hot gammon,
And they asked me in to dinner, to get the beauty of it hot—
HURRY UP PLEASE IT’S TIME
HURRY UP PLEASE IT’S TIME
Ta ta. Goonight. Goonight.
Good night, ladies, good night, sweet ladies, good night, good night (165–72).

The word “Well” implies that the whole of the previous narrative has been made to set up this newest revelation; it signals that the background, stage-setting phase of the telling has finally led to the climactic moment, presumably the occasion for the story’s retelling. The speaker-narrator shifts to the moment when Albert has returned and begins to narrate her experience at the climactic dinner. The phrase “asked me in to dinner” emphasizes the narrator’s special relationship with the couple—she is invited into their private domestic space, even to their reunion celebration. The speaker, in turn, invites the reader into the dinner as well, to get the “beauty of it hot.” The final phrase of the narrative refers to the excitement of the hot, atypically festive meal, but also points to the narrator’s story-telling techniques which allow the reader to experience her story “hot” as well. This image also invokes a promise of satisfaction—of sated hunger and of fulfilled narrative desire. The failure of this promise provides the lasting resonance of the speaker’s narrative—the longing for narrative that haunts the remainder of the poem and challenges the seeming closure of the shored fragments and the final shantihs.

The Waste Land’s careful construction of narrative desire accounts for much of the unsettling affect of this passage, as the reader’s desire to know more about Lil’s fate is shown to be illicit and perhaps even complicit after it has peaked in intensity: the slurred yet cheery “goonights” of the bar patrons are juxtaposed with the echo of Ophelia’s mad goodbye after Hamlet has tragically forsaken her, and each farewell
colors the other. The colloquial “goonights”—which, significantly, are products of Vivien’s revisions—become tragically significant both in terms of Lil’s plight and possible fate as an Ophelia-like forsaken woman and in terms of the truncation of the story and the readers’ lingering unsatisfied desire to know what becomes of her. Additionally, Ophelia’s pathetic end is rendered less uncommon and somewhat de-mythologized by its similarity to the everyday tragedy of Lil’s marriage.

Many critics interpret this contrast of high and low registers as clearly elevating the lofty literary language and they neglect to consider the inverse trafficking of meaning. Alison Tate argues that Eliot’s inclusion of non-privileged modes of speech (those of women and of the working-class) only serves to exemplify the hierarchical, traditional privileging of “male/written/literary” levels of discourse over the subordinate “female/spoken/non-literary” types of discourse (163). She uses the example of the Goonight/Ophelia pairing as a major justification for her claims that the latter types of discourse are subordinated to the former, preferred “higher” currencies of language in the poem: “This formal and nostalgic second line, with its allusion to Ophelia’s farewell in Hamlet, has the effect of undermining the distinction between styles and genres employed. Isn’t the contrast clearly to the disadvantage of the former, which is thus implicitly characterized not just as colloquial, but as degraded, slovenly?” (167). I do not think that the answer to Tate’s question is a foregone conclusion. Tate’s resistance to the alternative possibilities—that Eliot might be using the voices of women and working-class figures not to degrade them but to explore the alternative possibilities, cultural associations, and readerly desires that they make available—illustrates the intensity of the readerly impulse to contain the narrative and lyric desires that the poem creates within a larger, coherent, hierarchical schema.12

My reading of the narrative strategies employed in the pub sequence suggests that we should not assume that Eliot’s juxtaposition of generic registers and manipulation of narrative techniques constitutes, as it does for Tate and for many other critics, a privileging of “higher” lyric forms of discourse. I hope to alter the critical tendency to read the generic complexity of The Waste Land as an easy dismissal of the “degraded”—even “slovenly”—voices of the gendered and classed representatives of narrative. Unlike Tate, I interpret the “lower” register of narrative and of the voice of the pub speaker-narrator as being not easily undermined by the poem’s subsequent shifts into different registers. The desires created through the reader’s encounter with the pub narrative are not immediately closed off and disenchanted, but rather remain as a lingering, potent, ever-unsatisfied longing for narrative closure and for further revelation.13 It is precisely the “lower” register of the working-class female voices of narrative—and not the high lyric allusive speakers invoked elsewhere in the poem—which create the most intense readerly desires. The progression and truncation of the gendered, working-class, pub-located narrative constitutes the site through which the reader can experience these “different voices” in a way distinct from the pleasures of lyric desire and satisfaction.14 Indeed, while there has been a critical tendency, especially within feminist criticism, to associate lyric discourse with revolutionary potential and to associate narrative with authoritarian discourse and repression, in The Waste Land the narrative seems to erupt into the lyric
and to create a space for the “different voices” of working-class and female speakers to emerge and to disrupt the elite male-dominated allusive lyric discourse that dominates the rest of the poem.\textsuperscript{15} Importantly, the pub sequence includes not only the voices of Lil and her narrating friend, but also the voices of Vivien Eliot and her maid Ellen Kelland who helped to fashion and to inspire the female and working-class voices in “A Game of Chess.”

**INVISIBLE YET INVALUABLE: VIVIEN’S COLLABORATIONS ON THE WASTE LAND**

Taking cues from Ezra Pound—who cast himself as performing the “caesarean Operation” to deliver *The Waste Land*—critics often tell the story of the origins of the modernist movement as an act of homosocial midwifery and even as one of homoerotic consummation.\textsuperscript{16} Indeed, since Valerie Eliot published *The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts Including the Annotations of Ezra Pound* in 1971, almost no critical discussion of modernism neglects to incorporate the story of the “birthing” of the movement through Eliot and Pound’s visible collaboration on the pages of the drafts. In *Double Talk*, his study of the erotics of male-male collaboration, Wayne Koestenbaum sees these collaborative and editorial processes as implicitly gendered and eroticized; Koestenbaum likens Pound and Eliot to two doctors approaching “the discontinuous poem as a woman in need of cure” and compares their efforts to a surprisingly productive act of male copulation: “The male modernist anus, a barren, intrinsically unprocreative zone, achieves a weird flowering—lilacs out of the dead land—when men collaborate; Pound penetrates Eliot’s waste land, and fills the hollow man with child” (*Double Talk* 114, 123). While Koestenbaum’s account is perhaps unusually figurative, his exclusive focus on the two male “parents” of the text reflects the overwhelming majority of scholarship on the poem and on the pre-publication materials.

The bibliographic coding of Valerie Eliot’s seminal publication of the drafts also hints at the almost universal privileging of Pound’s contribution to the poem. The cover of her text presents a palimpsest with a replica of T.S. Eliot’s signature in large red characters sitting at the top of the page, then immediately under it “The Waste Land” in a smaller rust colored font, followed by:

**A FACSIMILE AND TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORIGINAL DRAFTS INCLUDING THE ANNOTATIONS OF EZRA POUND**

Here the “Including” seems to function as a drum roll announcing the key headlining act of Pound’s annotations. Yet why does the fascinating story of the other annotator get left off the cover and out of the majority of critical accounts of the making of the poem? The overwhelming critical neglect of this other collaborator—whose emendations have been just as accessible in the margins since 1971—moves me to ask: Who’s afraid of Vivien Eliot?
While there are some exceptions to the general rule of Vivien’s invisibility in critical discourse, even the critics who have the most interest in recovering the story of Tom Eliot’s first wife barely touch upon her role in shaping one of the key cultural monuments of modernism. Richard Badenhausen acknowledges Eliot’s avowed dependence on his wife’s opinion by citing a telling letter from Eliot attesting to Vivien’s importance to the process of the poem’s making: “In a 1921 letter to Sydney Schiff . . . Eliot explains that he had finished a ‘rough draft’ of part III of The Waste Land, ‘but [I] do not know whether it will do, and must wait for Vivien’s opinion as to whether it is printable’ (LI 484)” (87–88). Badenhausen’s interest in Vivien’s editorial feedback serves to bolster his larger argument about Eliot’s consistently “collaborative impulse”; he is more interested in the psychological dynamics of their acts of collaboration than in her impact on The Waste Land. Like other critics who champion (or at least recognize) Vivien as an author, Badenhausen focuses mainly on her later pseudonymous publications in The Criterion rather than on her impact on The Waste Land.17 While these critics often briefly cite Vivien’s marginalia on the pages of the drafts, they do not fully analyze the specifics of her influence. Badenhausen’s appraisal touches upon Vivien’s most notable involvement with the poem—her collaboration on the pub scene in “A Game of Chess”; he compliments her for “altering the tone through ordinary language” and explains that “she helped give shape and authenticity to dramatic scenes less dependent on literary allusions” (97). Even Carole Seymour-Jones, Vivien’s recent feminist biographer, echoes Badenhausen’s brand of faint praise—briefly noting that Vivien possessed an “ear for dialogue [that] was acute” (301). Puzzlingly, in her mammoth account of Vivien’s life in Painted Shadow, Seymour-Jones gives little space to discussing Vivien’s impact on The Waste Land.18

Before looking more closely at Vivien’s influence on the pub sequence in “A Game of Chess,” I would like to introduce both Vivien’s voice as a writer and her relationship to Tom through an analysis of her correspondence. Sydney Schiff’s assessment of Vivien’s epistolary voice, excerpted from a letter to Vivien dated December 9th, 1921, accurately characterizes most of Vivien’s letters: “It is very encouraging to have a spontaneous expression of feeling like yours and I really am grateful. . . . By the way, your letter reads exactly as though you were talking, which is a very good sign. Your natural sincerity is one of your fine qualities” (Letters 492).19 In a letter to Scofield Thayer dated July 20th, 1921, Vivien’s play with language creates a witty, intimate tone with phrases like “excuse the alliteration,” “she does not wish . . . to spill her cash for the cause of Literature” and “Well, go and frizzle” (Letters 462). And at the end of her Tuesday, August 23, 1921 letter to Henry Eliot, she urges her own theory of “personality” in writing: “Write at once and don’t wait ‘for the mood.’ The mood comes, in writing. . . . And be personal, you must be personal, or else its [sic] no good” (Letters 466, original emphasis). As these letters indicate, Vivien’s epistolary style is marked by her play with language, her intimate tone, and her drive toward candid personal communication. Her efforts at creating intimacy through writing with a playful voice that aspires to “talking” and her advocacy of “personal” style resonate with her influence on the pub scene and her collaborative suggestions to shape the tone and substance of the reported exchange between Lil and the pub speaker-narrator.
The letters also reveal the collaborative nature of her life with her husband—the Eliots often wrote postscripts or jotted informal notes at the ends of one another’s letters and continually refer to reading one another’s correspondence. Vivien noted in her letter to Richard Aldington on July 15, 1922 that, “Tom always leaves his letters behind for me to read” (Letters 544). The published correspondence of both Eliots reveals their mutual intellectual engagement with works of the current moment (Ulysses, Babbitt, etc.) and Tom often praises Vivien’s opinion of a new work and describes her as “invaluable” to his work on The Criterion (Letters 462). Indeed their efforts at intellectual collaboration (especially during the time of the composition of The Waste Land) seem to have been some of the most fulfilling aspects of their marriage.

Vivien writes poignantly about the publication of The Waste Land in a letter to Sydney Schiff on October 16th, 1922: “Perhaps not even you can imagine with what emotions I saw The Waste Land go out into the world. It means to me a great deal of what you have exactly described, and it has become a part of me (or I of it) this last year. It was a terrible thing, somehow, when the time came at last for it to be published” (Letters 584). Vivien’s account emphasizes her deep emotional connection to the poem as a first reader of the manuscript and as a collaborator in its production. Her comments suggest that she saw the publication of the poem as somehow “terribly” foreclosing the community created through the conversations between herself, Pound, and Tom in the margins of the drafts. In this letter, Vivien also acknowledges her embeddedness in the poem itself (“or I of it”) and she reveals the intensity of her involvement with the poem as it circulated in draft form. Vivien’s feelings of connection to the poem and particularly to the process of its production and pre-circulation in draft form are underlined by her note to Tom on the verso of her marked up copy of the final lines of “A Game of Chess.” On the back of the leaf on which she commented “Splendid last lines” and on which she suggested substantive changes to the text, Vivien wrote: “Make any of these alterations—or none if you prefer. Send me back this copy & let me have it” (Facsimile 15). Her comments emphasize her sense of her own intimate involvement in the process of revision: while not overly invested in how much of her voice made it into the final version, she desired to preserve the memories or traces (in the physical copy that she marked) of her collaborative efforts in the process of the production of the poem.

While Vivien found her involvement with the pre-publication poem to be painfully intense, most critics continue to ignore or downplay her role in the life of The Waste Land. The critical neglect of Vivien’s contributions to the poem stems not only from the usual story of her personal history (she’s often cast as a neurotic, unhappy drain on Eliot, and as a woman whom Woolf bitingly describes as a “bag of ferrets [that] Tom wears round his neck” [The Diary of Virginia Woolf, Vol. III, 6]), but also from the specific section of The Waste Land that she influences the most visibly: the pub scene in “A Game of Chess.” The story of Lil and Albert is glanced over and ignored in critical conversation even more thoroughly than is Vivien’s co-authorship of these lines. Perhaps the critical neglect of the twin figures of Vivien and Lil stems from the way that Eliot’s poem became canonized through the responses of other modernists and through the literary critical establishment as the monument of
“high modernism.” Koestenbaum describes this type of canonization: “The Waste Land was used to shore up that monolith, the male modernist. Joyce wrote that it ‘ended the idea of poetry for ladies,’ and Pound commented that ‘Eliot’s Waste Land is I think the justification of the ‘movement,’ of our modern experiment, since 1900’” (Double Talk 111). If the history of the cultural reception of The Waste Land has cast the poem as a monument to a masculinist version of modernist genius, then it is not surprising that some critics have strategically downplayed the efforts of one of these poetic “ladies” to insert her voice into the poem’s texture.

However, while the gender of Lil and Vivien certainly plays a role in their exclusion from the story of the poem’s “caesarian” delivery, the critical silence surrounding the pub scene also derives from the anomalous readerly desires generated by this section of the poem and by its associations with lower-class and female voices and modes of story-telling. The pub sequence creates intense readerly desires for narrative and then refuses to fully satisfy those desires. In this scene, these narrative desires are inflected by class and by gender and the speaker builds readerly desire to a fever pitch only to abruptly cut it off. The readerly desire created in the pub narrative is significantly different from other modes of desire and frustration in the poem: here, readerly engagement is generated by the speaker-narrator’s use of narrative techniques and by the section’s incorporation of female and working-class voices and relationships. The pub sequence constitutes the site through which the stylistic possibilities and the cultural associations offered by narrative enter The Waste Land. Vivien’s most significant contributions to the published poem affect the pub scene: her voice helps to shape the moment in the poem when the voices of working-class women emerge and when the female experience of modernity is expressed through narrative technique, the mode of written discourse most closely tied to female figures through the cluster of cultural associations surrounding the novel and its circulation.

Vivien’s most substantial contributions occur in lines 153–164 just after the interruption of the repeated barman’s call. The barman’s call functions throughout the pub sequence as an insistent reminder of the urgency of the speaker’s narrating. In these lines, this urgency applies not only to the telling of the tale (the reader desires to have it completed before the bar closes, when the mood will be shifted and the story truncated), but also to Lil’s need for urgent action to combat her friend’s legitimate sexual threat (Albert has been demobbed and Lil’s teeth have apparently not yet improved). In this segment of uninterrupted narrative, the story develops further and becomes increasingly tragic and sordid as the speaker presents the reasons behind Lil’s defacement:

If you don’t like it you can get on with it, I said.
Others can pick and choose if you can’t.
But if Albert makes off, it won’t be for lack of telling.
You ought to be ashamed, I said, to look so antique.
(And her only thirty-one.)
I can’t help it, she said, pulling a long face,
It’s them pills I took, to bring it off, she said.
(She’s had five already, and nearly died of young George.)
The chemist said it would be all right, but I’ve never been the same.
You are a proper fool, I said.
Well, if Albert won’t leave you alone, there it is, I said.
What you get married for if you don’t want children? (153–64).

Importantly, in the initial drafts of the poem the first line of this excerpt read, “No, ma’am, you needn’t look old-fashioned at me,” until Vivien changed the line to “If you don’t like it you can get on with it” by canceling out the line on the draft copy and writing her suggestion in the margin. Vivien’s influence on this section of the poem (she made more substantive changes than Pound or her husband in this section of the drafts) helps to create the apt characterization of feminine speech within the context of an intimate, although sexually embattled, female friendship. While Tom Eliot’s initial line seems to detract from the tacit understanding between the two women, Vivien’s version suggests that there would be no need to explain the look (as “old-fashioned”), and thus with her suggestion the line becomes a defensive response (from one who has understood the look) rather than an explication of Lil’s expression.

Vivien also helped to dilute several of the least poetic lines and to exorcise some of the prosy strains of this section: in addition to the clunky “old-fashioned” line, Vivien also modified line 159 from the awkward, “It’s that medicine I took, in order to bring it off” to its present, more fluid condition. By altering these lines to make them more succinct and less explicatory, Vivien softened the section’s initial gestures at a prosier cadence and also increased the pacing (the shorter lines read more quickly), the emotional complexity (her line changes add additional tone shifts and implications rather than simply further explaining earlier lines), and the intimacy (by offering less explanation of the relationship and of the events, she increases the sense of the mutual understanding between the two women and also on the part of the audience) of the narrator’s story-telling style.

Vivien’s most important contribution to the meaning of the poem is her revision of line 164, which initially read, “You want to keep him at home, I suppose” (Facsimile 15). The original version of the line makes more logical sense in terms of the previous line (“Well, if Albert won’t leave you alone, there it is, I said.”), yet it makes less emotional sense in the context of the sexual rivalry and generally unforgiving tone of the speaker. With Vivien’s revision (she proposed the change to “What you get married for if you don’t want to have children?” in the margins), the speaker-narrator’s brief moment of sympathy in acknowledging that if Albert won’t stop impregnating Lil, “there it is,” is immediately subverted by an attitude of annoyance and the assertion that she should have known what she was getting herself into (Facsimile 15). The emotional flipping that occurs midway through the narrator’s utterance complicates her relationship to her friend, adding a layer of anger that could be attributed to jealousy, and potentially increases the reader’s interest in the speaker-narrator’s personal investment in Lil’s marriage. The line becomes even more intriguing when one considers that despite this illogical mid-sentence mood-swing, the narrator still incorporates this past speech into her story-telling act at the pub. Again,
the motivations and drives of the female speaker-narrator seem to be centered on creating the most dynamic, multivalent, and dramatic story that she can despite any damaging effects the revelation could have for her audience’s judgment of her character or of her role in the story. She seems bent on recreating the dramatic tension of their conversation and on building up intense narrative desire on the part of her audience as to what will happen to the two entangled friends and to the endangered marriage.

The narrator unfolds the saddest part of her story in the lines that Vivien most helped to shape and sharpen. The speaker-narrator evokes a complex register of emotion through her narrative progression: first she reiterates her sexual threat and her warning that Albert will make off with another willing woman, and then chides Lil for “[looking] so antique,” and finally parenthetically reveals the reason for Lil’s deteriorating complexion and teeth. The parenthetical interruptions remind the reader that the speaker is narrating this story in “the present” (i.e. when she narrates it to her audience in the pub). The insertions carry a more sympathetic tone as they include details that intensify the pathos of Lil’s early decline. These parenthetical insertions create two temporal levels of the dialogue with two different levels of sympathy: the speaker-narrator’s present degree of pathos enclosed in the parentheses and her past, more mixed, emotion revealed in the reported dialogue. Lil’s plea for sympathy, “I can’t help it,” and her candid acknowledgement of her abortion and its consequences are met with present sympathy as evidenced by the qualifying bracketed remarks. This divergence in the narrator’s emotional and sympathetic response to Lil suggests a narrative climax that will engender further sympathy; perhaps Lil meets with a tragic end and thus earns the speaker’s increased empathy. In any case, the parenthetical insertions imply a change in the speaker and emphasize the gap between the time of Lil’s conversation with the speaker and the time of the speaker’s current narration of it to the audience in the pub. The poem uses parentheticals to draw attention to the time-lapse to increase the reader’s burgeoning narrative desire by implying a meaningful climax that will explain the speaker’s changed opinion. The speaker’s past reaction with its abrupt mood-shifts also suggests that the climax must have been quite intense in order to resolve the malleable and somewhat mercuric emotional relationship between the speaker-narrator and Lil.

Vivien’s contributions to the poem’s composition and her suggestions for the pub sequence crucially influenced the development of female voices and the intensity and complexity of the speaker-narrator’s storytelling technique. Vivien’s collaborative efforts complicate the emotional exchange between the speaker-narrator and Lil with her revised lines (“If you don’t like it you can get on with it” and “What you get married for if you don’t want to have children?”) and increase the authenticity of the dialect-inflected voices (with her revised version “It’s them pills I took, to bring it off” and her suggested “goonights”). In addition to her role as a collaborator in the composition of the poem, Vivien also played a key role as important member of the poem’s pre-circulation audience (along with Pound of course). She valued the intellectual exchange enacted on the pages of the draft and even wanted to preserve her connection to that exchange by retaining the marked copy of the drafts. In a letter to his brother, Henry Eliot, dated 13 Dec 1921 and sent from Lausanne, Eliot com-
mends Vivien’s role in his life during the time while he was working on The Waste Land: “The great thing I am trying to learn is how to use all my energy without waste, to be calm when there is nothing to be gained by worry, and to concentrate without effort. I hope that I shall place less strain upon Vivien, who has had to do so much thinking for me” (Letters, 493). Eliot’s strange comment coupled with his other remark while working on the poem that he “must wait for Vivien’s opinion as to whether it is printable” suggest that, for Tom Eliot, Vivien’s role as a judge and pre-audience for the poem was as vital to the poem’s birthing as Pound’s caesarian contributions.

CONCLUSION

The narrative sequence in the pub opens up a space for female and working-class voices to enter the poem both through the pub speaker’s mobilization of narrative techniques and content and in the pre-circulation and domestic production of the poem in the Eliots’ home. Vivien is not the only female member of the Eliot household whose voice enriches the pub scene in “A Game of Chess”; another, somewhat elided female voice that influenced this section of the poem belonged to Ellen Kelland, the Eliots’ maid who helped to inspire the pub sequence. According to Valerie Eliot (Tom’s second wife), Eliot told her that these lines were “pure Ellen Kelland [sic]” (Facsimile, 125). Importantly, Carole Seymour-Jones attributes the pub “dialogue” to a secondary collaboration through conversations between Vivien and Ellen: “The dialogue was based on many conversations with Ellen Kelland, the Eliots’ maid for many years, to whom Vivien was devoted. The grim future Vivien predicted for Ellen, who was later to marry one of her ‘followers’, is captured in lines given to ‘Lil’ and her friend, and edited by Vivien, whose ear for dialogue was acute” (301–303). While Ellen’s contributions to the poem cannot be precisely documented, Tom Eliot reveals his interest in her unique voice and its evocation of a working-class dialect in a letter he wrote to Eleanor Hinkley on June 17, 1919. In this letter, Eliot refers to Ellen as “the servant” and seems to delight in her play with language: “[T]he servant is also taking a fortnight’s holiday at Margate, presumably making herself ill on prawns and winkles. But as she says of everything ‘it makes a change’ (i.e. when she bakes potatoes instead of boiling them)” (Letters, 304). Vivien’s feelings about Tom’s interest in Ellen are somewhat cryptically reflected in her letter to Mary Hutchinson dated December, 20, 1921: “Tom kept on Ellen. He would” (Letters, 497). Whatever the specific resonances of the Eliots’ domestic milieu and the role of Ellen in that space, The Waste Land was produced and pre-circulated within the Eliots’ private sphere and was clearly influenced by its contact with both Vivien and Ellen.

The Waste Land’s investigation of the formal potential of narrative is enriched and influenced by Eliot’s understanding of the ways in which narrative texts had been associated culturally with female and working-class voices, readerships, and modes of circulation. Significantly, Eliot’s interest in incorporating narrative elements into his poem extended beyond the pub into other areas of the drafted text.
While the pub sequence functions as the most extended narrative moment in the versions of *The Waste Land* published in 1922 and 1923, Eliot’s use of narrative techniques and his allusions to narrative texts are much more pervasive on the pages of the drafts than they are in the revised published versions. During the revising process, most of the extended scenes of narrative development were excised from the poem, obscuring the poem’s interest in narrative techniques. The story of Lil in the pub serves as the major remaining trace of the larger developmental structure of narrative moments and allusions that function as a recurring motif in the drafts. Importantly, the extended moments of narrative development in the drafts often form the opening passages of the subsections of the poem, preceding lines with more lyric qualities: at different stages in the development of the drafts a narrative account of a drunken romp opens “The Burial of The Dead,” lines featuring an extended portrait of Fresca begin “The Fire Sermon,” and a long tale of the sea opens “Death by Water.” This repeated gesture of opening subsections with narrative experiments speaks to Eliot’s deep commitment to incorporating narrative forms into his poem and demonstrates his persistent working through of the ways in which narrative and lyric modes could productively intersect and intermingle in *The Waste Land*.

In the eventually excised couplets concerning Fresca, Eliot most pointedly explores the relationship between gender and the production of cultural forms; he casts Fresca—a female reader and dilettantish poet—as a spectacle of a silly woman reading and writing within the domestic space of her boudoir. Here Fresca seems to stand in for the threateningly scribbling and voraciously reading women of mass culture, and her crudeness and vulgarity (her “hearty female stench”) are used to render her intellectual aspirations highly comical. Within these couplets, texts circulate in feminized, domestic realms only in debased ways: Fresca reads Richardson while defecating and the tale only serves to “ease her labour” (i.e. the famous novelist becomes degraded into toilet-reading) and then she reads the *Daily Mirror* while eating in bed and next she “devours” her letters. Here feminized cultures of reading are rendered almost obscene by their associations with the daily routines of the female body and by their assimilation into the feminized domestic routines of a morning toilet and of daily correspondence. However, my reading of *The Waste Land*’s invocation of narrative techniques—and of the kinds of female and working class figures associated with nineteenth century narrative—demonstrates that Eliot was not merely dismissing female and mass readerships and feminized textual production and consumption. While the lines describing Fresca may function as a comical portrait of many modernists’ fears of the mass market and of the cultural inheritance of readerships from the nineteenth century, Eliot’s insistent inclusion of narrative techniques and of female and working-class representatives of narrative in his poem attests to his very serious engagement with the relevance and possibilities offered by narrative expression. Focusing on the pub scene and on Vivien’s (and Ellen’s) collaboration on the pages of the drafts allows us to reconsider the traces of narrative in the drafts of the poem and to rethink the often obscured role of narrative genres in the development of the poem. We must revise our histories of the poem’s composition to recognize how the intermixing of genres functioned centrally in the poem’s developmental process.
The Eliots' manipulation of narrative techniques and of the readerly responses produced by the mixing of genres in the pub attests to the centrality of narrative modes to *The Waste Land*’s poetic response to the conditions of modernity. The poem’s generic mixing asserts that narrative genres constitute an essential element for the “modern lyric” and that, for Eliot, poetry as a modern genre must incorporate narrative technology to adequately engage with modern life and with the modern literary marketplace. We can usefully place *The Waste Land*’s investment in the generic complexities of narrative in dialogue with the poem’s explorations of gender, of readerly desires, of different classes, and of high and low cultures to argue for the poem’s insistent engagement with the cultural conditions of modernity. Tom and Vivien Eliot use the narrative moment in the pub to bridge the high-low culture divide and to incorporate the voices of women and working-class speakers as part of their version of modern poetry in “different voices.” My reading of the pub sequence has shown that the Eliots’ invocation of narrative in the pub—ushering in the generic and content-based associations of narrative with nineteenth-century print culture and with its circulation involving women and working-class figures—opens up a space in the modernist lyric landscape of *The Waste Land* for these alternative and resistant voices.

Importantly, the anomalous voice of the pub scene speaker-narrator resists being “shored” up with all the other voices into a unifying voice of the poem, the voice often associated with the “I” heard in the final lines: “These fragments I have shored against my ruins / Why then Ille fit you. Hieronymo’s mad again. / Datta. Dayadhvam. Damyata. / Shantih shanith shanthih” (430–33). While these final lines shift between different allusions and even languages, many readers tend to collapse the voices here into one overarching voice of the poem—a sort of polyvocal lyric speaker formed from all of the different voices that have been invoked throughout the course of the poem. This sort of lyric speaker, while not necessarily reducible to the specific identity of Tiresias or the Fisher King, has been imagined to speak for the poem (and indeed at times for the many voiced modern subject) and for the poetic logic of “shoring” fragments to make meaning and to describe modernity: “These fragments I have shored against my ruins” (430).27

And yet, I argue that while this speaker could potentially voice the opening lines and the ending movement and almost all of the fragments in between—though they alternate between languages and genders—this type of speaker could not speak the lines told by the speaker-narrator in the pub. These lines refuse to be collapsed into any unifying voice of the poem—they are spoken in a totally different cadence and language, they draw on female and working-class modes of discourse and speech, and they advertise their ties to narrative techniques and associations as opposed to lyric allusiveness and interiority. Unlike most of the other “fragments,” these lines will not be reconciled into a lyric present or into a larger vision of an internal waste land or lyric landscape projected by one lyric consciousness or persona. The voice of the speaker-narrator in the pub—made unique by the use of the formal techniques and contents associated with nineteenth-century narrative and sharpened by the inclusion of the voices of Vivien Eliot and Ellen Kelland—will not blend seamlessly into the stream of lyric moments and lyric speakers of the rest of the
poem, but rather stands as a sort of resistant trunk in the flood, maintaining its separateness and arguing for the place of its narrative techniques and for the readerly desires those techniques motivate.

My reading of the pub scene through the drafts and the pre-publication involvement of Vivien and Ellen reminds us that the making of The Waste Land is not reducible to just one author-genius—and not even just one author and his caesarian helper Pound—but rather asserts that the poem’s prehistory is powerfully shaped by these female and working-class voices and by its production on the pages of the drafts and in the domestic space of the Eliots’ home. The Waste Land’s inclusion of these voices and their outlet in the narrative moment in the pub underscores Eliot’s understanding of and experimentation within the context of the historically-embedded production of modernist texts. Eliot’s experimentation with narrative techniques opens out into his inclusion of marginalized voices and subjects often culturally linked to nineteenth-century narrative circulation. This formal play with narrative and its cultural associations is crucially linked to Eliot’s thinking about the production and relevance of poetry in the modern literary marketplace.

The content and form of the pub scene—the narrative techniques and the inclusion of female-female relationships, working-class storytelling, sexual rivalries, physical deterioration, abortions—link back to the initial titular allusion to Dickens, to Sloppy’s readerly performances, and to the cluster of cultural associations surrounding novels, readers, and circulation in the nineteenth century. While the materials—both form and content—that Eliot deploys in this section are familiar from the textual production of the novels and narratives of Dickens and others, the section also tells the story of the inclusion of female and working class voices—through Vivien and Ellen Kelland—in the domestic pre-circulation and material production of The Waste Land. My argument attests to the ways in which we need to challenge comfortable habits of reading which separate the formal techniques of seminal modernist texts like The Waste Land from the sites and sources of their cultural and material production. We cannot fully understand modernist formal experimentation without fleshing out the interest of modernists in the connections between form and the cultural logic of its production, circulation, and reception. The Eliots use narrative form to draw on a wide array of readerly desires and cultural associations and to link a highly allusive modern poem to the popular realm of nineteenth-century novels and mass readerships. The case of Tom and Vivien doing narrative in different voices illustrates what we can gain by recognizing and analyzing the embeddedness of modernist formal experimentation within histories of material production and within the context of the cultural associations surrounding those print culture histories.
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1. All quotations from the published version of *The Waste Land* are taken from the "Text of the First Edition: New York, Boni and Liveright" printed in *The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts Including the Annotations of Ezra Pound* and are cited parenthetically by line number. Any quotations from the facsimile of the drafts of the poem will be cited parenthetically as coming from the facsimile and including the page number on which they appear.

2. Later on in the novel, Sloppy has been disguised as a dustman as part of a plan to trick the greedy Silas Wegg and boasts of his skill at voices as playing a part in his successful trickery: "‘Ha, ha, ha, gentleman!’ roared Sloppy, in a peal of laughter, and with immeasurable relish. ‘He never thought as I could sleep standing, and often done it when I turned for Mrs. Higden! He never thought as I used to give Mrs. Higden the Police-news in different voices! But I did lead him a life all through it, gentlemen, I hope I really and truly DID!’" (785). He doesn’t directly use his skill with newspaper reading to fool Wegg, but his boast suggests that he values this skill as so clear a sign of his cleverness that he must hide it from Wegg to keep him unsuspicuous.

3. I agree with Rainey’s observation that the poetic formula set out in “Tradition and the Individual Talent” was only one of the possible aesthetic models that Eliot was considering when writing the poem: “Indeed, to read the ten essays that Eliotrote in 1921 while working on *The Waste Land* is to discern the discontinuous but coherent outline of an aesthetics deeply at odds with the notions of decorum, repose, sobriety, and equilibrium typically associated with neoclassicism. One key word in Eliot’s critical vocabulary is ‘surprise,’ a term he stresses again and again. . . . In 1921, it] was only one of several options facing Eliot, and in relation to *The Waste Land*, “The Road Not Taken” might be the most appropriate title for it. And the road taken? The strange, the surprising, the fantastic, something very near to parody . . . histrionies” (50-51).

4. In “Eliot, Gender and Modernity,” her introduction to the recent collection of essays *Gender, Desire and Sexuality in T.S. Eliot*, Cassandra Laity explains that her volume of collected essays will build upon the growing critical interest in the relationship between modernism and the high and low cultures of modernity. She argues that this increased focus on Eliot’s engagement with modernity will bring to view “Eliot’s largely unexplored engagement with various public and private worlds of women, eroticism, and the feminine” (2). My reading of the mixing of genres, genders, and high and low cultural registers in *The Waste Land* participates in these new conversations within Eliot studies and repositions Eliot within dynamic conversations about modernity which focus on gender, on class, and on the cross-fertilization between high and low cultures.

5. My focus on narrative elements in *The Waste Land* allows me to consider the kind of “generic contract” that Eliot negotiated with his readers and the readerly desires and expectations that he engages in these moments of generic experimentation. I have found Fredric Jameson’s theory of the “generic contract” between authors and readers—“Genres are essentially literary institutions or social contracts between a writer and a specific public, whose function is to specify the proper use of a particular cultural artifact”—especially useful for considering the function of the narrative elements in Eliot’s poem (106).

6. For Phelan, “Lyricality,” in contrast, involves “somebody telling somebody else on some occasion for some purpose that something is—a situation, an emotion, a perception, an attitude, a belief; and . . . somebody telling somebody else on some occasion about his or her meditations on something” (635). Importantly, Phelan is interested in the response involved by the implied position of the “somebody else”; Phelan asserts that “two activities of the authorial audience are particularly salient: observing and judging” (634). Phelan distinguishes between the position of the audience in narrative and the audience’s position in the lyric mode: “Furthermore, in . . . lyric, the authorial audience is less in the position of observer and judge and more in the position of participant” (635). In the pub scene, the audience is definitely not allowed to partake of the “participant” role because the speaker is always claiming that she was “there” and stating her authority as witness while the authorial audience can only observe and judge the past events based on the speaker’s retelling.

7. I agree with Phelan’s definition of lyricality as an opposing mode that “is neutral on the issue of change for the speaker—it may or may not occur—and invested less in character and event than in
thoughts, attitudes, beliefs, emotions, and specific situations... Thus, the double movement of lyric (that is, of what is represented and of the audience’s response) is toward fuller revelation of the speaker’s situation and perspective and toward deeper understanding of and participation in what is revealed” (635). Interestingly, the narrativity of the pub scene resists these movements of the lyric in its refusal to be subsumed into a coherent lyric “I” speaking for the poem.

8. For a further discussion of the tendency of contemporary critics to privilege the lyric as the predominant mode in twentieth-century long poems see Susan Stanford Friedman, “Craving Stories: Narrative and Lyric in Contemporary Theory and Women’s Long Poems.”

9. Allison Tate argues that the pub scene narrator’s voice indexes the linguistic features of spoken speech rather than written narrative and also represents a distinctly working-class dialect, rather than simply a regional London accent. Tate asserts: “What we have here is much more a representation of working class dialect than regional dialect. It is one that draws on quite traditional stereotypes—linguistic and non linguistic—to achieve its effect... But rather than single lexical items, the distinctiveness of the language seems to lie in the use of set idiomatic phrases and a particular form of discursive organization associated with oral narration. The markers of oral narrative are worth noting, the frequency of reported speech tags ‘he said’... ‘I said’, (14 instances in the first 26 lines) and in the narrator’s impellations: ‘I said—I didn’t mince my words, I said to her myself... He did, I was there... she said, and gave me a straight look.’ These are forms characteristic of oral story telling’ (166). Tate’s linguistic evidence is compelling, although her larger argument about the scene underestimates the effect of this narrative interlude on the poem as a whole and neglects the ways in which it draws not only from oral story-telling modes, but also from the formal techniques, cultural associations, and subject-matter often associated with nineteenth-century novels.

10. In the first draft of the poem Lil says “Other women” instead of “Oh is there” until Pound suggested a change and it eventually developed to its present form. In the initial version, Lil seems less indicting of her friend or at least less quick in mistrusting her and in catching on to her threats and hints (Facsimile 13).

11. Carol Christ makes an interesting point about the juxtaposition of looking and the grotesque body in this section in her article, “Gender, Voice, and Figuration in Eliot’s Early Poetry,” (23–37). Christ argues: “A number of the images in ‘A Game of Chess’ reinforce this concern with the desire to look and its repression... All of the eyes that do not look... are juxtaposed to images of a deconstituted body, imagined alternately as male and as female: the change of Philomel, withered stumps of time... the teeth and baby Lil must lose. As the men in the section resist looking, so they do not speak. Albert is gone, and the speaker cannot or will not answer the hysterical questions of the lady” (33). Christ’s reading of the poem’s emphasis on deflected or problematic gazes and on the disfigured body in “A Game of Chess” suggests that the section of the poem draws attention to the ethics of looking and implicates the possibly distorting or at least transforming gaze of the desiring reader.

12. As J. Hillis Miller notes in his influential reading of the poem in Poets of Reality: Six Twentieth Century Writers, it is easy to doubt one’s interpretation of The Waste Land precisely because of the strong desire to create a narrative for oneself: “The Waste Land” works by the abrupt juxtaposition... The meaning emerges from the clash of adjacent images or from a line of action which the reader creates for himself. The poem works like those children’s puzzles in which a lion or a rabbit emerges from nowhere when the numbered dots are connected in sequence. Who is to say that the animal is really there? It may be an illegitimate patterning of what is in fact without pattern” (145). As Hillis Miller’s image of phantom meaning suggests, readers of The Waste Land have continually projected their own desires for narrative closure and fulfillment into their evaluation and interpretation of the poem. As Louis Menand avers in Discovering Modernism: T. S. Eliot and His Context, Eliot’s notes to the text also foreground and perhaps sharpen this readerly desire for interpretation, for master structure, and for teleological closure: “It is, to begin with, a poem that includes an interpretation—and one ‘probably not in accordance with the facts of its origin’—as part of the poem, and it is therefore a poem that makes a problem of its meaning precisely by virtue of its apparent (and apparently inadequate) effort to explain itself” (89).
13. In the pub scene, *The Waste Land* exploits the formal tensions of narrative and incorporates the instability of closure often associated with the genre of the novel. D. A. Miller has argued for the underlying tension between the unstable play of the "narratable" (the messiness of a text—the shifting meanings opened up by the erotic and semiotic threads that temporarily destabilize and dominate novelistic narratives) and the forced return to the "non-narratable" (the closed unified world before the text begins and after it ends). Miller defines the "narratable" as "the instances of disequilibrium, suspense, and general insufficiency from which a given narrative appears to arise. The term is meant to cover the various incitements to narrative, as well as the dynamic ensuing from such incitements, and it is thus opposed to the 'nonnarratable' state of quiescence assumed by a novel before the beginning and supposedly recovered by it at the end" (ix). Miller's argument suggests that narrative fundamentally contains a conflict between closure and what it attempts to "close": "It is my hope that the shift of emphasis—from narrative to its underlying impulsive narratives in the narratable—will better allow us to identify and account for a central tension in the traditional novelistic enterprise: namely, a discomfort with the processes and implications of narrative itself" (ix). By incorporating the pub narrative, the Eliots utilize the generic instability of narrative itself (the impossibility of ending and of foreclosing the pleasure of narratability) to raise crucial generic questions about the possibilities and potential tensions in the developing genre of modern poetry.

14. In her recent book, *Genders, Races, and Religious Cultures in Modern American Poetry, 1908–1934*, Rachel Blau DuPlessis articulates the gender dynamics that complicate traditional lyric structures of meaning: "One of the key narratives that constructs traditional lyrics is 'masculine, hetero-sexual desire,' with its interests in a silent, beautiful, distant female object of longing...there is often a triangulated situation in the lyric: an overly male 'I,' speaking as if overheard in front of an unseen but postulated, loosely male 'us' about a (Beloved) 'she'" (29). If we accept DuPlessis's assertion that triangulated desire lies at the heart of the structure of the traditional lyric, then how might we interpret the pub scene as enacting a distinctly different dynamic with an overly female speaker, reporting female-to-female discourse, as if overheard to an audience of both genders (Bill, May, Lou and "us") about her rival Lil? Perhaps, by inverting the traditional lyric gendering (of both audience and speaker), Eliot hopes to explore the possibilities offered by the non-lyric mode of narrative.

15. See Susan Stanford Friedman, "Craving Stories: Narrative and Lyric in Contemporary Theory and Women's Long Poems." Unlike the many critics whom Friedman sees as privileging the lyric as the site of potential feminist power, I argue that relationship between the lyric and narrative relationship in *The Waste Land* shows that in this case it is actually the narrative that is a more powerful avenue for expressing the female, un-patriarchal, un-authoritarian voices in the poem. The pub scene narrative resists fitting in with the order of the lyric sequences that compose the rest of the poem and functions as a moment of resistance which is more linked to revolutionary potential. The use of narrative in the poem contradicts the usual association of lyric with freedom of speech and narrative with authoritarian control and masculine power that Stanford Friedman describes as a common critical opinion.

16. Richard Badenhausen reads Pound's self-description of the process of the making of *The Waste Land* as revelatory of certain psychosexual roles and dynamics within the Pound-Eliot collaboration. Badenhausen argues that Pound's poetic description of the collaborative effort genders the editing process as male: "Pound's own 'reading' of his collaboration on *The Waste Land*, in his whimsical poem 'Sage Homme,' emphasizes hierarchy and situates Pound in a dominant position... Although one does not want to make too much of Pound's 'Sage Homme,' as a whole it reveals him intuitively gendering the editorial act, and places him in the dominant, active, male role marking up a passive, feminine manuscript... In fact the characterization rang so true with Eliot that he hoped in January 1922 to print Pound's lines about the caesarean operation 'in italics in front' of the entire poem, a move that would have publicly announced collaboration as a norm in modernism (LI 504)" (71). Pound's gendering act here contributes to the misleading masculinizing myth of the making of the poem—and of modernism—and can be corrected if we revise this version of the story to include the voice and contribution of Vivien Eliot. For a fuller account of the homoerotics of the Pound-Eliot collaboration see Wayne Koestenbaum, *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration*. 
17. Badenhausen focuses almost exclusively on The Criterion "Letters of the Moment" 1 and 2 and on the psychosocial dynamics of the Eliot's collaborative relationship shown in these letters. Shannon McRae suggests that "the poem is thoroughly imbued with Vivien's presence—as an object of the poet's terror and as a figure for his desire... she is a central, metaphoric node in the complex matrix of the mythic, literary, and libidinal cross-references from which it was constituted" (194). Although her arguments about Vivien's influence on the poem are compelling, McRae chooses not to discuss Vivien's role in shaping the pub-scene, focusing instead on her psychological influences on Tom and on scenes where Vivien may have been represented in the women figured, like the neurotic woman of the first half of "A Game of Chess" or Fresca. Loretta Johnson is very brief in her assessment of Vivien's annotations to The Waste Land, simply stating the changes Vivien makes to "A Game of Chess" and saying that they are "more convincing" than the lines Eliot had originally drafted. Like Badenhausen, Johnson focuses on Vivien's published work that appeared in the criterion between 1924 and 1925: "There were twelve contributions—sketches, short stories, letters, reviews, and a poem—by authors with names beginning "F. M." Eliot explained in a letter to Ada Leversee in 1925, "I believe you must have guessed that all the contributions signed F. M. are by Vivien Eliot" (50). Johnson reads these contributions to The Criterion as biographically relevant semi-autobiographical sketches of unhappy women and their marriages. Importantly, Victor P. H. Li argues against confining interest in Vivien to purely biographical studies. Li makes an interesting argument for the generic implications of Vivien's "double-voiced discourse": "Vivienne [sic] Eliot's pseudonyms and 'feminine' prose sketches are forms of critical mimicry in which certain 'gender generic' assumptions are ostensibly adopted only for them to be revealed as inadequate or limiting" (74–75). While Li's argument about Vivien's later work in The Criterion is compelling, he does not address how her challenging of these gender and generic assumptions might apply to her collaborative work on The Waste Land.

18. Like many other critics, Seymour-Jones focuses almost exclusively on the emotional life of Vivien Eliot—briefly mentioning her creative bursts, but mainly as symptoms or contributing factors to her unhappiness—and surprisingly, she does not revise the Eliot-Pound "birthing of modernism" story.

19. Of course this style may only typify the letters by Vivien that have been published. While much of Vivien's published correspondence centers around her illnesses and the Eliot's financial and household worries, she does also write to publishers and literary friends about Tom's writing and about her role in their marriage. In a letter to Eliot's brother Henry on October 11, 1916, Vivien candidly expresses her feelings about Tom's leaving Harvard: "Tom took a much larger risk than that would be—a year ago—and I can swear he has never regretted it. Of course he has had me to shove him—I supply the motive power, and I do shove. If you were here I should shove you!" (Letters 157). Vivien reveals her openness and her warmth to Henry (whom she had not yet met) and her mix of humor and honesty in this letter typify her epistolary voice in her most expressive letters.

20. In a letter to Pound on June 27th, 1922, Vivien describes her illness and her symptoms with sort of a wry sense of humor: "First of all, Colitis. This is, I am told, a symptom in itself. It may apparently be a symptom of anything, nobody seems to know what. ... This is an extremely stupid letter." TSE wrote a postscript: "Vivien has shown me this letter and I think it is quite inadequate as a description of her case" (Letters 533).

21. The full quote from Woolf's diary reads: "But oh—Vivienne! Was there ever such a torture since life began,—to bear on one's shoulders, biting, wriggling, raving, scratching, unharmless, powdered, insane. ... This bag of ferrets is what Tom wears round his neck" (6).

22. Eliot shortened this suggested line, omitting Vivien's "to have," in the published versions of the poem.

23. The drafts of The Waste Land emphasize Eliot's use of fiction as a source of inspiration for his poem. The initial title of the "A Game of Chess" section was "In the Cage." That title looks back to Henry James's story narrating the unorthodox reading practices of a young female telegraphist and conjures up another working-class reader who imaginatively spins narratives from the coded messages that she
transmits. While there has been critical disagreement about the reference of this title—many follow Valerie Eliot’s note in her edition of the drafts which point to Sibyl’s cage and others like Michael Levenson in *A Genealogy of Modernism: A Study of Literary Doctrine, 1908–1922* have pointed to James’s story as the title’s source—I argue that Eliot alludes to James’s tale because of the specific phrasing of the line (i.e. not in “a cage” as the Sibyl complains—but “in the Cage” which echoes exactly James’s title for his tale of the telegraphist). Additionally, Eliot’s substitution of “A Game of Chess” (referencing Middleton’s text) gives weight to the idea that Eliot was searching for a title of an older text to function as the title of his poem’s subsection. Also the content of the section includes working-class story-telling and unsatisfying upper-class romance—two themes in James’s text. In James’s narrative, the telegraphist transforms telegrams—the coded terse messages that epitomize communication under the urban conditions of modernity—into romances and fantasizes about her role as the ideal reader, the one who cracks the code. Eliot’s allusions to fictional readers who imaginatively transform modern scraps (newspapers and telegrams) into compelling narrative performances (i.e. Sloppy’s different voices and the telegraphist’s cracking of the lovers’ code) suggest that Eliot wanted his poem to grapple with the types of readerly performances and desires engendered by narrative techniques.

24. While Lawrence Rainey argues, in *Revisiting The Waste Land*, that Eliot draws from popular narrative modes of “typist fiction” in the descriptive account of the typist’s try in “The Fire Sermon,” I do not see this moment as participating in the same narrative associations and readerly desires as the pub sequence. Unlike the multiple female voices which emerge in the pub scene, the typist’s voice is unheard and all is told by the detached, third-person voice of Tiresias. The highbrow allusion to Tiresias as the lyric (and potentially epic) speaker who has perceived the scene reduces the narrative drive of the moment. Rainey argues that Eliot draws from the “topoi of contemporary journalism and realistic fiction which treated typists: a single room with cramped conditions, poor food, a bed that doubles as a couch or divan, references to female garments” (61). Unlike the typist plot which draws on these familiar topoi in order to emphasize the predictable arc of the typist’s fate, in the pub-scene the plot-line is unpredictable—the speaker builds suspense and when the narrative gets cut off violently there is no possibility of simply filling in the blanks. For Rainey, the predictable plot of the typist becomes tragic and as “automatic” as the movement of her hand. While Rainey views Eliot’s narrative gestures in the creation of the typist as formulaic and thus emblematic of the pathetic, automated, plottedness of modernity, I argue that the narrative gesture in the pub resists such a reading and instead opens up a space for female and working-class voices to emerge and for pleasurable readerly desire. It is precisely the unplottedness of the pub speaker’s narrative that elicits the reader’s interest and the instability of the narrative (the pub-call’s reminder that at any moment it will be cut off) that stimulates the reader’s desires.

25. Interestingly, despite their excision from the poem, a heavily revised version of these lines later circulated more publicly in *The Criterion* when they were published under “F.M.” (one of Vivien’s pseudonyms). There is some critical disagreement on whether they were written by Vivien or Tom: Valerie Eliot says they are originally Eliot’s (citing drafted versions in a black exercise book) and Badenhausen agrees, but others like Carole Seymour-Jones disagree and attribute them to Vivien.

26. Shannon McRae offers an excellent comparative reading of Fresca as she emerges in the facsimile drafts and of Fresca as she appears in the version later printed in *The Criterion* by approaching the multiple possibilities contingent upon who (Vivien or Tom) wrote the initial lines and who revised them. For a reading of the Fresca lines as part of the developing manuscript see Philip Cohen. Wayne Koestenbaum contextualizes Fresca as part of Eliot’s larger engagement in processes of hysteria.

27. Philip Cohen’s discussion of Part V: “What the Thunder Says” offers a good example of this critical tendency: he reads the poem’s conclusion as a resolution of voices into a single lyric-speaker: “The tale is told by the different voices of one shadowy speaker—the quester himself” (16). Cohen argues that the drafts show that the development of the poem led Eliot in the final section to adopt a much more personal prophetic and lyric voice: “After effacing himself behind his creation, the poet enters center stage as a prophet speaking in a voice very similar to his own, perhaps not to all mankind but only to himself” (19). Calvin Bedient takes a more extreme stance as he argues that a single protagonist performs the whole poem in his pointedly titled book, *He Do the Police in Different Voices: The Waste Land and Its Protagonist*. 
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