Abstract

Ezra Pound and T.S. Eliot were friends and collaborators. The effect of this on their work shows similar ideas and methodological beliefs regarding theory and formal technique usage, though analyses of both theories in tandem are few and far between. This essay explores the parallels between Pound’s Imagist theory and ideogrammic methods and Eliot’s objective correlative as outlined in his 1921 essay, ‘Hamlet and His Problems’, and their similar intellectual debt to Walter Pater and his ‘cult of the moment’. Eliot’s epic poem, ‘The Waste Land’ (1922) does not at first appear to have any relationship with Pound’s Imagist theory, though Pound edited it extensively. Further investigation, however, finds the same kind of ideogrammic methods in ‘The Waste Land’ as used extensively in Pound’s Imagist poetry, showing that Eliot has intellectual Imagist heritage, which in turn encouraged his development of the objective correlative. The ultimate conclusion from this essay is that Pound and Eliot’s friendship and close proximity encouraged a similarity in their theories that has not been fully explored in the current literature.

Introduction

Eliot’s Waste Land is I think the justification of the ‘movement,’ of our modern experiment, since 1900

—Ezra Pound, 1971

Ezra Pound (1885–1972) and Thomas Stearns Eliot (1888–1965) were not only poetic contemporaries but also friends and collaborators. Pound was the instigator of modernism’s first literary movement, Imagism, which centred on the idea of the one-image poem. A benefit of Pound’s theoretically divisive Imagist movement was that it prepared literary society to welcome the work of later modernist poets such as Eliot, who regularly used Imagist techniques such as concise composition, parataxis and musical rhythms to make his poetry, specifically ‘The Waste Land’ (1922), decidedly ‘modern’. It is arguable that one of the reasons ‘The Waste Land’ has specific Imagist influences is because Pound edited it in great depth.
Also notable is that one of the theories for which Eliot is most known—the objective correlative, published in 1921 in ‘Hamlet and His Problems’—is distinctly similar to Pound’s ideogrammic method, also known as ‘super-position’, explained and published five years earlier in *Gaudier-Brzeska* (1916).

This essay sequentially examines Pound’s Imagist theory, Pound’s and Eliot’s debts to past theorists, Eliot’s theory of the objective correlative and its relationship to Pound’s super-position or ideogrammic method, and the resulting impact of Imagism on the composition of ‘The Waste Land’. Eliot’s ‘The Waste Land’ is used as a case study to identify the theoretical relationship between Pound’s Imagism and Eliot’s theory and poetry, whilst Pound’s and Eliot’s shared scholarly influences are investigated to highlight the common similarities in their famous theoretical arguments.

### Imagism and the cult of the moment

By the summer of 1912, Pound had first referred to a poem as ‘Imagist’, and by November 1912 he had published his own volume of poetry, *Ripostes*, with T.E. Hulme’s five Imagist poems as an appendix, titled ‘The Complete Poetical Works of T.E. Hulme’. Defining the Imagist Image became more elaborate once it became evident that Pound’s poetic theory did not remain static but was constantly evolving over the lifespan of Imagism and Vorticism. However, the most enduring definition of the Image was published in ‘A Few Don’ts’ (1913) as follows:

> An ‘Image’ is that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time … It is the presentation of such a ‘complex’ instantaneously which gives that sense of sudden liberation; that sense of freedom from time limits and space limits; that sense of sudden growth, which we experience in the presence of the greatest works of art.

Pound’s most thorough explanation of the ideogrammic method or super-position is in the essay ‘Vorticism’, which states: ‘the one image poem’ is a form of super-position … it is one idea set on top of another’ (1914). His most well-known example is ‘In a Station of the Metro’; ‘one idea set on top of another’ is structurally replicated so the reader can see the precise moment of interaction but because the lines are not enjambed, the ideas are kept distinctly separate (Lewis 2010: 10).

> ‘In A Station of the Metro’
> The apparition of these faces in the crowd;
> Petals on a wet, black bough.

As an interpretive metaphor, the comparison makes clear that super-position in an Image is about the relationship between two ideas where no complete merger will ever take place. The ‘Image’ occurs in the act of mind and lies after and between the
two images: after, in that it is the poem’s experience of fusion; and between, in that it lies between where the two images meet. The result of Pound’s super-position is a density and energy made from a perfect combination of words that it creates for its author an equation for both emotion and an intellectual experience. Korn notes that the ‘emotional charge which intensifies language has “come upon” the intellect of the reader and fused with it, forming a new mode of experience … [while remaining as] words on the page’ (1983: 83). The Image creates movement within the subconcious and Altieri notes that perhaps the poet ‘can be the only true realist because the true pressures of his limited form and his linguistic skills might make it possible to capture the vitality of objects and ideas’ (1976: 109–110). Through limiting the poetic form to succinct, direct language, the poet can bring to the surface the vibrancy contained in a complex, leaving it free to pulse with poetic energy as the poet intended.

It is likely that Pound’s Imagist idea of super-position influenced the theory and development behind Eliot’s objective correlative—if the same conclusion was not arrived at separately—as both ideas present the idea of a poetic ‘equation’ for emotional or psychological response within a reader. Knowing that Eliot and Pound were close acquaintances and that Eliot was affiliated with the Imagists even though he was not technically categorised as an ‘Imagist’ himself, means that it is likely Pound’s theories filtered into Eliot’s own literary developments. Which begs the question: when Eliot is equating images in ‘The Waste Land’ with the intention to create a new emotional poetic experience, is he using the Imagist idea of super-position, his own idea of the objective correlative, or are the two ideas one and the same? The answer is likely to be a mix of all of the above; whilst Cooper calls Eliot’s objective correlative ‘a theory of how works of art convey not just ideas or themes but the full breadth and textures of experience’ (2006: 62), Beasley reminds her readers that Pound ‘Designated the “Image” [to be] … the effect that happens after the poem’ (2007: 39) which includes the emotional response as well as the mental process.

Kenner describes Pound’s Imagism as:

energy … [and] effort. It does not appease itself by reproducing what is seen, but by setting some other seen thing into relation … The ‘plot’ of the poem is the mind’s activity, fetching some new thing into the field of consciousness. The action passing through any Imagist poem is a mind’s invisible action discovering what will come next that may sustain the presentation … (1971: 186).

Kenner’s Image is an active complex, existing within the boundaries of the poem but filled with energy; not only of the words themselves but of the relationships between them and the direct correlations that the mind makes, therefore sustaining both the active and creative mind. Hakutani (1992: 48) suggests that the reason for Pound’s insistence for why a poetic image must be active instead of passive is because a poem is not a description of something, but as Aristotle had stated in
Poetics (Butcher 2009), an action. Pound’s description of his ‘metro emotion’ in ‘In a Station of the Metro’, described as him having seen ‘suddenly a beautiful face, and then another and another …’ (Pound 1914) was translated from feeling into dynamic sensorial experience through the use of the active word ‘apparition’. Pound ‘approaches Aristotelianism in his insistence … [that] according to his experience, this particular image instantly transformed itself into another image’ (Hakutani 1992: 48), as Aristotle declared in Poetics, the poet ‘must represent men either as better than in real life, or as worse, or as they are’ (Butcher 2009), meaning that for the concept of representation to mean something, there has to be something in reality to represent. Neither Eliot nor Aristotle talk about an ‘inward looking reproduction of the workings of the poet’s mind’ (Olsen 2012: 6); imitation, as Aristotle saw it and the objective correlative agrees, ‘points outwards’ (Olsen 2012: 6). Whilst a phenomenon worthy of a poet’s imitation might be the traditional epic in Aristotle’s day, Eliot might have found that a scene would be a befitting objective correlative of a modern poet’s reaction.

Eliot did credit Hulme with ‘an infusion’ to his early thought, specifically regarding the opposition of ‘Classicism’ to ‘Romanticism’ … In composing an Image, writes Hulme, the poet selects ‘certain images which, put into juxtaposition in separate lines, serve to suggest and to evoke the state he feels.’ Hulme likens [this] to ‘a chord in music: They unite to suggest an image that is different to both.’ … The important point for our purposes is that the sum of two images forms a third … the ‘Image’ is a relation, but also a union [that is] initiated or inspired by a relation (Lewis 2010: 110).

It is undeniable that both Eliot and Pound have creative debts to the past, including strong influences from the French Symbolists, Henri Bergson and in particular, English writer and critic Walter Pater. Walter Pater (1839–94) wrote of unequalled moments ‘streaming by’ (Kenner 1971: 182) and defined the Paternian image as ‘an attention which, rescuing … [the moments] from the flux of time, will render them static, hence pictorial’ (Kenner 1971: 182). Bornstein (1977: 44) referred to a list of ‘aesthetic debts’ that Pound had owing to Pater that was based upon an ‘emphasis on … [and] cult of the moment’. Pater introduced the idea that in a ‘whirlpool’ of impressions, of the ‘inward world of thought and feeling … art comes to you proposing frankly to give nothing but the highest quality to your moments as they pass, and simply for those moments’ sake’ (Pater 1868). Pound’s intense interest in arresting and capturing moments to create an Image is in opposition to typical Romantic poetry that favoured sequential development. Rendering Pater’s images ‘static, hence pictorial’ as Kenner (1971) defines it above adds a fundamentally diachronic nature to them.

In a different sense, Eliot too, has debts to Pater, though his are less obvious in their construction. Eliot’s ‘emotion which is inexpressible, because it is in excess of the facts as they appear’ (Eliot 1921a) is very similar to Pater’s adulatory description of an ineffable ‘passion and energy [being] greater than any known issue of them.
Ezra Pound’s Imagist theory and T.S. Eliot’s objective correlative explains’ (Pater 1868). Significantly, however, their valuations are ‘diametrically opposed’ (DeLaura 1965: 430). Pater’s detailing of an artistic mechanism—that Sandro Botticelli from the Renaissance is an ‘entire’ artist because he suggests ‘original sentiment’ that has not necessarily been elicited straight from the facts—is inverted by Eliot who seemingly took what was ‘the objectionable imprecision and subjectivity’ (DeLaura 1965: 430) of Romantic judgements of success but retained the same elements of the aesthetic equation. Eliot was then able to apply a criterion of adequacy to *Hamlet*, which condemned the romantic art of the play and, subsequently for Eliot, provided a base for his objectively anti-Romantic theory of poetry and drama.

**Eliot’s objective correlative**

Part of the difficulty in properly defining Eliot’s ‘objective correlative’ stemmed from the numerous synonyms he used interchangeably to describe his theory. ‘Hamlet and His Problems’ (1921a) uses several alternatives to form a picture of what an ‘objective correlative’ is:

‘Emotion’: defined as ‘feeling’ (twice), ‘feelings’ (once), ‘state of mind’ (once).

‘Correlative’: defined as ‘equivalence’ (twice), ‘equivalent’ (twice), ‘adequacy’ (once).

‘Objective’:

a) First used to describe sensorially perceived objects: ‘external’ (twice), ‘out there’ (once).

‘Objective’:

b) Secondly appears in the forms ‘adequate’ (once) ['adequate equivalent for it'], ‘exact’ (once) ['exact equivalence'], ‘objectify’ (once).

(Frank 1972: 312)

Although Washington Allston had used the term ‘objective correlative’ nearly a century earlier, it first became a well-known phrase under Eliot’s name. In the ‘Introductory Discourse’ of his ‘Lectures on Art’, published posthumously in 1850, the American poet and painter Allston proposed that ‘mental pleasures [or emotions] are produced when the senses convey impressions of the material world … so, too, is the external world to the mind; which needs, also, as the condition of its manifestation, its objective correlative.’ (Allston 1850: 15; cited in Wright 1970: 590) It is possible that Eliot had read Allston whilst at Harvard but if he was citing him it was most probably not consciously as he had correctly referenced the remainder of ‘Hamlet and His Problems’ (1921a).
Eliot first cites *Hamlet*, the play, as the focus of his inquiry—not Hamlet, the protagonist—and then, as Stevenson (1954: 70) elucidates, Eliot delves into his explanation for the fact that there is a ‘central and peculiar difficulty [in the play … because] there is no objective equivalence in its events or in the actions of its other character’s for Hamlet’s expressed feelings of disgust’. The way to properly articulate feelings is through use of the objective correlative, as outlined below by Eliot (1921a):

The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an ‘objective correlative’; in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked.

Eliot does not give further clarification of the objective correlative, but rather offers it as fact. He deems *Hamlet* an artistic failure due to Hamlet’s outpouring of emotion compared to the seemingly mismatched events of the play. To express emotion, a corresponding objective event must occur because in *Hamlet* the play, Hamlet’s mother is not ‘an adequate equivalent’ for his disgust because it ‘exceeds her’ (Eliot 1921a). Stevenson is critically aware that, unlike Shakespeare’s other plays, in *Hamlet* Shakespeare does not devote any portion of the play to ‘demonstrating the cause or the inception of Hamlet’s feelings. It is almost wholly concerned with the moment by moment exposition of the consequence of these feelings’ (1954: 70). The cause of Hamlet’s feelings is not thoroughly explored and it is possible this is the reason his feelings are not understood. Within the play, Hamlet is restrained by the progressive revelation of his emotions and their consequences and is not given the opportunity to explore his emotions or reason his way out of them; one of the main duties of his role is to watch them play out without himself or, even at times, the audience truly understanding why particular events were set in motion or connected to Hamlet.

Eliot (1921a) noted that the ‘artistic “inevitability” lies in this complete adequacy of the external to the emotion; and this is precisely what is deficient in Hamlet’. However, Hamlet ‘is dominated by an emotion which is inexpressible, because it is in excess of the facts as they appear’. For an audience to empathise with a character, they must express emotion on an approachable level associated with factual events but, more importantly, for an author to understand their character’s state of mind, the author must also understand their own emotions and feelings. The central concern for the objective correlative is ‘a need of the artist [and] his urge to search for an understanding of his own emotions or feelings’ (Frank 1972: 314) which is precisely the same function of Pound’s ideogrammic method. Both the objective correlative and Pound’s ideogrammic method are literary equations for authors to express emotions and feelings, who share them once they are ‘accessible
to contemplation’. In ‘Vorticism’, Pound states that a ‘given subject or emotion belongs to that artist, or to that sort of artist who must know it most intimately and most intensely before he can render it adequately in his art’.

However, when an objective event occurs, the witness to the event—such as Eliot—has no way of knowing the internal stimulus for the character’s emotions—their past experiences, their painful memories, etc. By Eliot’s definition, the character should operate out of the context of their lives and only within a strictly defined relationship of themselves to the event, and so without information being introduced that may explain out-of-character expression of emotion, there is only the emotion that can balance whatever event that has happened at a given time and little to no regard for a character’s past history or fluctuating mood. Frank (1972: 312) also challenges Eliot’s assessment of Shakespeare by declaring that ‘a character’s overreaction or under-reaction is the necessary condition of both tragic catharsis and comic catastasis’, which, in turn, assumes that Hamlet’s overreaction is crucial in categorising the play as a tragedy because he is so dominated by inexpressible emotion. Whilst Eliot determines Hamlet’s inadequate show of balanced emotion to be the most harrowing thing about the famous tragedy, Frank cites the imbalance of human reason and emotion as the constituent that makes it tragic.

There is a direct relationship between the Poundian super-position as an equation for emotion or experience and Eliot’s objective correlative as an external ‘exact equivalent’ (1921) for an author’s projected emotion. In *Gaudier-Brzeska*, when discussing the thought process prior to and during the conception of ‘In a Station of the Metro’, Pound refers to finding an ‘expression’:

"I do not mean that I found words, but there came an equation … not in speech, but in little splotches of colour. It was just that—a ‘pattern’, or hardly a pattern, if by ‘pattern’ you mean something with a ‘repeat’ in it. But it was a word, the beginning, for me, of a language in colour (1970: 87)."

Pound’s emphasis on needing an emotional equation to exist in order for an Image to be conveyed through an Imagist poem is a startlingly similar idea to Eliot’s theory, published in ‘Hamlet and His Problems’, that ‘the only way of expressing emotion [in literature] is by finding … the formula of that particular emotion’ (1921a). Both critics expressed a desire to find an exact equation in literary form for emotion; whilst Pound is more painterly in his descriptions, Eliot’s is more schematised as Eliot was aware of basic Imagist principles even though his was written after Imagism’s heyday.
Imagism in ‘The Waste Land’

Imagism in Eliot’s theory is more than a promotion of free verse. ‘The Waste Land’ and the objective correlative also utilise typically Imagist spare verse and juxtapose seemingly opposite words and images. Through appropriating Imagist techniques, Eliot learned that the ‘power of the poem … stems ultimately from Eliot’s ability to transcend the inherent confinements of language and to approximate an “intermediate area of meaning” which encompasses the response of individual readers’ (Gamlin 2010: 63) into the poem itself. The Imagist idea that the end result or experience of the poem can be more powerful than the poem itself was first coined by Pound whilst developing the idea of the super-positioned ‘Image’. He proposed that a psychological, almost Jungian experience could be had through poetry by provoking a reader into a transcendent state through a combination or ‘equation’ of sparse words that would lead to a fuller and richer aesthetic and artistic experience as their mind filled in the gaps.

Lewis (2010: 88) notes that Eliot’s comments at the time, such as one citing Imagists as ‘the starting point of modern poetry’ imply a perception of the Imagists as peers of his, while his work displays ‘relevant affinities’ with Imagism. Images can be discerned in his poetry according to their ‘concrete imagery and … singular intimacy of language and object’.

Eliot makes reference to the idea of the objective correlative, or the combined Image, early in the poem, citing that ‘Son of man,/You cannot say, or guess, for you know only/A heap of broken images’ (1922: 20–22). Such Imagist nostalgia serves to remind the reader of Eliot’s poetic history, but the sentence itself indicates not only the modernist poetic predicament but also the forthcoming structure of ‘The Waste Land’. Knowing only ‘A heap of broken images’ (1922: 22) and being forced to make meaning between them is the psychological act that Altieri (1976) believes is the modernist objective regarding the act of the mind in modern poetry. ‘The Waste Land’ embodies the disjointed imagery and the aesthetic strategy of the direct, presentational objective image, and the subsequent problems created by these strategies. Once the narrator has denied the meaning in what were largely former Romantic symbols, he is ‘trapped in a consciousness … [that maintains] a delicate balance between a variety of metonymic images, all suffused with a nagging sense of how much the images seek to participate in larger wholes or structures of meaning’ (Altieri 1976: 106). How, asks Altieri, can one deal with metonymy when one is convinced that the source of despair, the human condition as it may be, is not metonymy but ‘the dream that consciousness can find single unifying structures?’ (1976: 109) Eliot’s answer to this struggle is to place the pieces of ‘The Waste Land’ into a pattern of a single organising myth—that of Tiresias, the Fisher King—and to encourage a mythical-historical reading of the poem through his extra written ‘Notes’ that accompany it, verifying his authorial authority as both a presence in the poem and an external influence giving an imperative regarding how he meant it to be read.
It is possible that Eliot’s creation of the Fisher King was his attempt to create ‘The Waste Land’s objective correlative; that is, a mythical structure that provides some degree of unity and emotional rationality. Through this process, and the search for mythical coherence as foundation for a collective human identity, was created what Altieri terms a ‘myth of myth’—a single or unified mental image that is ‘shadowed forth in the fragments particular cultures had taken as their basic image of reality’ (1976: 108–109). Once realising that this method opens the poem to a range of interpretations and intensifies the fragmentation it seeks to oppose, Eliot instead tried to concentrate the poem’s structures in pursuit of unity and uses sentences of rhetorical doubling to provoke the mind into a meditative state; i.e. ‘I was neither,/Living nor dead, and I knew nothing’ (1976: 39–40). The emphasis on myth as humanity’s unifying structure is explored in Eliot’s essay ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’ (1921b) and is a similar theme that both Eliot and Pound share in their works. Eliot theorised of literary history as a ‘simultaneous order’ of literary works where the poet should write ‘with a feeling that whole of the literature of Europe’ is behind him, whereas Pound proposed a ‘method of Luminous Detail’, whereby a scholar presents a ‘few dozen carefully chosen facts that will sum up the [historical or literary] period under discussion’ (Beasley 2007: 66).

The Imagist language of fragmentation and alienation is apparent within ‘The Waste Land’ as the language of the post-war generation was largely defined by Eliot’s poem. The modernist template was heavily influenced by this work of ‘high aesthetic self-consciousness and non-representationalism’ (Bradbury & McFarlane 1796: 25; cited in Beasley 2007: 79) which treats the First World War as a symptom of its main subject—the ‘disintegration of civilisation in the modern world’ (Beasley 2007: 80). Whilst at first ‘The Waste Land’ may read as somewhat confusing or as a heap of disproportionate images, it is actually its articulateness and coherent language that leads the reader deeper within its intensive style. Eliot calls it ‘that at which I have long aimed, in writing poetry … poetry standing naked in its bare bones’ (Matthiessen 1947: 90) as it is free of romantic or ornamental phrase, which also heralds back to Pound’s first and second Imagist objectives as published in 1913. Pound’s editing technique and economical cutting contribute an Imagist element as it introduces subsequent run-on parataxis, which become a defining stylistic feature of the poem and helped characterise its ‘fractured’ nature. Perhaps the most obvious and concrete indication of Imagism in ‘The Waste Land’ is the reminder that it was, in fact, essentially a collaboration between Eliot and Pound. Though originally composed by Eliot, Pound’s editorial work on the poem was undeniable once the facsimile of ‘The Waste Land’s draft manuscripts were published in 1971. Pound edited Eliot’s drafts in January 1922, making ‘major cuts from the beginnings of parts one, three and four and from the middle section of part three … and suggesting many more changes to individual words and phrases’ (Beasley 2007: 92). Rainey deems Pound’s process one of ‘uncanny insight’ (2005: 98) as his editorial intervention helped shape the poem into ‘The work of wild,
irredeemable fury that we know today’ (2005: 98). He deleted three of Eliot’s narratives from parts I, III and IV, which means that the poem lacks any kind of linear storytelling that traditionally is representative of spatio-temporal and logical-causal connectedness and understanding. Not only did Pound slash a good estimated two-thirds of Eliot’s work from the poem—which, in effect, illustrated the second Imagist imperative to ‘use no word that does not contribute to the presentation’ (Pound 1918)—but it created a context by which collaboration could be used as part of the creative process in the landscape of the poem’s spare voices. Rainey comments that ‘The Waste Land’, whilst lacking a narrative, has instead ‘the scent of a narrative, hovering in the air like a perfume after someone has left the room’ (2005: 99). This ‘scent’ is the process of the mind’s workings as it puts together Eliot’s allusive pieces. This, however, does help explain in part why ‘The Waste Land’ had Imagist influences aside from the objective correlative—because it was edited and added to by an Imagist.

The following couplet is an example of Pound’s parataxis inside ‘The Waste Land’:

It has no windows, and the door swings,
Dry bones can harm no one.
(1922: 389–390)

This refers to an empty chapel that the wind has made home. The two sentences in isolation added together makes less sense than what they mean in conjunction or their meaning in relationship. The structure of the chapel is missing its windows and can be referred to as the ‘dry bones’ of the leftover church, whilst the door swinging and the statement that it can ‘harm no one’ implies an emptiness of people and place that is concurrent with the barren nature of the ‘decayed hole among the mountains’ (1922: 385). ‘Dry bones’ is also a reference to the open and standing gravesites that abandoned buildings have come to comprise; without the life force of a community that keeps its inanimate buildings fresh and living, so too do structures die and dry out: windows disappear and the door swings because of wind in the absence of people. Reading further into this super-positioned couplet, though the door is swinging and dry bones are mentioned, the assumption is made that the buildings and town are so empty that even the ghosts of the town have left. The door swings but there is nothing ghostly about it because it ‘can harm no one’ (1922: 390). Dry bones infer the passing of the time and a similar ‘drying out’ of memories, whereas not only is the foundation of the house its own dry skeleton but it may be a suggestion that due to the lack of people living there for some time, there are no fresh bones in the town’s graveyards. The poem’s principal didacticism of rebirth is unsaid but yearned for in this couplet as the town is so empty that even its ghosts have left it; only the sun and wind remain.

The parataxis in ‘The Waste Land’ is not always confined to two single lines as exhibited by Pound’s ‘In A Station of the Metro’. Instead, in the same vein of the grand, sweeping epic, so too are his examples larger and grandiose. Paragraphs
describing a single image are set upon paragraphs describing a second without any discernible connecting thread and these apparently unconnected images create a poem of shattered images, unified in part by its theme of fragmentation. An example of this is found in stanza I, ‘The Burial of the Dead’: lines 43–59 describe a visit to clairvoyant Madame Sosostris, whilst lines 60–76 describe a crowd of people ‘flow[ing] over London Bridge’ (1922: 62). The two separate paragraphed images are at first seemingly unrelated but the objective mind’s understanding of each paragraph’s various allusions and contextual quotations means it can draw out intellectual and emotional similarities to make meaning. Madame Sosostris presents a card showing the drowned Phoenician Sailor, which highlights the destructive power of life-giving water and emphasises the next paragraph that shows crowds of men flowing like the dead over London Bridge, which sits above the River Thames. Previous paragraphs also repeat images of water in different forms—of snow, ‘a shower of rain’ (9), lush hyacinth flowers—and water’s absence—‘fear in a handful of dust’ (30). These images of nature’s life cycle are interrupted at the end of Part I with the reminder of how Stetson, friend of the narrator from the Punic War, has unnaturally buried a corpse in his garden with the intention to make it grow again through water’s renewing power, though nothing will make it rise again. The Punic War is used as a reminder that all wars are destructive and ultimately, much the same and even if a single man cannot be rebirthed from nature, the world itself can heal from each war much like Stetson’s garden is growing or at the very least, continuing to exist on the top of his buried corpse.

Conclusion

Korn stresses that for Pound the Image was not meant to mirror reality but at the same time, ‘he was quite clear that it is not symbolic—it does not simply “mean” something else … the aim is to create a flash of understanding in the reader’s mind: an affective, psychological event’ (1983: 78). She also makes the comment that in his addendum is the ‘[Walter] Pater-like comment that the effect of instantaneous presentation … [triggers the] sense of growth and liberation, always produced by great art’. Pound’s aim to evoke the sense of great art through psychological liberation is noticed by Korn, who states that for Pound ‘the Image is rather an affective process [not just a mimetic creation] causing a psychological event’. In this sense, Eliot’s fragmentary pieces approximate a minefield for the careless reader as there is little coherent thread on which the poem can balance or be strung together. In 1926, literary critic I.A. Richards added an appendix ‘The Poetry of T.S. Eliot’ to his Principles of Literary Criticism where he felt that searching for such a thread was pointless since the unity of the poem lay in the ‘accord, contrast and interaction of their emotional effects’ (Richards 1926: 231) instead of an intellectual scheme. Ultimately, the degree of Imagist influence on Eliot cannot be finitely measured, but rather acknowledged through example.
Pound’s friendship with Eliot may have influenced ‘The Waste Land’, but Eliot’s Imagist heritage can also be seen in the way he evokes meaning in his poetry without retreating to unnecessary periods of description. Their super-position and objective correlative theories also share several similar thinking processes, which have not been discussed within the constraints of this essay. It is possible to see from their shared influences and context that Eliot and Pound reached similar conclusions regarding how to represent emotion—both found literary equations that pieced together representative images and linguistic signals in trying to embody a particular sentiment and felt they succeeded when scholarly eruditeness met appropriate emotional expression.
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