

**“BETWEEN TWO WORLDS BECOME MUCH LIKE EACH OTHER”:
LIMINAL SPACES IN THE POETRY OF DAVID JONES AND T. S. ELIOT**

BY CARA CORDELIA CHIMIRRI

A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in English Literature

Victoria University of Wellington

2014

Abstract

T. S. Eliot remains a literary giant close to fifty years after his death while David Jones, in contrast, is undeniably a marginal figure in the world of poetry but one who is slowly gaining a larger profile. Jones has from the very beginning been aligned with Eliot by virtue of Eliot's own comments and by a succession of critics who cast him as Eliot's disciple. The time has come, however, for the side notes to Eliot, which have become almost a convention of Jonesian criticism, to be expanded into a detailed comparative study between his and Eliot's work. Eliot scholars appear to show no interest in pursuing comparisons to Jones, as he is hardly mentioned, even in passing, in discussions of Eliot's work. This too, is something that deserves to be reassessed. Undertaking a new approach to Jones-Eliot comparisons develops Jones criticism and opens up a new branch of Eliot studies.

This thesis repositions Jones and Eliot from the way they have, thus far, been critically related to one another by focusing on liminal space in both poets' major texts: *The Anathemata*, *In Parenthesis*, *The Waste Land*, and *Four Quartets*. This threshold space can be found in their landscapes and in the way they adapt poetic techniques, such as imagery and juxtapositions of irreconcilable opposites. The between-space of transition manifested in their texts reflects the wider environment of flux and transition Jones and Eliot experienced in the first half of the twentieth century.

Using the work of a range of literary critics, historians, philosophers, and geographers, including Arnold van Gennep, Victor Turner, Michel Foucault, Edward W. Soja, Michel de Certeau, Andrew Thacker, Thomas Dilworth, David Harvey, and Stephen Kern, establishes a spatially focused model of liminality which facilitates a close reading of these spaces in Jones's and Eliot's work.

Acknowledgements

For Ken Cooke

I wish to express my gratitude to Victoria University of Wellington for funding my course of study as well as to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences' Faculty Research Committee for awarding a further research grant, which enabled me to travel to the United Kingdom in aid of my research.

I am extremely grateful to Professor Harry Ricketts for first introducing me to David Jones in 2011 as well as for his unwavering support, rigorous critique, and enthusiasm during the writing of this thesis. I simply could not have asked for a better supervisor.

Nor could I have asked for a better person to share an office with all year. Thank-you to Lucy Alston for the friendship, laughter, and camaraderie she brought to every day.

Many, many thanks also go to Judy Asalache for having the thesis and I to stay for the final months and for all she has done to inspire and encourage me.

This project would not have been possible without the additional support and assistance of Judy Cooke, George Chimirri, Gwen Cooke, Yvette Popovic, Associate Professor Heidi Thomson, Micah Ferris, The National Library of Wales, and Quilter's Bookshop.

Contents

Introduction.....	7
Chapter One: Surveying the Field	9
Chapter Two: Contextual and Liminal Space	22
Chapter Three: Embedded Liminal Structures	53
Chapter Four: Wastelands	72
Chapter Five: The City	94
Chapter Six: Woods and Gardens	110
Conclusion	126
Works Cited	128
Other Works Consulted.....	136

Introduction

“This writing is called ‘In Parenthesis’ because I have written it in a kind of space between”, explains David Jones in the preface to his epic of the First World War (*In Parenthesis* xv). Jones’s title, like so much of his poetry, contains a multiplicity of meanings packed into a tight syntactical unit. Jones qualifies this explanation, stating “I don’t know between quite what”, but gesturing towards the myriad of ways the title might be interpreted by describing both the war and a single human life as kinds of parentheses (*In Parenthesis* xv). The significance of Jones’s title has far-reaching consequences not only for analysis of his own work but for that of other modernist poets among whose company he most certainly belongs.

Jones’s personal as well as literary relationship to T. S. Eliot has been established by critics for some time, but scholarship has barely scratched the surface as regards the critical connections that can be drawn between them. Within Jones studies comparative side notes to Eliot abound, while Eliot scholars consistently pass over opportunities where a mention of Jones would enrich and add depth to their analysis. A number of articles attempt to pursue dedicated Jones-Eliot comparisons, but ultimately either present excellent pieces of literary biography or become yet more examples of Jones-focused discussions strategically reinforced by comparison to Eliot’s work. A new approach to Jones and Eliot as comparable poets is required. This thesis aims to present a reciprocal reading in which Jones informs our interpretations of Eliot as much as Eliot informs analysis of Jones, generating fresh perspectives on both authors’ work.

The shadow cast by *In Parenthesis* as a title heralds one of the dominant points of comparison between Jones’s and Eliot’s poetry. For, as Eliot once remarked, “a title is a kind of substitute or shadow of a subject (“Scylla and Charybdis” 5). Comparing Jones and Eliot reveals that parenthetical space is not only an important concept for Jones but lies at the heart of modernist sensibilities and concerns. Both poets explore what it means to inhabit a parenthetical space, suspended between, in a moment of transition. One could focus attention on what

lies on either side of these parentheses, but it is an extended comparison of this very in-between space that offers a new approach to conceptualising how their poetry and poetics engaged with the modern environment. This approach explores parentheses and analogous spaces beneath the umbrella term “liminal space”.

Liminal space is the transitory, between-space of the threshold. Originally identified as part of rituals and rites of passage, concepts of liminality have been incorporated into the vocabulary of many different fields, including literary criticism. Liminal spaces are those of both isolation (the bracketing off of parentheses) and those acting as connections between different spaces. The between-space of liminality by virtue of its porous, fluid nature facilitates the co-existence of dualities and simultaneous experiences.

Within a range of spaces found in *In Parenthesis*, *The Anathemata*, *The Waste Land*, and *Four Quartets*, there can be found this consistent liminal quality. Jones’s and Eliot’s poems present obvious liminal spaces, such as doorways, gates, and passages. But the term can also be extended so as to analyse setting, imagery, allusion, characterisation, and the predominance of opposites suspended in perpetual tension – an aspect long noted and grappled with by critics. Liminal space will be thought of in this thesis not only in terms of the physical settings of the poems but also in more abstract senses, including the spaces constructed by memory or carved out by imaginative engagement.

Such a spatially orientated reading puts into action a revision of current comparative approaches as it draws together a wide range of subjects, techniques, and themes from across four of their major works. But in order to carry out this new close reading a theoretical scaffold on which to situate a spatially focused comparison is required. This framework draws on the work of a range of literary critics, historians, philosophers, and geographers, including Michel Foucault, Edward W. Soja, Michel de Certeau, Andrew Thacker, David Harvey, and Stephen Kern. Engagement with this range of theorists and scholars establishes both the spatial context of the early twentieth century as well as a spatial vocabulary which facilitates and directs text-based discussion of Jones’s and Eliot’s work.

Chapter One: Surveying the Field

It is rare to find any work on David Jones that does not contain at least a cursory mention of his relationship to T. S. Eliot. Present in almost every introduction to an article or book on Jones will be some version of the same famous comments from Eliot: firstly, that he immediately recognised Jones's poem *In Parenthesis* "as a work of genius" (*In Parenthesis* vii); secondly, that he enfolded Jones into "the same literary generation as Joyce, Pound" and himself (*In Parenthesis* viii). By contrast, Eliot is usually discussed without any reference to Jones whatsoever. Sarah Cole's *At the Violet Hour: Modernism and Violence in England and Ireland* (2012) and Joanna Scutts's "Battlefield Cemeteries, Pilgrimage, and Literature after the First World War: The Burial of the Dead" (2009) focus on topics central to Jones's work yet make no reference to him as part of their discussion of Eliot. If we take seriously Eliot's praise and promotion of Jones as well as their professional relationship and private friendship, this appears a significant oversight.

Reiterating the Eliot-Jones connection can provide the sense of throwing weight behind Jones as an undeniably marginal figure in the modernist canon. Hugh Ross Williamson's 1932 declaration that "it is no exaggeration to say that there is no young poet at present writing who does not owe something to T. S. Eliot" has been integrated with fervor into Jones scholarship, with critics seemingly constantly on the lookout to acknowledge a debt to Eliot (Williamson 14). Such comparisons risk endorsing comments similar to that of John Simon's, who perceived that Jones was "legitimized" by Eliot's prefaces and promotion (22). Consequently, Thomas Dilworth's assertion that "Eliot is probably the greatest literary influence on David Jones" can be applied in a variety of ways (*Shape of Meaning* 29). This relationship can reductively narrow our reading of Jones, explaining all Eliotic parallels as due to this "influence", or can expand Jones, Eliot, and modernist scholarship by becoming a cue to explore the affinities, contrasts, parallels, and echoes between their work in greater depth.

A significant part of this established critical trend is the practice of

describing or defining Jones's work in terms of Eliot. Elizabeth Ward has noted the tendency to place *In Parenthesis* "within the aura of *The Waste Land*" (79), but takes such comparisons even further when she describes Jones's "Eliotian manipulation of parallels" (183), "echoing" of Eliot, and his "Eliot-like spasms of horror" (184). Similarly, Patrick Deane describes Jones's poetic techniques as "identifiably Eliotic" (80). Nowhere do we find an image, turn of phrase, or poetic device of Eliot's described as "Jonesian" or "evocative of David Jones". No doubt a significant contributing factor to this situation is the fact that Jones's first publication came so long after Eliot's. Eliot indeed described Jones as "the tardiest to publish" of their generation of modernist authors (*In Parenthesis* viii). But does this mean such comparisons are totally without value? Discussions of Eliot frequently touch on areas that would greatly benefit from a comparison with Jones's treatment of the same subject or technique. If we may worry that Jones is not allowed due credit independent from Eliot, we can also express concern that Eliot scholarship is overlooking potentially significant avenues by failing to incorporate Jones into the mainstream of discussion.

Classifying certain features, devices or motifs as originating with Eliot or Jones is not the aim of this study. Rather this comparative analysis seeks to identify some of the significant points of comparison in their poetry and poetics in order to better understand how these poetic concerns themselves function.

Jones's personal papers make it clear that he did admire and was inspired by Eliot's work. A handwritten list of sources for *In Parenthesis*, among the text's earliest manuscripts (1928-1933), includes "Mr Elliot's (sic) *Waste Land*" (*Early Manuscript Drafts* LP1/2). Letters written to Harman Grisewood in the 1960s also demonstrate Jones's engagement with Eliot's work. In a letter of January 1962, he again compiled a list of influences, noting down "Tom E[liot]" and adding "evidently" (*Dai Greatcoat* 185). He elaborated in May upon the "considerable" impact *The Waste Land* produced on him in the mid-1920s (*Dai Greatcoat* 188) and later that month stated it "would be untruthful to say that Tom E[liot]'s *Waste Land* and also Rene's reading to me *Anna Livia* did not influence the 'form' of *IP*" (*Dai*

Greatcoat 189-190). Most Eliot-Jones criticism suggests that these statements are the only sort Jones had to offer on Eliot's work, whereas he also expressed more critical views.

Jones's recorded reservations about Eliot are by no means extensive, but certainly suggestive. Dilworth has recalled Jones telling him that "he liked Eliot's early poems best, the ones written 'when he wasn't well off' [...]. The only poems by Eliot that he positively disliked were 'Tom's awful poems about cats', which he thought 'embarrassing!' (24 August 1972)" (Dilworth, "T. S. Eliot and David Jones" 80). In a letter to Grisewood dated 10th January 1954, while discussing the issue of subjectivity in art and poetry, Jones remarked: "At *bottom* it's the trouble with Tom E. also. In fact, in one form or another, it holds the field. At base, I suppose it is this subjectivism that separates them *all* from Joyce" (Dilworth, "T. S. Eliot and David Jones" 81). Jones's second comment in particular hints at some of the opportunities for exploring instances where his poetics and execution significantly differ from Eliot's, even when exploring almost identical subjects.

Eliot's dominance is further evidenced by the significant difference between the development of Eliot studies and that of Jones criticism. Despite bursts of interest in his work, particularly during the last thirty years of the twentieth century, Jones's literary standing has never gained the kind of concentrated reinforcement which facilitates sustained critical development or is needed to catapult writers into the sphere of general cultural consciousness. As a result, most new articles or books begin as though from scratch. The same material (largely biographical), the same quotations, and series of events are again and again, (however engagingly) recycled in introductions and opening chapters.

This is in stark contrast to the continually evolving discussion surrounding Eliot's work. Already by 1944 Eliot's position in the canon was so secure that D.S. Savage could begin a discussion of his work with: "The reputation of T. S. Eliot is now so well established that there is little need here for preliminary eulogy or appreciation"(138). Eliot studies has also developed multiple, clearly perceptible, strands of discussion which reflect the shifting foci of literary studies as political,

social, and critical climates have changed. Eliot criticism has been propelled along by the development of fields that look at sexuality (including homosexuality and attitudes towards women), anti-Semitism, politics, philosophy, religion, and Eliot's relationship to different literary genres and movements.

By contrast, studies of Jones's work tend to return to two issues. The first is the perception that Jones merely imitated the modernist modes of Pound, Joyce, and Eliot. This charge can hopefully be left to rest but does perhaps, on some level, still prevent Jones from becoming a major player in the modernist canon.¹ The second argument centres on whether or not *In Parenthesis* expresses an attempt to ennoble, justify, and condone the First World War. At the heart of this second issue is the interpretation of contrasting, unresolved elements. Exploration of these irreconcilable opposites is something that both Jones's and Eliot's critics have focused on and is also central to an understanding of liminal space.

Both Eliot and Jones themselves discussed the significance of contrasts in relation to their own poetry. In "The Metaphysical Poets" Eliot observes: "When a poet's mind is perfectly equipped for its work ... it is constantly amalgamating disparate experience" (*Selected Prose* 64). Eliot outlined a more specific example in "What Dante Means to Me" when he described "the possibility of fusion between the sordidly realistic and the phantasmagoric, the possibility of the juxtaposition of the matter-of-fact and the fantastic" (*To Criticize The Critic* 126). With reference to the arts more generally, Jones similarly argued that the "one common factor implicit in all the arts of man resides in a certain juxtaposing of forms" (*Epoch and Artist* 265). Jones also spoke of "unresolved elements" in respect to *The Anathemata* (*The Anathemata* 17).

The prominence of contrasts both in Eliot's poetic persona as well as in the content of his poetry was identified early by critics and has often been returned to by those offering new approaches to his work. In 1924, Richard Aldington depicted

¹ Jones presented his own view of these accusations in a letter to W. H. Auden dated 24th February 1954 (*Dai Greatcoat* 160-4). He expresses his boredom at the obsession of art and literary critics with identifying influences, states that he had not read the *Cantos* until after *The Anathemata* was published, and that he feels that artists and writers can engage with the very same *zeitgeist* while otherwise being totally unrelated.

the modern poet – of whom he saw Eliot as the epitome – “perilously balanced among the rude forces of a turbulent mechanical age”, walking “the tight-rope over an abyss” (5). Similarly, Paul Elmer More recorded his impressions of Eliot as man, poet, and critic in 1932 as one who “seems to be leading us in two directions at once” (29). More recently Robert Crawford has identified contrast as a favourite device of Eliot’s, reflecting that from “his early years Eliot displayed a sensibility fascinated by the bringing together of apparent opposites” and that this “preoccupation with bringing together apparent contraries lasted throughout Eliot’s life” (1). Crawford points out that at Harvard Eliot read Heraclitus’s philosophy of the world in terms of contraries (1). This early influence resurfaces explicitly in his use of Fragment 60 of Heraclitus as the epigraph of *Four Quartets* – “the way up and the way down are one and the same” (*Collected Poems* 175).

These qualities discerned in Eliot himself have also provided a focus for analysis of his poetry. In the late 1930s Cleanth Brooks observed that *The Waste Land* was “built on a major contrast – a device which is a favourite of Eliot’s and is to be found in many of his poems, particularly his later poems” (320). Crawford echoes Brooks, identifying that “meetings of polar opposites are vital to the pattern of Eliot’s work” (2). Elizabeth Drew also singles out “basic ironic contrasts” (66) in her analysis of the poetry, which she finds particularly distilled in “the inextricably intertwined attraction and repulsion” of *The Waste Land*’s opening lines (100).

Critical attention has similarly focused on Jones’s use of contrasts. Dilworth, Ward, and Paul Fussell have all identified this trait in his work. Dilworth has suggested *In Parenthesis* possesses a “dialogical tension [...] between the actual and the desirable” (*Shape of Meaning* 116). Ward perceives a “tension of indeterminacy which gives the work its abstract shape” as well as a similar “ambiguity which pervades *The Anathemata*” (101, 131). Elaborating on the tension found in *In Parenthesis*, Ward describes “the duality which haunts *In Parenthesis* and strives to impose its terms of understanding against the parallel perception of ambiguity which the poem, to its credit, also sustains” (107).

Ward particularly notes Fussell as one critic who has discerned the presence

of “a coherent ‘ideology’ ” beneath the indeterminacy of *In Parenthesis* (Ward 102). Fussell’s discussion in *The Great War and Modern Memory* (1975) demonstrates how the issue of opposites and juxtapositions is central to interpreting Jones’s stance on the war that he renders in such visceral detail. Fussell argues that “*In Parenthesis* poses for itself the problem of re-attaching traditional meanings to the unprecedented actualities of the war” and concludes “Jones believes such an equation can be made” (146). However, the “problem” Fussell identifies remains unresolved by the text, as Ward’s analysis demonstrates. Fussell hits upon the liminal nature of relationships between juxtaposed elements when he proposes “by placing the suffering of ordinary modern British soldiers in such contexts as these, Jones produces a document which is curiously ambiguous and indecisive” (146). But Fussell almost immediately negates his application of the terms “ambiguous and indecisive” and concludes that the text “implies that, once conceived to be in the tradition, the war can be understood” (146). This prompts him to pronounce the text “deeply conservative” as it, in his view, uses “the past not, as it often pretends to do, to shame the present, but really to ennoble it” (147). Fussell’s reading ultimately leads him to label the text “propagandistic” (147). Rather than the failure of intent he detects in the fact that Jones’s “Western Front is not King Pellam’s Land, that it will not be restored and made whole, ever,” (154) it is possible to argue that this very lack of rehabilitation is indeed what lies at the heart of the meaning of contrasts and opposites in the text.

Yvor Winters has also pronounced an adverse judgment based on the failure of these opposites to reconcile or cohere in Eliot’s work. In “T. S. Eliot or The Illusion of Reaction” (1943) Winters claims that he

has loosely thrown together a collection of disparate and fragmentary principles which fall roughly into two contradictory groups, the romantic on the one hand and on the other the classical and Christian; and being unaware of his own contradictions, he is

able to make a virtue of what appears to be private
spiritual laziness. (112)

Winters's perception of "laziness" and Fussell's accusation of war propagandising demonstrate the temptation to undo the indeterminacy of these opposites by ascribing them an agenda. These two examples in particular present unsatisfactory conclusions, partly because they address only specific instances of a device which recurs in a variety of ways and is part of larger scheme throughout Jones's and Eliot's work.

Lawrence Rainey's and Louis Menand's observation that "contradictions [...]" stood at the heart of the modernist project" (7) suggests the wider importance of finding new ways to explore how these opposites function in Jones's and Eliot's work. Reading these problematic contrasts in terms of liminal space offers a new perspective on what critics have so far made of these co-present opposites by presenting a spatial model which can reconcile the very fact of their irreconcilability. The critical examples I have just been discussing do not frame irreconcilable opposites in an overly spatial manner, except in the case of Aldington and More whose comments are spatially suggestive. Both the suspended tightrope walker and the figure being pulled in two directions simultaneously, hints at how contrasts suspended in tension become a natural part of a consideration of liminal space in Jones's and Eliot's poetry.

Irreconcilable contrasts and opposites are only one of the many points of comparison between Jones and Eliot which have the potential to generate extended discussions in their own right. Almost all of the different strands teased out of Eliot's work have been noted in Jones by critics such as Dilworth and Ward, although only in passing. This suggests that Jones's work contains the elements required to produce comparable critical exegesis to that which has sprung up around Eliot. However, these elements have not, as yet, been responded to in such a way as to garner the forward momentum of a developing critical dialogue. All that is needed for this to occur is the time and attention of future critics. This thesis seeks

to contribute to the formation of such a dialogue by simultaneously developing the existing discourse surrounding Jones-Eliot comparisons and spatially focused readings of their work.

Opportunities for such comparisons have been identified by several critics but have not been adequately developed. John H. Johnston produced one of the first extended treatments of *In Parenthesis* in a chapter of *English Poetry of the First World War* (1964). Largely identical to an earlier essay, "David Jones: The Heroic Vision" (1962), this chapter establishes a comparison with *The Waste Land* as a base for much of Johnston's discussion. Johnston's work is an inspiring source of material for any scholar beginning to write on Jones with his comparison of Eliot and Jones being the prime example. Johnston acknowledges that the two texts "differ widely in materials, inspiration, theme and purpose" but pairs them together as "specimens of poetry written between the two great wars" and "as embodiments of a much more flexible and comprehensive conception of poetic art" (327). Johnston suggests that "future literary historians" are likely to place *The Waste Land* and *In Parenthesis* "into an even closer relationship" (327). This has indeed been the case, but the full implications of such a comparison have yet to be explored.

Dilworth, who is the single most prolific writer on Jones, has offered a range of comparative viewpoints on Jones and Eliot. His promisingly titled article "T. S. Eliot and David Jones" (1994) gives an excellent, often delightful, account of how their professional relationship as editor and poet transformed into friendship. But the article does not reach far beyond literary biography. In an earlier book, *The Shape of Meaning in the Poetry of David Jones* (1988), Dilworth did present several examples of literary-focused Eliot-Jones comparisons. The majority of Dilworth's comparative comments are similar to the sort we have already seen. These expand analysis of Jones into a momentary comparison with Eliot in order to situate explication of Jones within the more solidly built framework of Eliot's critical heritage. One characteristic example sees Dilworth qualify the "reciprocity between past and present" in *In Parenthesis* as "the sort that T. S. Eliot describes in 'Tradition and The Individual Talent' " (*Shape of Meaning* 94).

Dilworth begins to depart from the status quo when he stresses some of the differences between *The Waste Land* and *In Parenthesis*. Still acknowledging Eliot's influence on Jones, Dilworth suggests "because *In Parenthesis* is a narrative poem, it differs generically from Eliot's work" (*Shape of Meaning* 28). Comparing the endings of both texts, he argues:

The final part of *In Parenthesis* certainly seems to owe something to *The Waste Land*. In the concluding section of Eliot's poem, montage speeds up, voices speak out of delirium and hallucination, and archetypes become autonomous [...] Similar things happen in Part 7 of Jones's poem, and even though differences far outweigh them, the similarities are striking. (*Shape of Meaning* 29)

Dilworth, however, seems almost hesitant to explore the scope of these "differences", as a little later in *The Shape of Meaning* the following comments seem to water down, even withdraw from, the overwhelming contrasts he has previously asserted. Still discussing *In Parenthesis* and *The Waste Land*, he now attests to the overall similarity of both texts' narrative character:

There is no plot, no important causation stemming from character. Infantrymen are "pawns" (165); they do not initiate or control the main action. Events merely happen, but in the process the narrative gathers momentum and emotional resonance. In this regard *In Parenthesis* resembles *The Waste Land*.

(*Shape of Meaning* 59)

While the issue of narrative in *In Parenthesis* is far from straightforward, Dilworth

appears to teeter on the edge of completely affirming points of contrast. The instances where he does suggest such contrasts are restricted by a lack of detailed close reading. In a book devoted to Jones, rather than comparative readings of Jones, there is perhaps no space for these. But such generalised comments about narrative in both texts would present a more solid argument if accompanied by a wider range of textual examples.

Patrick Deane presents another typical comparative treatment in “David Jones, T. S. Eliot, and The Modernist Unfinished” (1995). Deane somewhat misleads readers by the title of his article as Eliot is primarily used to bookend a discussion almost entirely devoted to Jones’s use of the fragment and dramatic mode. Eliot provides a gateway and a precedent to thinking about Jones and is brought in to give substance to Deane’s speculation on the unrealised scope of Jones’s dramatic leanings.² A detailed comparison involving close readings of both poets never eventuates. Again Eliot is the fount for the fragmentary modernist form from which Jones drinks. Deane speaks of Jones’s “debt to the early Eliot and his ‘mythic method’ ” (79).

In her book *At the Turn of a Civilization: David Jones and Modern Poetics* (1994), Kathleen Henderson Staudt situates Jones among the modernists through similar side notes to Joyce, Pound, and Eliot. Staudt does, however, use these brief comparisons in order to demonstrate how Jones differs from Eliot. In one example, she distinguishes Jones’s “order of signs” as “less specifically literary than Eliot’s tradition” (*Turn of a Civilization* 28). In an earlier article, “The Language of T. S. Eliot’s *Four Quartets* and David Jones’s *The Anathemata*” (1986), specifically devoted to comparing *The Anathemata* and *Four Quartets* Staudt gave even more prominence to these distinctions.

Here Staudt presents the similarities between both works, such as their

² It is interesting to note that Deane does not discuss the radio plays produced by the BBC of *In Parenthesis* and *The Anathemata*. The draft scripts of these available at The National Library of Wales clearly display Jones’s part in the process of adapting his texts into scripts. For example, Jones’s opinion on the musical accompaniment for “The Lady of The Pool” is evident in material relating to scripts for *The Anathemata* (Broadcast Notes LA 4/3 (15)). His involvement with the production of these radio plays would have provided a more solid basis for Deane’s comparisons to Eliot.

circular structure ("The Language" 124) but also provides greater investigation of the sort of comparative contrasts suggested by Dilworth. Just as Johnston placed *The Waste Land* and *In Parenthesis* together as poems significantly located between the two world wars, Staudt situates *The Anathemata* and *Four Quartets* "as attempts to discern or construct some kind of spiritual order amid the cultural chaos of England during the Second World War" ("The Language" 118). She also argues that although "their purposes are similar [...] the modes of discourse of *The Anathemata* and *Four Quartets* contrast radically" ("The Language" 118). She asserts Jones's "significantly different poetic strategies" ("The Language" 123). For example, she reads *Four Quartets* as a predominantly personal journey and *The Anathemata* as a public, cultural one ("The Language" 118). Staudt argues that placed side by side, these texts "present separate and mutually illuminating efforts" ("The Language" 119).

Most recently, in "Transcendence and The End of Modernist Aesthetics David Jones's *In Parenthesis*" (2013), Jack Dudley has identified what he takes to be allusions to Eliot throughout Jones's poem. At first this seems to be a further reinforcement of the trait of situating Jones in terms of Eliot, as Dudley picks out aspects of "Jones's Eliotic inheritance" and how "Jones modifies these citations and allusions" (108). His examples include Jones's use of "Prickly Pear" (from "The Hollow Men") as a password and refrain of "Good night" (taken from "A Game of Chess" in *The Waste Land*) (Dudley 110- 112). At one point, however, Dudley claims that "Jones echoes the mature Eliot of *The Dry Salvages*" in *In Parenthesis* (119), seeming to reverse the comparative relationship. Yet, there is deference to Eliot lurking here also. Rather than "anticipating" something Eliot would publish four years after *In Parenthesis*, Jones is described as echoing this future Eliotic piece. Dudley essentially continues the line of criticism which sees *In Parenthesis* as a derivation of Eliot's work, particularly *The Waste Land*, rather than as a companion text.

Dudley's perception that Jones's use of the "Good night" refrain is lifted from "A Game of Chess" was also put forward by Valentine Cunningham in *British Writes of the Thirties* (1987) (52). In the same vein, Cunningham identifies what she

considers as Jones's "prominent theft of the arresting word 'cupidon' " from *The Waste Land* (52).

In "Provincialism and The Modern Diaspora: T. S. Eliot and David Jones" (2009) Steven Matthews uses Jones to inform reading Eliot in a new way. He argues that Eliot's promotion of Jones "retrospectively prioritized an aspect of Eliot's poetics which had been present, but occluded, all along" (57). Specifically, that Jones's work "re-confirmed for Eliot the element of necessity forcing modern poetry's 'obscurity' that he had held in the early 1920s" (61). He concludes by considering how both Jones and Eliot engaged with St-John Perse's *Anabase*. While Matthews's discussion displays the revision this thesis wishes to put into action, he does so by pairing Jones's poetry and Eliot's poetics. But this comparative approach can also be applied in regards to verse-to-verse relationships. However, in Chapter Six, when considering woods and gardens, discussion will take a cue from Matthews and use both Jones's and Eliot's poetics to explore the liminality of these spaces in more detail.

These examples demonstrate that the existing comparative work is by no means insignificant, while at the same time certainly incomplete. There exists no dedicated, extended comparative overview of the poetry of Jones and Eliot incorporating a broad survey of both points of comparison and departure. What also emerges as a trend from these comparative treatments is the comparison of *In Parenthesis* with *The Waste Land* and *The Anathemata* with *Four Quartets*. These same pairings will form the basic structure for my own comparative analysis not only in order to maximize the opportunities to make developments based upon the existing literature but also because the appropriateness of these pairings offers a range of textual and contextual ties.

Before turning to look at how critics, Dilworth among them, have already utilised different spatial models in their readings of Jones and Eliot it is necessary to establish the spatial context of the modernist period in order to situate these different discussions more clearly in the realm of spatial studies. Following this contextual digression (or parenthesis), conclusion of the critical survey will then lead

into a detailed consideration of liminal space.

Chapter Two: Contextual and Liminal Space

Modernism and Space

An analysis of liminal space within Jones's and Eliot's work interacts with the spatial turn in literary criticism. In *Spatiality* (2013), an overview of this critical focus, Robert T. Tally Jr. describes how in "the past few decades, *spatiality* has become a key concept for literary and cultural studies" to the point that it has become "an unavoidable, and often extremely valuable, concept for a number of scholars and critics" (3-4). Tally ties this spatial turn to postmodern literary studies and "the transformational effects of postcolonialism, globalization, and the rise of ever more advanced information technologies" (3). He explains that "the dominant, time-focused discourse of the prewar era served to mask the underlying spatial realities. After two world wars, these spaces reasserted themselves in critical consciousness" (12-13). While the developments of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have highlighted spatial issues and Jones and Eliot display abiding preoccupations with time and history, the importance of space in the first half of the twentieth century is far from insignificant. The turn of the twentieth century saw sweeping changes in the way space was experienced, produced, and imagined. Some of the most significant changes to space and spatial perception during this period relate directly to components of liminal space. The contextual situation of simultaneity, compression, and fragmentation inform analysis of the same features in Jones's and Eliot's parenthetical, liminal spaces.

I have indicated that I will consider Jones and Eliot as modernist poets, but modernism like any similar label or classification has a fluidity and multifariousness which results in its use being either extremely enriching or essentially meaningless. As Tally puts it:

Modernism, like postmodernism, is probably not a

very good term for understanding the diverse artistic and philosophical productions with which it is associated. An endeavour to definitively characterize modernism is likely to be frustrated, like trying to contain a bead of mercury. Nevertheless, the label helps to name an aesthetic mode or field, if only provisionally. (34)

As I will be focusing on the spatial quality of liminality in Jones's and Eliot's poetry, I wish first to offer a range of definitions and descriptions of modernism as a cultural movement within a period of significant spatial contexts.

The "modernist" label has been liberally applied to both authors, but a few critics have expressed doubts as to its appropriateness. Donald Davie, for one, was sceptical about referring to Jones as a modernist writer at all. He describes how the "interminable" unfinished poem of which *The Anathemata* appears to have only been part

seemed to range Jones along with Ezra Pound, author of that similarly interminable poem, *The Cantos*; and so Jones got to be called a "modernist." But all the evidence is that Jones had no interest in, and little information about, programmatic modernism in general and Pound's poem in particular. (162)³

Davie's dismissal suggests that Jones, or any author, can only be referred to as "modernist" if it can be established that they had knowledge of and a desire to engage with established modernist concerns. I will apply the term modernist to

³ A different thesis could have looked at the relationship between Jones and Pound. Although there are not the biographical links between Pound and Jones which underpin Jones-Eliot comparisons, a serious comparison of their poetry is another hole in modernist studies.

Jones in the sense that his content and formal concerns can be best understood in the context of other so-called modernists, Eliot foremost among them.⁴

It almost seems to go without saying that Eliot is a, if not *the*, quintessential modernist poet. However, Julian Symons has made the claim in *Makers of The New* (1987) that Eliot “abandoned after *The Waste Land* the form and language of modernism” (164). He argues that *Four Quartets* “contained no shocking or outrageous language” and “presented no problems of meaning” (164). As *Four Quartets* is frequently placed side by side with *The Anathemata*, Symons’s claim requires attention. It is true that *The Anathemata* has a greater formal affinity with *The Waste Land* due to their shared fragmented, allusive nature; however, it is equally true that meaningful critical connections are almost exclusively formed between it and *Four Quartets*, mainly as a result of their shared focus on Christian symbolism and relationship to the Second World War. Addressing the spatiality of *Four Quartets* in a comparative discussion effectively rebuts Symons’s assertion as it demonstrates how the text, despite its less fragmented form, engages with modernist concerns and characteristically modernist environments.

Critics have already begun to focus their attention on the specifically spatial qualities of modernist writing. In their introduction to *Geographies of Modernism: Literatures, Cultures, Spaces* (2005) Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker draw attention to the fact that we should not only ask when modernism occurred or who was involved, but also “*where* was modernism?” (Brooker and Thacker 3). This question “brings us to reconsider the metropolitan centers long associated with modernism, and to review the social and physical architecture of modernity” (Brooker and Thacker 3). In *Moving Through Modernity* (2003) Thacker also argues that “the spaces of modernity alter and transform the literary space of early twentieth-century writing; while the peculiar spatial stories told in the literary texts of modernism shape the ways in which we view and understand modernity itself” (31). This implies that “an investigation into such spaces and geographies should

⁴ Jack Dudley has explored a variety of ways in which Jones’s work interacts with different aspects of modernism in “Transcendence and the End of Modernist Aesthetics: David Jones’s *In Parenthesis*” (2013).

further elucidate some of the riddles of modernism” (Thacker 222). Thacker’s study acknowledges the work still to be done in this field, asserting that “the spaces and images of modernism are still ours to contest and revise” (107) and that we should look towards reconnecting “the representational spaces in modernist texts not only to the material spaces of the city, but also to reverse the focus, and try to understand how social spaces dialogically help fashion the literary *forms* of the modernist text” (4). Identifying and dissecting liminal spaces in Jones and Eliot enacts Thacker’s very suggestion. Such an investigation highlights how the physical and cultural spaces Jones and Eliot inhabited came to influence how they would represent liminal space within their texts.

Edward W. Soja in *Postmetropolis* (2000) situates modernism as a cultural phenomenon in relation to modern forces in line with Thacker’s equation. Soja states:

the practical consciousness of modernity is produced and reproduced by individuals and social movements through the specific interaction between modernization (the more concrete and objective processes of societal change and development) and modernism (the diverse cultural, ideological, and reflexive responses to the contemporary condition, to ongoing modernization processes and especially to the generative and intrinsically spatio-temporal question of what *now/here* is to be done). (72)

It is precisely the consequences of this modern march of progress which Eliot and Jones address in a liminal “spatio-temporal” framework. The forces of modern progress, driven by the Enlightenment and later industrial revolutions, led to the radical re-configuring of space in physical, cognitive, and imaginative terms around the turn of the twentieth century. Their expression of these spatial changes follows

Soja's equation of modernising forces to the reflexive response of modernist artists.

David Harvey has discussed how the period 1910-1914 was "crucial in the evolution of modernist thinking", particularly in respect to the concept of space (266). One prime example of these changes in action is Henry Ford's factory assembly line, established in 1913. Ford's was a system which

fragmented tasks and distributed them in space so as to maximize efficiency [...]. [Ford] used a certain form of spatial organization to accelerate the turnover time of capital in production. Time could then be accelerated [...] by virtue of the control established through organizing and fragmenting the spatial order. (Harvey 266)

Fragmentation on Ford's production line is paralleled by fragmented form and allusions in Jones's and Eliot's texts. Their work can be seen as a collection of fragments, but they also generate them. Many of the allusions to literature are taken from complete, discrete works and are splintered by inserting shards of allusion and quotation into a later poem. The production and collection of fragments, which become dispersed or concentrated within the poetic space of the text, is not a Fordist acceleration of time, but a concertinaed collapse or simultaneous vision somewhat analogous to the simultaneity displayed on Ford's production lines. I. A. Richards expressed just this when he concluded that "allusion in Mr. Eliot's hands is a technical device for compression" (217). This ability to experience spatial simultaneity is at the heart of liminal space in Jones and Eliot. It can manifest itself as the simultaneity of opposites, of imagery, or the experience of two distinct landscapes as one.

Simultaneity was highlighted by another momentous event of 1913, the first globally broadcast radio signal from the Eiffel tower. This reinforced "the capacity to collapse space into the simultaneity of an instant in universal public time"

(Harvey 266). Stephen Kern has also discussed the simultaneity of the period in *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918* (2003). Kern, in accordance with Harvey, argues that the “ability to experience many distant events at the same time, made possible by the wireless and dramatized by the sinking of the *Titanic*, was part of a major change in the experience of the present” expressed in turn “by numerous artists, poets, and novelists” (67-8). Kern describes how journalists from the period argued that the new transportation and communication technologies had “annihilated time and space”, creating what later historians deemed an “age of simultaneity” (xiii). What we see most forcefully in Jones and Eliot is a simultaneity established between present moments and various past eras. Eliot outlined this phenomenon in “Tradition and the Individual Talent”, when he wrote of how the poet perceives the present and past tradition occupying a “simultaneous existence” and “simultaneous order” (*Selected Prose* 38). As T. H. Thompson put it, Eliot “tries to write in three centuries at the same time” (161). Liminal space in both poets’ work facilitates parallel compressions and simultaneity of both place and time.

The dissolution of boundaries implicit to the creation of simultaneous space produced associated tensions. Marshall Berman, in *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (1982), has explored these tensions and in the process offered a list of Eliot and Jones’s major concerns:

to be modern is to find ourselves in an environment
that promises adventure, power, joy, growth,
transformation of ourselves and the world – and, at
the same time, that threatens to destroy everything
we have, everything we know, everything we are.
Modern environments and experiences cut across all
boundaries of geography and ethnicity, of class and
nationality, of religion and ideology: in this sense,
modernity can be said to unite all mankind. But it is
a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity: it pours us

all into a maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish. To be modern is to be part of a universe in which, as Marx said, “all that is solid melts into air”. (15)

Berman’s description highlights how simultaneity in space relates to the paradoxical co-existence of opposite elements of the sort that recur throughout Jones’s and Eliot’s work.

Transience, simultaneity, and un-resolvable tension all point towards the temporary, transformative space of becoming, which is central to liminality. Harvey comments on the idea of “becoming” in relation to modernism, suggesting that “since modernity is about the experience of progress through modernization, writings on that theme have tended to emphasize temporality, the process of *becoming*, rather than *being* in space and place” (205), concluding that “the opposition between Being and Becoming has been central to modernism’s history” (283). Harvey here lumps “space and place” together but elsewhere distinguishes between the two when he states that “modernism, seen as a whole, explored the dialectic of place versus space [...] While celebrating universality and the collapse of spatial barriers, it also explored new meanings for space and place” (273). Michel de Certeau distinguishes between place and space in a way that applies to conceptualising spaces and settings in Eliot’s and Jones’s work and clarifies how we can understand both terms in the light of Harvey’s comments.

De Certeau, in *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1980), suggests that place indicates stability and is a location where “elements are distributed in relationships of coexistence” (117). While space, on the other hand, “occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities” (de Certeau 117). Thacker has elaborated on de Certeau’s thinking, arguing that:

Two things cannot occupy the same place: elements can only exist beside one another, each situated in its 'proper' location. De Certeau uses 'proper' to mean the official and legitimized use to which a place or activity belongs. A space, however, is based not on stability but on direction, movement and velocity.

(31)

Thacker concludes: "Stories constantly oscillate around these two poles, transforming spaces into places and places into spaces" and that "de Certeau is careful to suggest that these are not unchanging binary terms, since places and spaces are constantly being transfigured into one another in the play of narrative"(31, 32). The (however fleeting) stability of place is expressed by Eliot in "Ash Wednesday": "place is always and only place / And what is actual is actual only for one time / And for one place" (*Collected Poems* 85). Jones echoes the same sense of "the inward continuities / of the site / of place" (*The Anathemata* 90).

Liminal spaces in both Jones's and Eliot's work facilitate an exploration of what is not fixed by the singularity of place and time. These spaces highlight the instability of modern environments, which allows for metamorphoses of different places into particular poetic spaces. London, for example, is both a definite place and a polyvalent, fluid space in their work. Harvey has suggested that modernism is "a troubled and fluctuating aesthetic response to conditions of modernity produced by a particular process of modernization" (99). This "fluctuating aesthetic response" is most evident in the fluid, unstable and ultimately liminal spaces that can be found in Jones and Eliot. Kern characterised Joyce and Proust as "the two most innovative novelists of the period" who "transformed the stage of modern literature from a series of fixed settings in homogeneous space into a multitude of qualitatively different spaces that varied with the shifting moods and perspectives of human consciousness" (149). Jones and Eliot represent poets engaged in this same enterprise. Kern employs "space" as a term in defining these two distinctions, but, by returning

to de Certeau's distinction of place and space, it is possible to substitute Kern's first use of "space" for "place".

Using a combination of de Certeau's, Kern's, Harvey's, and Thacker's thinking attaches "being", of feeling rooted and stable, to "place" while the transience and flux of the modern environment is central to a "space" of becoming. While Jones and Eliot do emphasise the significance of specific places in their work, such as the documentary quality of Jones's trenches or the detail of Eliot's rose garden, thinking of their poetry as spaces rather than places provides greater comparative connections and contextual ties. The instability of space, rather than place, expresses the human experience of the modern world. Space in these texts, particularly liminal space, allows for the exploration of the indeterminate, irreconcilable, and polyphonic.

This liminal space of becoming and simultaneity incorporates another key modernist preoccupation found in Jones's and Eliot's work. This is the presence of the past in the contemporary world. Kern suggests that every age "has a distinctive sense of the past" and that the modernist generation "looked to it for stability in the face of rapid technological, cultural, and social change" (36). In regards to modernism's relationship to the past, Michel-Rolph Trouillot has argued in "The Otherwise Modern: Caribbean Lessons from the Savage Slot" (2002) that modernity is structurally plural, analogous to the conception of simultaneous space. Trouillot states modernism "requires an alterity, a referent outside of itself – a pre- or nonmodern in relation to which the modern takes its full meaning" (222). Similarly, Thacker and Brooker observe that "to be 'modern' seems to imply an intrinsic relation to time and history, and thus to past, present and future cultural practices" (1). Harvey in effect summarises Jones's and Eliot's inter-relation of past and present when he concludes:

while in one sense breaking with all past
conventions, [modernist artists and writers] still had
to situate themselves historically and geographically

somewhere. Both the library and the museum have the effect of recording the past and depicting geography while breaking with it [...] [They] painted for the museums or wrote for the libraries precisely because to work this way allowed them to break with the constraints of their own place and time. (272)

Addressing the same topic of museums, libraries, and archives in connection with modernist engagements with the past-present dynamic, Sarah Cole has proposed the following definition of modernism:

Out to make it new, modernism aligned itself with innovation, snubbing the monuments and certainties of the past [...] Yet modernism took a great interest in beginnings, and not only as a part of an atavistic or conservative embrace of the past's coherence; it did so, rather, in the shadow of its own belatedness, espousing the role of reviver. Modernist literature took up beginnings by resuscitating classical categories like myth and reimagining heroic wanderers on epic journeys, and also by thinking back through mothers or fathers into the tunnel of human history and consciousness. At times, too, it turned the historical lens on itself, creating an archive out of the local, domestic and personal. (4)

Eliot and Jones obviously engage with literary and cultural history and the archival quality of the epic genre. But what also needs to be plucked from Cole's definition is the engagement with "the monuments and certainties of the past". Cole's choice of

“snubbed” is perhaps inappropriate, considering what Eliot and Jones present. Engagements with the past are fundamental to their poetic endeavour, but it is less a snobbish rejection than an exploration of the relationship of an apparently comprehensible, meaning-full past with a chaotic, perplexing present and to an anxiety in regards to an indeterminate future, in line with Kern, Harvey, and Trouillot.

This break with the past, although arguably not quite as complete as Cole’s “all” might suggest, is not something portrayed as an initiative or choice in Jones’s and Eliot’s work. Far larger historical forces have determined this sense of a break and the poets to react accordingly by their choices of form and subject.

The sense of a break is linked to the First World War, but also brings into focus the longer ranging forces highlighted by the conflict. The impact of the war on changing modern conceptions of space are of particular significance when considering *In Parenthesis* and *The Waste Land* as companion texts, reflecting the immediate legacy of the war during the 1920s and 1930s. History has created an additional contextual parenthesis as we can now see the two poems as inter-war texts, caught in the bracket between two global conflicts.

Kern argues that the First World War meant that “in four years the belief in evolution, progress, and history itself was wiped out” as the conflict “ripped up the historical fabric and cut everyone off from the past suddenly and irretrievably” (291, 290). Kern’s ripping up of the historical fabric recalls Jones’s concept of “The Break” which, while referring to the nineteenth century, does express the same sense of fracture that came to characterise the Great War:

in the nineteenth century, Western Man moved
across a rubicon which [...] seems to be as definitive
as the Styx [....] But it was not the memory-effacing
Lethe that was crossed; and consequently, although
man has found much to his liking, advantage, and
considerable wonderment, he had still retained

ineradicable longings for, as it were, the farther
shore. (*The Anathemata* 15-16)

This longing for the farther shore, still within sight, manifests itself spatially in the four long poems of Jones's and Eliot's careers. Lucy McDiarmid's description of the Great War in *Saving Civilization: Yeats, Eliot and Auden Between the Wars* (1984) as the "violent, apocalyptic culmination of historical forces long developing" (3) clarifies how the sense of a break following the war may be related to Jones's nineteenth century chasm.

While Jones and Eliot do reflect Kern's sense of being "irretrievably" cut off from the past, they also express how the memory of this past, whether personal or cultural, is retained. Their longing produces a poetic and imaginative between-space which facilitates certain connections. Harvey describes this duality of isolation and connection when he observes:

The trauma of world war and its political and
intellectual responses [...] opened the way to a
consideration of what might constitute the essential
and eternal qualities of modernity [....] In the
absence of Enlightenment certitudes as to the
perfectibility of man, the search for a myth
appropriate to modernity became paramount [....]
[it] seemed possible to build metaphorical bridges
between ancient and modern myths. (30)

The bridge itself can be read as a liminal structure and suggests how liminal spaces in Jones's and Eliot's work, as essentially connective spaces, are part of a larger agenda. In a 1959 statement to the Bollingen Foundation, Jones connected the poet's role as " 'rememberer' " to the metaphor of a bridge (*The Dying Gaul* 17). Comparing the poet to Boethius, Jones remarked "that when asked to what end does my work

proceed I can do more than answer in the most tentative fashion [...] perhaps it is the maintenance of some sort of single plank in some sort of bridge” (*The Dying Gaul* 17).

Both Harvey’s and Jones’s comments draw attention to how such bridges and fragments are part of both poets’ preoccupation with relating the past and present in a complex system of paralleling and juxtaposing relationships. These relationships infuse the poetry with the dual sense of both coherence or continuity and destabilising fragmentation. This duality can be understood by imagining it in spatial terms. Distance is traversed by connections, parallels, and analogies and generated by juxtapositions, gaps, and fragments. The intricate collage of allusions and intertextual devices presented by Jones and Eliot simultaneously produce and embody qualities from both the connective and dis-connective lists. What this sense of tension, plurality, and between-ness demonstrates is that one can only access the past in an incomplete manner. The past is manifest in a library or museum of potsherds. This archive compresses these fragments into a simultaneous vision of past and present. The threshold or bridge space between fosters and highlights these relationships. Liminal spaces within Jones’s and Eliot’s work present a variety of these threshold spaces in many different forms and on different scales.

Liminal Space

Liminal as a term is used sparingly in modernist critical discourse and has been adapted more widely by post-colonial and post-modern literary critics.⁵ But much of

⁵ It is interesting to note the possible connections between post-colonial adoption of this term with both poets’ own biographies. In very different ways both were types of “resident aliens”, as Eliot once signed himself using the Greek “Metoikos” (Ackroyd 272). Indeed, “East Coker” explores Eliot’s return to the place in England from which his ancestors emigrated to America in the 17th century. Despite America’s subsequent independence, Eliot does in a way come to England as a colonial. Although born and raised in England as an English speaker, Jones felt a strong connection with his father’s Welsh nationality, recalling that “from about the age of six, I felt I belonged to my father’s people and their land, though brought up in an entirely English atmosphere. So it was natural that when, sometime in

what scholars describe at work in a variety of modernist texts fits into a liminal theoretical approach. Thacker, for instance, only uses “liminal” a handful of times in *Moving Through Modernity* (153, 192, 193), but frequently employs a decidedly liminal vocabulary in his analysis of modernist spaces. In keeping with this trend, liminality barely features in explorations of either Jones’s or Eliot’s work, even by critics who approach the poetry in spatial terms. Before establishing a spatially liminal framework within which to consider Jones and Eliot it is necessary to return to and conclude the critical survey by outlining existing spatial readings of their work. A detailed reading of liminal space develops various aspects of these extant spatial approaches.

Eliot’s use of landscape and setting has been discussed in, among others, Unger’s “T. S. Eliot’s Rose Garden: a Persistent Theme” (1942), R. D. Wagner’s “The Meaning of Eliot’s Rose Garden” (1954), Christopher Heywood’s “Frances Hodgson Burnett’s ‘The Secret Garden’: A Possible Source for T. S. Eliot’s ‘Rose Garden’ ” (1977) and Nancy D. Hargrove’s *Landscape as Symbol in The Poetry of T. S. Eliot* (1978). Such discussions are of places rather than spaces in the texts. Landscapes can alternatively be read in terms of liminal space.

In 1945, Joseph Frank seriously ignited spatial consideration of modernist literature in his three-part essay “Spatial Form in Modern Literature.” In the first installment he argued that writers such as Eliot, Pound, and Joyce were taking modern literature “in the direction of spatial form”, more in line with the plastic arts than a previous literary tradition (225). Frank proposed that Eliot and Pound attempted “to undermine the inherent consecutive-ness of language, frustrating the reader’s normal expectation of a sequence and forcing him to perceive the elements

the first decade of the twentieth century, I was taken to Gwentydd Wen [...] I felt a Rubicon had been crossed, and that this was the land of which my father had spoken of with affection and suppressed pride” (*The Dying Gaul* 23). Much of his work deals with the Welsh as a conquered and occupied people throughout history. One can read Jones’s identity as caught between English and Welsh in a manner similar to the liminality and hybridity post-colonial writers and critics explore. For example, Jones is careful to qualify his use of Welsh in *The Anathemata*, apologising to any Welshmen who “may smile or be angered” (*Anathemata* 13) at any of his inaccuracies and was acutely aware of his childhood failure to imitate the sounds of his father singing in Welsh (*Anathemata* 41). Jones reflected that once he began to write he “experienced the full difficulty of somehow making viable the things of Wales in the only language [he knew] – English” (*The Dying Gaul* 31).

of the poem juxtaposed in space rather than unrolling in time” (227). Applying this thesis to *The Waste Land*, Frank perceived that “syntactical sequence is given up for a structure depending on the perception of relationships between disconnected word-groups” (229). The juxtaposition of these different linguistic groups requires readers to perceive them in a simultaneous relationship in order to fully unpack their meaning (Frank 229). Although Frank’s use of simultaneity conceived the text more as an object, his use of it heralds how liminality may be used as a new way to conceptualise space in modernist poetry.

William V. Spanos challenged Frank’s spatial interpretation in “Repetition in *The Waste Land*: A Phenomenological De-struction” (1979). He claimed that Frank’s conception of *The Waste Land* as “a New Critical object” (Spanos 242) or “autonomous object outside of temporal existence” (Spanos 231) disregards the importance of time and history to the text. The plastic object, analogous to sculpture or painting, in Spanos’s view also denies the “phenomenological process” (242) at work in *The Waste Land*. Although Spanos’s essay is essentially an attack on a spatial reading, what he finds lacking in Frank’s spatial model is in fact part of liminal space. Liminal space encompasses processes and includes an extended engagement with time and history.

In a response to Spanos’s (and therefore Frank’s) argument, Robert Franciosi uses Gaston Bachelard’s *The Poetics of Space* (1958) in order to apply a different spatial reading to *The Waste Land*. Franciosi’s “The Poetic Space of *The Waste Land*” (1985) interprets Spanos’s approach, despite its aim to rebut a spatial reading, as laying the foundation for an application of Bachelard which detects within the text an overarching movement from hostile to felicitous space. His discussion is significant to a consideration of liminal space due to the emphasis he places on the interaction of the human mind with space in the text. Franciosi argues that while much has “been written on the landscape or setting of *The Waste Land*; yet, for the most part, the relationship between the persona and the space he occupies has been viewed usually as a static, at most symbolic, reflection of the persona’s mind” (19). Imaginative interaction with liminal spaces takes centre stage

when the city in Jones and Eliot is considered in Chapter Five.

Elizabeth Drew draws attention to a separate spatial concern in *Four Quartets* when, in *T. S. Eliot: The Design of His Poetry* (1954), she discusses the approaches taken to the “still point” present in the text. Drew suggests that this

“still point” therefore is *the point of intersection* between time and the timeless, between stillness and movement, and partakes of the qualities of both the eternal unmoving Logos and the inescapable world of time and movement [....] If we try to define it in space, we have to envisage (to quote Mr. Wheelwright again) “a mathematically pure point” existing at the centre of a revolving wheel: again not a part of its movement, but to be expressed only by reference to movement. (182)

Drew’s definition of the “still point” is in terms of a meeting of opposites. It is also something which exists at a remove, such as from the movement which in turn defines it. The dual centrality and marginality of the “still point”, as Drew describes it, relates to the ability of liminal spaces to be both spaces of connection and at a remove.

Dilworth’s discussion in *The Shape of Meaning* emphasises certain spatial features of Jones’s work. He argues for the existence of “an abstract, visualized shape which emerges for Jones himself during the middle phases of composition” (*Shape of Meaning* 13). The shape of *The Anathemata* is “a number of closing circles [...] resembling the circles of a target” (*Shape of Meaning* 158), while that of *In Parenthesis* is parenthetically arranged around journeys and arrivals (*Shape of Meaning* 119). These geometric shapes are, significantly, “almost always centered” (*Shape of Meaning* 13). He identifies the centres of both *In Parenthesis* and *The Anathemata* in a dramatic monologue; Dai’s boast in *In Parenthesis* and Elen Monica’s in *The*

Anathemata.

Dilworth presents Jones's vision of "shape itself [as] symbolic" as setting him apart from other modernists, such as Yeats and Eliot, "for whom the symbol is an image within the poem" (*Shape of Meaning* 13). While one cannot make the case for the same geometric organisation in Eliot, this thesis will challenge Dilworth's distinction to an extent, demonstrating how poetic space in Jones and Eliot assumes as much symbolic resonance as embedded connotative images. His consideration of shapes in Jones's poetry is connected to, but distinct, from a consideration of poetic space. Although Dilworth uses the terminology of spatiality, his focus is on the geometry of Jones's poetic form. This thesis, by contrast, considers the geography contained and produced within these shaped poems. Jones says in his preface to *In Parenthesis* "I have only tried to make a shape in words" (x). Dilworth's work uncovers how Jones achieved this, but I argue that Jones has also constructed distinct and meaningful spaces, all the more significant for their relationship to counterparts in Eliot.

The work of Carol L. Yang and Jennifer Fairley is of particular significance as they apply liminality to their readings of Eliot and Jones respectively. In "Revisiting the Flâneur in T. S. Eliot's 'Eeldrop and Appleplex – I'" (2011) and "T. S. Eliot's Virtual Europe" (2012), Yang identifies several liminal examples in Eliot's work related to the flâneur and urban space. Fairley devotes a much larger portion of her essay "David Jones's Thirties" (1996) to identifying liminal elements.

Just as Yang's comments hint at how Eliot's city may be further considered in liminal terms, Fairley's identification of liminality within *In Parenthesis* paves the way for a detailed discussion of liminal space in Jones's texts. She bases her identification of liminality chiefly on the title and the epigraph, speaking in general terms about the liminal situation within and surrounding the text. She discusses the liminality of *In Parenthesis* in terms of a state rather than a space. Fairley argues that the "form of the text, described by its author as 'a shape in words,' exhibits a similar liminal state, frequently shifting between prose and poetry, defying strict generic categorization" and that a "state of liminality permeates *In Parenthesis* which

effectively becomes a quest for a sense of place, both physically for the men involved, and culturally and historically in terms of the experience” (45). Her use of place as something desired for its stability returns us again to the distinctions between places and spaces. However, there is a slight discrepancy between Fairley’s description of the desire to transition from a *state* of liminal flux and chaos to a secure, stable *place*. While the characters of *In Parenthesis* certainly do inhabit a psychological state of liminality, they also exist within a liminal space, which sits in opposition to the security of place. If one wishes to discuss the state of characters within the text, the space in which they occupy this state must also be addressed.

“Liminal” as used by Fairley and Yang, has its root in the Latin word *limen*, meaning “threshold” or “beginning”. Liminal entered the vocabulary of literary criticism from the field of social anthropology where it refers to the intermediary stage in rituals and rites of passage. This anthropological origin is not merely a point of interest but directly relevant to the intellectual climate in which both Jones and Eliot were immersed. The early decades of the twentieth century saw great developments in anthropology and archaeology, evidenced by the texts of Arnold van Gennep, James Frazer, Jessie L. Weston, and Christopher Dawson among others. Connections between these anthropological texts and Jones’s and Eliot’s poetry become apparent during a close reading of their liminal spaces.

Arnold van Gennep is credited with defining the term as we now have it in his 1908 book *Rites of Passage* (*Les rites de passage*). In which he proposed “to call the rites of separation from a previous world, *preliminal rites*, those executed during the transitional stage *liminal (or threshold) rites*, and the ceremonies of incorporation into the new world *post-liminal rites*” (Gennep 21). Gennep’s study aimed to demonstrate that “this symbolic and spatial area of transition may be found in more or less pronounced form in all the ceremonies which accompany the passage from one social and magico-religious position to another” (Gennep 18). While Gennep focused on rituals and rites, he also suggested some of the ways we might consider using the concept of liminality with a broader vision. Gennep concludes: “For groups, as well as for individuals, life itself means to separate and to be reunited, to change form and

condition, to die and to be reborn. It is to act and to cease, to wait and rest, and then to begin acting again, but in a different way. And there are always new thresholds to cross” (189).

Although Gennep is not mentioned by name, Fairley applies his threefold rite of passage to *In Parenthesis*:

the liminal experience of the Fifty-fifth Battalion “B” Company, the three stages of the rites of passage are described: the separation, initiation, and (potential) return of the hero. The detachment of the men from their country and from their normal lives is portrayed in terms of rebirth into “this new world” (*In Parenthesis*, 9), with the childlike frailty of the soldiers evoking “almost a motherly concern” from the officers. (47-8)

Dilworth’s analysis has also highlighted elements of initiation rituals within *In Parenthesis*. Such connections pull the text into a closer relationship with its contemporary anthropological context. Dilworth suggests that

Part I of the poem seems informed by an underlying initiation pattern of mimetic death to an old way of life and a resurrection or rebirth to a new life. Conforming in part to pagan sacramental typology, the rite of passage begins with the channel crossing as the end of an old way of life. Like dying in classical mythology and pagan rites of initiation, this is a descent into Hades with the channel passage corresponding to the crossing of the Styx. (*Shape of Meaning* 125)

Dilworth additionally discerns affinities with the initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries (*Shape of Meaning* 126).

Victor Turner's work has further developed Gennep's concept of liminality. In *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors* (1974) he outlined his attempt "to extend the concept of liminality to refer to any condition outside, or on the peripheries of, everyday life, arguing that there was an affinity between the middle in sacred time and the outside in sacred space" (53). This extension meant considering a different side to liminality from Gennep's community-focused emphasis on the ritual. Turner's added dimension "may imply solitude rather than society, the voluntary or involuntary withdrawal of an individual from a social-structural matrix. It may imply alienation from rather than more authentic participation in social existence" (52). This adaptation of Gennep's liminality is especially apt for the application of the term to the predominately solitary acts of reading and writing, while the more socially focused view recalls the poet's civic role.

Turner's exploration of liminality also connects it to the concepts of fragmentation and fracturing. He proposes that

the process and state of liminality represents at once a negation of many, though not all, of the features of preliminal social structure and an affirmation of another order of things and relations. Social structure is *not* eliminated, rather it is radically simplified: generic rather than particularistic relationships are stressed. (196-7)

The idea of generics, rather than particulars, and the word "dichotomy" relates to how Jones and Eliot collage their disparate materials together to connect various past times with the present. Rather than a modern homogenisation, much like a factory assembly line, it can be interpreted as a quest for connections between

disparate elements. Turner's assertion that, while some of the preliminal is erased, other aspects remain is reminiscent of fragments in the form of allusions, quotations, and intertextual images.

Turner's discussion is directly relevant to the historical, political and social context in which Eliot and Jones were writing. Turner argues that

each public crisis has what I now call liminal characteristics, since it is a threshold between more or less stable phases of the social process, but it is not a sacred limen, hedged around by taboos and thrust away from the centres of public life. On the contrary, it takes up its menacing stance in the forum itself and, as it were, dares the representatives of order to grapple with it. It cannot be ignored or wished away. (39)

Both pairs of poems are related to the "public crisis" of each world war. *The Waste Land* and *In Parenthesis* as inter-war texts reflect the anxiety, impending sense of crisis and atmosphere of flux and disorder associated with these two decades. In the aftermath of the First World War the pre-war established order had been exposed as an illusion of stability. The final three of Eliot's *Four Quartets* were published during the Second World War, which also served as the backdrop to most of Jones's composition of *The Anathemata*, finally published in 1952. These texts' are situated within transitional periods, the future outcome of which remained indeterminate at the time of composition.

Liminal space provides a framework for considering the sustained tension between contrasting impulses in Jones and Eliot as well as the relationship between past and present. Their poetic spaces can be thought of in a threefold, spatially liminal structure. There exists a space either side of a threshold, with the threshold itself being a kind of parenthesis removed from either of these defined spaces, but

still connected to each and able to connect each in turn to the other. In “Burnt Norton” Eliot gives us an almost exact depiction of this structure as he describes the movement “Down the passage which we did not take / Towards the door we never opened / Into the rose garden” (*Collected Poems* 177). The quality of simultaneity, inherent in the spaces of modernism, is something Unger has also identified in “Burnt Norton”. Although Unger does not employ the term liminal, this is the very phenomenon he describes. He asserts:

Burnt Norton opens with a statement of the co-existence of all times, the ever presence of past and future. An implication of this is that the lost experience of the past and the desired experience of the future are in no way repetitions, but exist identically in the timeless reality that is possibly available at any actual moment.

(“T. S. Eliot’s Rose Garden” 383)

Both poets utilise a cultural inheritance, which they associate with a unified, coherent, and meaningful past, in order to come to terms with the new and unfamiliar of the twentieth century and its times of crisis. This positions both poets and their work in a liminal cultural space, in a moment of transition. Both old and new are distinct from the threshold position Jones and Eliot occupy, while at the same time inseparable and intermingled within this transitory phase.

While what Turner and Gennep have to say about the concept of liminality informs the use of this term in literary criticism, their focus is predominantly on the sense of liminal as a status or state. But I wish to consider the term more in the sense of a poetic space created and inhabited. This requires a more specific consideration of space itself. Foucault’s term “heterotopia” is one that can be appropriated in order to understand liminality in the specifically spatial manifestation as it is found in Eliot and Jones.

In “Of Other Spaces”, Foucault addresses the importance of space to the twentieth century. From this essay emerges a terminology and framework suited to analysis of the kinds of liminal spaces present in the work of Jones and Eliot. Foucault identifies the defining “obsession” of the nineteenth century with history, while our present era “will perhaps be above all the epoch of space” (22). With their emphasis on literary and cultural history, it would be tempting to use Foucault’s comment to conclude that Jones and Eliot are poets existing out of sync with the twentieth century. And yet, however critical of or dissatisfied with the modern world their work may often appear, theirs are texts thoroughly of the twentieth century. Their work could not have taken the same form or dealt with the same concerns in any other era. Treating Jones’s and Eliot’s historical perspective as another element of their use of space brings their historical elements into line with their situation as twentieth century poets.

Foucault indeed outlines how time can become part of space. He states: “I believe that the anxiety of our era has to do fundamentally with space, no doubt a great deal more than with time. Time probably appears to us only as one of the various distributive operations that are possible for the elements that are spread out in space” (23). Thacker, too, sees the modernist preoccupation with time and history as understandable in spatial terms, suggesting that

there is no sense in trying to understand how a modernist text responds to the creation or adaptation of a particular location without grasping that both social space and literary space operate in relationship to historical co-ordinates [...] any reassertion of spatial concepts should not be a simplistic privileging of space over time. (5)

This situation of time within space is evident in the way Jones and Eliot often collapse different time-periods, moments, and figures separated by

chronological time into one poetic space, be it in a scene, landscape, or line of verse understood as a spatial unit. Jones's and Eliot's concentration of times in space can be read as analogous to the simultaneity Harvey describes as characteristic of modernity, specifically in capitalist societies, which is manifest as a " 'time-space compression' " where the "speed-up in the pace of life" overcomes "spatial barriers" in such a way "that the world sometimes seems to collapse inwards upon us" (240). But within Jones's and Eliot's poetry this collapse of time, in order that thousands of years of human history can be archived in such slim volumes, also facilitates expansion. Figures and scenes fan-out, concertina-like, to reveal parallel or connected layers which spatially render a sense of overcoming time's boundaries. One such example is where in *In Parenthesis* Jones presents the figures of dead warriors ghosting alongside the infantry of 1916. In Part Seven, following the apparition of "sweet sister death", the infantry fast approaching their own deaths are said to be "like" a catalogue of past heroes, such as Tristram and the warriors of Thermopylae (*In Parenthesis* 162-3).

Unger has used a different visual metaphor to describe this multiplicity at work. He describes one of the characteristic qualities of Eliot's poetry, embodied by "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock", as a structure analogous to a "series of slides, highly selective and suggestive" (*T. S. Eliot* 20). Unger's idea of a slideshow is apt for several reasons. Firstly, it offers the idea that these independent, separate images also hang together in different sequences from which readers form various associations or narratives both distinct from and attached to the images. Secondly, the transparency of both the glass slides and their larger projected images is an important quality to identify in the poetry of both Eliot and Jones. Setting, landscapes, and characters all display different levels of transparency, which allow them to signify and allude to several different things simultaneously, often to the point that these become blended. It is like layering two or more glass slides in succession before the projector or as if the person in charge of the slide show has stepped in front of the projector, thus assimilating themselves into the transparent image. Dilworth offers a similar description of Jones's work, suggesting that "allusion, evocation, and connotation

achieve an effect similar to visual transparency. Because Jones's poetry is always highly allusive, it is always, in this sense, transparent" (*Shape of Meaning* 18). The same relationship between allusion and transparency applies to Eliot's work.

This shared allusive transparency is demonstrated by the manner in which Jones and Eliot are drawn to characters or character types (of which the soldiers are one) who facilitate and embody the simultaneity of the collapse of time into a single space. Flavia Julia Helena in *The Anathemata* is such a character, described by Jones as one of these figures who can take on "such a diversity of significance" (*The Anathemata* 131 note 3). Tiresias, whom Northrop Frye characterises as a "hermaphroditic shadow-mind" who "contains all the men and women who appear" in *The Waste Land* also takes on a similar role (142).

Another example from *The Anathemata* presents a slightly different slant on collapsing time in a liminal, artistic space. Jones's footnote to the line: "Bang! Bang!! There where Julius stood-in for the South Foreland Light" (*The Anathemata* 149) explains the anecdote from which this image originates:

An English friend of mine living in Italy asked his Italian servant, who had been to the cinema, what picture he had seen. The reply was, a naval battle "in the old time", and a further query as to whose battle, evoked "Bang, bang, bang! perhaps Julius Caesar". The film in question dealt with Lady Hamilton and the hero of Trafalgar. I think it important to put this on record because it provides a concrete modern example of the attitude of the Old Masters who felt no anachronism in putting Herod or Darius or Joshua into medieval plate-mail. The same unconsciousness of period was still operative in this man of the Riviera di Levante in c. 1930.

(*The Anathemata* 149 note 2)

The kind of "unconsciousness of period" here described may show a disregard for

the integrity of a specific period or era, but demonstrates the way the human mind connects elements from different eras together, borrowing a little detail or an overall theme or sense. This creative impulse which has seen Shakespeare's plays set in a range of time periods and countless painters adorn Cleopatra and Helen of Troy with a corset, engages liminal space. Here past tradition and cultural legacy are united with an awareness of the contemporary moment. The same phenomenon can be identified in *The Waste Land* with Eliot's modern twist on Cleopatra at the beginning of "A Game of Chess" (*Collected Poems* 56). Otherwise distinct times are allowed to become intertwined and fused in the liminal artistic, creative space. Rather than "unconsciousness", these are examples of the human consciousness interacting and processing culture.

In addition to the incorporation of time in space, which is easily identified in both Jones and Eliot, Foucault offers a list of the further qualities of this era of spatial preoccupation. Foucault declares:

we are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed. We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein. (22)

Pulling out Foucault's key characteristics of this space – simultaneity, juxtaposition, extended relationships, parallels, fragmentation, intersections and connections – we are faced with a list which would serve equally well as a catalogue of the primary concerns of Eliot and Jones and which all connect to the liminal quality present throughout their work. Simultaneity, first on Foucault's list, links his discussion back to the relationship of simultaneous spatial experience to the reconfiguration of space in the early twentieth century, as put forth by Kern and Harvey.

Foucault's description of the epoch of space leads him to discuss two types of spaces which embody the essentials of our cultures and societies. He first considers utopias as "sites with no real place" and "fundamentally unreal spaces" (24). Launching from utopias, he introduces his term "heterotopia", which refers to

real places – places that do exist and that are formed
in the very founding of society – which are
something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively
enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other
real sites that can be found within the culture, are
simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted.

(24)

Foucault illustrates his definition with the example of the mirror. A mirror's reflection presents a typically heterotopic site as "it makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point" (24). The example of the reflection demonstrates how a heterotopia is a liminal site where the dual forces of severance and connection are co-present. The concertinaed vision of time in space could perhaps be revisioned as a hall of mirrors, where each reflection presents a parallel combined with a significant alteration.

Three of Foucault's six principles of heterotopias are of particular use when considering spatial concerns in Eliot's and Jones's work. The liminal space their texts create could be classified as a heterotopic space and the heterotopia is certainly a useful model for mapping out what is spatially at work in their poetry.

The third principle of the heterotopia describes how the "heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible" (25). This reflects exactly what has been discussed above in terms of a concertinaed vision of time in space and the liminal threshold which

distinguishes and combines simultaneously. The fact that these are “incompatible” returns us to the tension between irreconcilable opposites in Jones’s and Eliot’s texts. Liminality and heterotopias allow juxtaposition and simultaneity to co-exist as a single poetic phenomenon.

Foucault’s fourth heterotopic principle discusses the way heterotopias are

most often linked to slices in time [....] The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time [....] the cemetery is indeed a highly heterotopic place since, for the individual, the cemetery begins with this strange heterochrony, the loss of life, and with this quasi-eternity in which her permanent lot is dissolution and disappearance. (26)

Along with cemeteries, Foucault presents museums and libraries as “heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time” which aim towards “accumulating everything, of establishing a sort of general archive, [with a] will to enclose in one place all times, all epochs, all forms, all tastes” (26). Libraries and museums are places “of all times that [are themselves] out of time and inaccessible to its ravages” (26). This concept, Foucault argues, “belongs to our modernity” (26). These three heterotopic spaces of the cemetery, library, and museum, are all metaphors for what is at work in Jones’s and Eliot’s poetry and echo Harvey’s comments on the significance of the museum and library. Furthermore, the idea of “a general archive”, or encyclopedia, is a characteristic of the epic genre both Eliot and Jones work within and develop in line with modernist techniques and preoccupations.

Finally, Foucault argues that heterotopias “always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable” (26). This is the very definition of liminal space. The threshold image encompasses both opening and closing, distinguishing between the space or state one is passing from and that

one is about to enter or assume, while at the same time making a connection between each distinguishable space/state.

Foucault's heterotopias have also been used by Thacker in his discussion of modernist space. Thacker's use of the term further elucidates how it may be used as part of a reading of modernist liminal space. Thacker suggests that the

disorientating heterotopia of a modernist narrative might be directly indebted to urban space; experiments with typography and line spacing in modernist poetry could be linked to the emergence of heterotopic sites in modernist cities. Here the material form of the text is a transformation of some specific external space; turning, for example, the streets of Dublin into a meandering narrative in *Ulysses*, such that we read the twists and turns of meaning as an embodiment of urban space. If one function of heterotopia is, in Genocchio's words, to "inscribe instability into a given spatial order", then we should look for those moments in a text in which linguistic or semantic instability is associated with a certain site or location in order to find modernist heterotopias. (28)

The recurrence of "instability" in Thacker's discussion returns us to de Certeau's comment on the inherent instability of space, rather than place. Spaces where there exists instability of tensions or fusions in Eliot's and Jones's work is where we find liminality and heterotopias.

Thacker also identifies how, beneath these liminal spaces, where boundaries are blurred, we can discern "a desperate desire to maintain borders and boundaries" (7). Modernist writers, he suggests, must confront, using "textual space" the

“disorientating, thrilling and anxious kinds of experiences” of the modern environment (7). Thacker’s view is also expressed by Sarah Cole’s identification that modernism’s “violent content collapses boundaries and shatters distinctions” (5). Cole also highlights “doubled, structurally ambivalent, contradictory forms” (38). Thacker and Cole describe another set of opposites in tension found in Jones’s and Eliot’s work when they describe these conflicting impulses.

Edward W. Soja’s term “Thirdspace” draws from significant aspects of Foucault’s heterotopias to develop an understanding of a decidedly liminal concept of space. Soja reads the heterotopia as a “conceptualization that resonates with what might be called the micro- or site geography of Thirdspace” (*Thirdspace* 157). Along with heterotopias, the concept of Thirdspace offers an additional spatial term to aid a consideration of liminal spaces in Jones’s and Eliot’s work.

Soja defines Thirdspace as “a space of extraordinary openness, a place of critical exchange where the geographical imagination can be expanded to encompass a multiplicity of perspectives that have heretofore been considered by the epistemological referees to be incompatible, uncombinable” (5). Soja perceives that there has been in the past a division made between the experience of space which is “real” versus “imagined” engagement. Firstspace is “fixed mainly on the concrete materiality of spatial forms, on things that can be empirically mapped” while Secondspace encompasses “ideas about space ... thoughtful re-presentations of human spatiality in mental or cognitive forms” (10). Thirdspace proposes a combination,

another mode of thinking about space that draws upon the material and mental spaces of the traditional dualism but extends well beyond in scope, substance, and meaning. Simultaneously real and imagined and more (both and also ...), the exploration of Thirdspace can be described and inscribed in journeys to “real-and-imagined” (or

perhaps “realandimagined”?) places. (11)

Thirdspace therefore encompasses the quality of a heterotopia which is real and unreal (such as the reflection in a mirror) and encompasses the “both and also” of simultaneity. Later in his discussion Soja speaks explicitly of the “simultaneities of the ‘real-and-imagined’ ” (65).

Soja further describes how

Everything comes together in Thirdspace:
 subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the
 concrete, the real and the imagined, the knowable
 and the unimaginable, the repetitive and the
 differential, structure and agency, mind and body,
 consciousness and the unconscious, the disciplined
 and the transdisciplinary, everyday life and unending
 history. (56-7)

This catalogue of the opposites which can co-exist in Thirdspace indicates how the term is suited to considering the poetic space which facilitates Jones’s and Eliot’s presentation of contrasts.

From the spatial contexts of the turn of the twentieth century and the spatial models of the heterotopia and Thirdspace emerges a vocabulary to both facilitate a close reading of liminal space in Jones’s and Eliot’s work and to build upon spatial exegesis of their work to date. The same characteristics of simultaneity, fragmentation, and compression are found in all the liminal spaces in Jones’s and Eliot’s work. But the different relationships between these qualities and the varying degrees to which a heterotopic space or Thirdspace apply to each poetic, liminal space demonstrates the variety of liminal experience Jones and Eliot explore.

Chapter Three: Embedded Liminal Structures

Thresholds

Thresholds, doorways, and passages present the most easily identifiable liminal spaces and structures. Consideration of these liminal manifestations leads to discussion of the more abstract ways the term liminal can be used to understand Jones's and Eliot's engagements with space. These physical thresholds often occur in a passage where there are further layers of liminal elements at work.

In *The Anathemata* there is a single instance of the use of "limen". The call goes out to Mars: "*Satur fu fere Mars/— leap the limes!*" (176). Jones's footnote to this reads:

Cf. The Hymn of the Arval Brethren:

Satur fu fere Mars: limen sali

which is said to mean:

"Be satiated fierce Mars, leap the threshold" but which, it is thought, may have originally run:

"Be thou sower, sower Mars, sow the soil."

So that the priest come to bless the siege-engines, in substituting "frontier" for "threshold" is only underlining a metamorphosis already suffered by Mars the agriculture god. (176 note 2)

While Jones refers to "*limes*" in the body of the text, the note uses "*limen*". "*Limes*" means a border, limit, or boundary, whereas "*limen*" specifically refers to a threshold, entrance or a beginning. In the note, Jones demonstrates the manner in which "frontier" has been substituted for "threshold" by the interchange of these similar terms. This example suggests Jones is drawing on both the threshold "*limen*" with anthropological, ritual associations as well as boundaries and frontiers when he uses "*limes*". This reference to boundaries and thresholds demonstrate he was strongly aware of the symbolic associations of liminal structures and worked to

evoke these in his poetry.

Limens in the form of doorways, gates, and corridors recur throughout Jones's and Eliot's work. As Fairley has noted, the epigraph of *In Parenthesis*, taken from *The Mabinogion*, "places the text upon the physical and mental threshold" (45). The passage describes an enchanted, forbidden doorway located in a palace on the shore of Gwales in Penfro. Seven warriors taking the head of Bendigeidfran to be buried in London delay their journey at the palace, until one of them opens the door (*The Mabinogian* 39). When opened, the doorway forces the men to relive their deeds and suffering in the threshold space. It is this very moment that Jones chooses for his epigraph:

Evil betide me if I do not open the door to
know if that is true which is said concerning
it. So he opened the door ... and when they
had looked, they were conscious of all the
evils they had ever sustained, and of all the
friends and companions they had lost and of
all the misery that had befallen them, as if
all had happened in that very spot; ... and
because of their perturbation they could not
rest.

This quotation reinforces situating the entire text within a parenthetical, threshold space. This association is strengthened by various episodes within the text involving doors. One particular example has the troops pass through a doorway as if initiates taking part in a ritual:

You bunch together before a tarred door. Chalk scrawls
on its planking — initials, numbers, monograms, signs,
hasty, half-erased, of many regiments. Scratched out dates
measuring the distance back to antique beginnings.

.....

More clear, and very newly chalked, you read the title
of your entering, and feel confident, as one who reads his
own name on a church pew.

.....

Lance-Corporal Lewis
pushed open the door — and you file in. (*In Parenthesis* 22)

The chalked characters on the doorway give the impression of magical symbols or ancient lettering such as hieroglyphs or runes. These are the remains of the previous regiments who have passed through the door. Here there is a twofold sense of the doorway as a site to fuse past and present. The soldiers passing through are connected to their immediate contemporaries, whom they have perhaps missed by hours, as well as “to antique beginnings”. Such antique beginnings herald the diffused sense of liminality Jones will later establish as his infantry of 1916 walk alongside warriors of long ago.

Eliot too locates an intersection of past and present at a doorway. In “Burnt Norton” Eliot describes how “Footfalls echo in the memory / Down the passage which we did not take / Towards the door we never opened / Into the rose-garden” (*Collected Poems* 177). While Jones’s troops are aware, passing through the door, of the soldiers before them Eliot’s limen more strongly associates this threshold meeting of past and present with an absence or loss. The fact that the door was “never opened” suspends the moment and fixes the space perpetually in liminal transition. The speaker describes the progression down the passage and *towards* the door. The limen space is approached and entered, without being exited. This suspension in the liminal threshold of the door never opened establishes the ongoing preoccupation of a fusion of past and present which develops throughout *Four*

Quartets. Just as the doorway of *The Mabinogion* establishes a similar, yet distinct, overarching framework in *In Parenthesis*.

Eliot's use of the passage in the above example is also something which recurs as a liminal space in other *Quartets* and in Jones's work. "Passage" is listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as both a noun and a verb. The noun form can embody both the association of movement as well as the spatial construct of a passage as corridor. "Passage" also contains within it the verb "pass". This doubling of passage as a space and as a movement or a journey fits into a liminal conception of space as a site of a transitory progression and transformation.

In "Little Gidding" the liminal nature of the passage is made more explicit:

But, as the passage now presents no hindrance
 To the spirit unappeased and peregrine
 Between two worlds become much like each other,
 So I find words I never thought to speak
 In streets I never thought I should revisit
 When I left my body on a distant shore.

(*Collected Poems* 205)

The "two worlds become much like each other" can be interpreted as the experience of a liminal state which allows for the past and present to be combined in a simultaneous instant. The dissolution of boundaries signalled by the fact of there being now no hindrance to the spirit also reinforces such a reading. Here Eliot is playing with the word "passage" in relation to "peregrine". A passage hawk or falcon refers to an adolescent bird beginning its training. This wordplay further infuses this extract with connotations of transitional or initiative periods in a life cycle. Also, once word play is further considered, the "passage" as a passage of text seems relevant, as a passage of verse or prose can become a space in its own right and facilitate transition and transformation. History's "many cunning passages" from "Gerontion" is a clearer example of a passage space and passage of text doubling and

playing off each other (*Collected Poems* 30). Eliot's multifarious use of "passage" is evocative of the emergence of simultaneity, which characterised the space of the early twentieth century and can produce liminal experiences. This wordplay is something Eliot and Jones both employ. Jones's play with "wood" both in terms of synonyms and in a liminal fusion of imagery becomes central to a spatial reading of the wooded space in his work.

The sense of revisiting the past is also apparent in the passage from "Little Gidding", as is another liminal landscape; the beach. The beach is a liminal site, where land and sea are both distinguished from each other and intermingle. In the past tense, the distant shore parallels Jones's "longing for the farther shore" he described in the preface to *The Anathemata*. Space in this passage takes on a metaphoric liminality as elements expressing a cognitive, imaginative experience. The liminal quality of imaginative engagements with space is something we shall return to when considering urban spaces.

Jones more frequently deploys "passage" to represent and evoke movement, rather than a space, such as the "screaming passage" of the artillery shells in *In Parenthesis* (177). Passage spaces do occur, but the doubling with journeying is important to note, especially when thinking of how spaces are essentially created or defined due to the actions and movements which occur within them. All liminal spaces, passages included, are the sites of passages and of passing as a subject physically or imaginatively enters a state of transition. When not using passage explicitly, Eliot still presents journeys as liminal spaces of between-ness. This is evident in "The Dry Salvages" and connects to Jones's double use of passage as a space and a movement. Eliot explains that passengers:

are not the same people who left that station
Or who will arrive at any terminus,
While the narrowing rails slide together behind you;
And on the deck of the drumming liner
Watching the furrow that widens behind you,

You shall not think 'the past is finished'
 Or 'the future is before us.' (*Collected Poems* 197)

Eliot further elucidates that

You are not those who saw the harbor
 Receding, or those who will disembark.
 Here between the hither and the farther shore
 While time is withdrawn, consider the future
 And the past with an equal mind.
 At the moment which is not of action or inaction
 (*Collected Poems* 197)

Again, there is the image of a "farther shore", echoing Jones's Break and representing one side of the liminal threshold.

The trenches are the dominant source of passages within *In Parenthesis*. Employing both spatially and kinetic senses, Jones describes how the company

passed where an angled contrivance of breast-works
 formed a defensive passage, a cunning opening eastward, opening outward, a sally-way; a place of significance to drawers up of schemes, a pin-point of the front-system known to the Staff.
 They typed its map reference on their orders in quadruplicate.
 (76)

This example displays the same progression through the passage towards an opening as Eliot's unopened door from "Burnt Norton". In another trench passage there is another significant spatial link to Eliot's corridor. We are told that

here and there the trench

was lower built or not so repaired from damage, and they momentarily had view of where a continuing double line of trees masked the passage of a road, parallel to where they went securely in the trench; the road they walked on in the darkness of the night before. (*In Parenthesis* 87)

Here the passage is associated with the line of trees, pulling this liminal space into a connection with a wooded landscape. The wood is a key liminal site in Jones's work and is analogous with the liminality of Eliot's garden. This pairing is reinforced by the fact that just as in this extract Jones associates the passage space with the wood, the passage of "Burnt Norton" leads to the rose garden. The liminality of woods and gardens will be explored in depth below. The parallel of the road as a passage and the passage of the trench also alerts us to a liminal space. They represent the two worlds become much like the other. While "securely" in the passage (or parenthesis) of the trench, the imaginative awareness of what runs parallel behind the line of trees where they walked the previous evening signals the association of past and present selves. This association develops into the spatially liminal interaction of the soldiers with warriors, wars, and battles of the past and reflects engagements with phantoms in Eliot's work.

Much like doorways, gates are also important liminal thresholds in these texts. Gates frequently feature throughout *In Parenthesis*, but a few examples take on particularly significant liminal connotations. Gates often suggest a progression towards death or the underworld. When the soldiers walk "Past the little gate, / into the field of upturned defences, / into the burial-yard" (31), Foucault's description of a cemetery as a heterotopic space comes to mind. This connection is reinforced when we see the troops "descending this / gate to their prison-house of earth closed-to, which had momentarily stood ajar, tantalisingly upon the western escape, / where the way led back by the forward batteries" (92). The liminality associated with the journey of the living hero to the space of the dead, in Classical epic the *katabasis*, is something that again expresses Jones's engagement with literary and

cultural history. The added detail of the gate “momentarily ... ajar” also invites liminal analysis. The door ajar allows the two sides it distinguishes to also connect in a moment of simultaneity.

Mars also features in *In Parenthesis*, yet more specifically associated with a gate as limen. Jones presents

This gate of Mars

armipotente, the grisly place, like flat painted scene in top-
lights’ crude disclosing. Low sharp-stubbed tree-skeletons,
stretched slow moving shadows; faintest mumbling heard just
at ground level. With the across movement of that light’s
shining, showed long and strait the dark entry, where his minis-
trants go, by tunnelled ways, whispering. (44)

The gate, an allusion to Chaucer, is both liminal in itself and leads to a landscape of further liminal elements.⁶ Passing through Mars’s gate also leads to other limens. There is the “dark entry” and the “tunnelled ways” which link to the doors and passages already identified. This unfolding of one liminal, transitory space after another within the text has been noted by Fairley who remarks that in *In Parenthesis* “one threshold may be crossed, but it seems only to lead to others” (49). In these unfolding limens is a reflection of the climate of the interwar period in which Jones was writing. The anxiety of a seemingly unresolvable state of transition and flux, “the tempo of change” (*The Anathemata* 15), can be perceived here as one limen leads only to another. Gennep’s assertion that there are always “new thresholds to cross” (189), manifests itself here with continually perpetuating liminal zones “outside a reasonably static culture-phase” (*The Anathemata* 15).

Jones includes references to several gates from the city of London for particular symbolic purposes. These London gates highlight the communion of past

⁶ Jones footnotes the Chaucer reference, but there is also a probable allusion to “strait is the gate and narrow is the way” from Matthew 7:14.

and present in liminal space in his and Eliot's texts. In Part V of *The Anathemata*, "The Lady of The Pool", Elen Monica's monologue recalls that "They come — and they go, captain. / At Sepulchre's Turnagain Lane, t'ward the Smooth- / field pond, beyond the New Gate" (129-130). In the footnote to these lines Jones adds that this "gate, alone of all the gate-sites of Roman London, has yielded positive material evidence of Roman gate-work" (130 note 1). Newgate therefore presents a physical liminal space as well as a combined imaginative archaeological one. This example indicates how the fragments and allusions Jones and Eliot imbed from literary and cultural history function within their texts. Each collection of fragments is a textually created, rich archaeological gateway, allowing us to step into the threshold where we can perceive, connect, and ruminate upon past and present.

Ludgate is another example Jones flags as significant in the text. His footnote comments on "the story popularized by Geoffrey of Monmouth that King Cadwallon was embalmed and set in brass armour on a brass horse 'over the West Gate of London' [...]. Altogether apart from this legendary account it is documented that images in fact adorned Ludgate in the medieval period; the 'images of Lud and other kings' being repaired or added in 1260" (*The Anathemata* 130 note 2). Jones's description of the gate's decoration recalls the chalked symbols on the doorway of *In Parenthesis*. In both cases, visual adornment to these threshold spaces effectively brings the past into the present.

"Highgate" and "Ludgate" are also mentioned by Eliot in a list of London place names in "Burnt Norton" (*Collected Poems* 180). As part of a larger list of names which locates the passage in London, Eliot does not invoke the same liminal connotations Jones's footnotes highlight. However, these gates do connect to other significant gates throughout *Four Quartets*. In "Burnt Norton" there is "the first gate" which leads "Into our first world" (*Collected Poems* 177). This associates the gate with a kind of coming-of-age ritual, linking the limen back to anthropological analysis of rites of passage. The idea of a "first world" also suggests that there may be second, third or fourth worlds to pass into later, which echoes the idea of thresholds following on from one another in *In Parenthesis*, again recalling the wider context of

transition and uncertainty in the first half of the twentieth century.

Eliot circles back to this “first gate” in the final *Quartet*, “Little Gidding”:

And the end of all our exploring
 Will be to arrive where we started
 And know the place for the first time.
 Through the unknown, remembered gate
 When the last of earth left to discover
 Is that which was the beginning;
 At the source of the longest river
 The voice of the hidden waterfall
 And the children in the apple-tree
 Not known, because not looked for
 But heard, half-heard, in the stillness
 Between two waves of the sea. (*Collected Poems* 209)

Through a circular interaction with space the first gate is again passed through at the end of the journey. The gate is “remembered” yet also “unknown”. Here the experience of the past is tied up and fused together in the present as this same gate is again arrived at. The liminal, parenthetical space is highlighted by the “half-heard” voices “Between two waves of the sea”. The site of the gate encapsulates all that has occurred between each entry and exit. A similar circularity is at work in *The Anathemata*, as the ending reveals that the entire course of the poem has taken place during a specific moment in the Mass. The text begins, ends, and is entirely enclosed by the space and ritual of the Church.

These threshold structures embedded within the texts alert us to the wider use of liminal space, which underpins the various different spaces Eliot and Jones utilise. Analysis of these limens can be extrapolated in order to understand the way both poets use landscape and imagery to create various other, sometimes rather diffused, poetic limens which articulate their experience of modern space.

Places Between

In addition to the threshold spaces, bracketed parentheses are both embedded within the texts and provide new ways for analysing different spaces and landscapes in Jones's and Eliot's work. As has already been noted, it is not only in *In Parenthesis* that we can perceive the importance of parenthetical, bracketed space. Throughout their work, Jones and Eliot present the "space between" which for Jones particularly characterised the Great War. While all instances of liminal space in their work can be understood as parenthetical in nature, the many specific embedded instances of parentheses require closer examination.

A parenthesis is essentially made of four or five component parts. There are the two curves of the bracket which act as defining boundaries, encasing the more ambiguous area between, where liminal space is manifested. The space which surrounds the brackets can either be imagined as a homogenous whole, or divided into that which lies before and after the parenthesis. Thinking about Jones's and Eliot's parentheses specifically, this outside space could be segmented into areas which represent past and present to the left and right.

Parentheses of varying sizes exist within this range of texts. The smallest examples take the form of punctuation. Jones and Eliot both use brackets to indicate space. In *The Waste Land* the statement that "There is shadow under this red rock" is followed by the parenthetical invitation to "(Come in under the shadow of this red rock)" (*Collected Poems* 53 lines 25-6). The brackets take us under and inside this overhang, effectively offering a temporary separation from the wider waste landscape. The same inner space, entered into, is also created by Jones's use of brackets. The bracketed description details tunnels in the trench landscape: "(as grey-banded rodents for a shelving warren — cooped in their complex runnels, where the sea-fret percolates)" (*In Parenthesis* 67).

"The Dry Salvages" also uses brackets to characterise space, but in a different

way. In this poem Eliot creates a simultaneous vision of two movements in opposite directions by using brackets. As the speaker describes the passengers seated on a train which has just begun to move out of the station we are told “(And those who saw them off have left the platform)” (*Collected Poems* 196). As the train moves away, those who have paid their farewells also depart the station, but in the opposite direction. These two movements occur simultaneously and Eliot’s use of brackets brings together the elements of space, time, and movement in this scene. Jones also depicts movement in brackets, in the example “(between dun August oaks their pied bodies darting)” (*In Parenthesis* 80). This parenthesis also connects to the larger parenthetical structure of the text by the significant inclusion of “between” within this visual between-space on the page.

Jones’s parenthesis which describes movement “between dun August oaks” also demonstrates how he and Eliot employ brackets to play with multiple voices within their texts, producing polyphonic simultaneity. Jones’s footnotes this parenthesis in order to direct readers towards his allusion to Caesar’s *Gallic War* (*In Parenthesis* 208 note C). Eliot does much the same with his parenthetical aside “(Those are pearls that were his eyes. Look!)” (*Collected Poems* 54 line 48). This line adds multiple voices in the middle of a verse in *The Waste Land* as the bracketed phrase interrupts the speaker’s flow, either as an internal thought of theirs or an entirely new voice. The phrase is also an allusion to *The Tempest*, adding the voice of Shakespeare’s text into the mix. The line resurfaces later in “A Game of Chess”, when the speaker states “I remember / Those are pearls that were his eyes” (*Collected Poems* 57 lines 124-5). This echo plays with space in the text, pulling the reader back to the first appearance of the allusion in order to form a connection or contrast between them. Jones presents a similar echo when the bracketed phrase “(we came no more again)” is repeated across pages 82 and 83 of *In Parenthesis*. This refrain has the tone of a ghostly lament, connecting to the wider use of ghosts and ghosting doubles within the text. These uses of brackets both create separations and forge connections.

As this between-space of the bracket cannot exist without the defining edges,

analysis of the specific between spaces Jones and Eliot present must also consider their use of boundaries. Their shared focus upon the dissolution of borderlines makes examples of boundaries striking and significant. Jones writes in *The Anathemata* of being “Informed from before history proper: / from the boundary time” (229) and in *In Parenthesis* he situates us “at the place of boundaries” (80). But the establishment of boundaries is overwhelmed by a focus on the very moment that demarcations disappear. Jones describes how such “insubstantial barriers dissolve” in the “uncertain flux” of the new world of the trenches (*In Parenthesis* 59). We are told that “when it’s like no-man’s-land / between yesterday and tomorrow [...] material things are but / barely integrated and loosely tacked together” (*In Parenthesis* 181). *The Anathemata* shares this focus, with “the carious de- / marcations between the tawny ramps and the gone-fallow / lynchets” (233). The very instant of these structures failing to contain, define, and separate is captured in the lines “the dykes so full to overflowing to bound / these furrows from these, ran narrow glassy demarkations” (*In Parenthesis* 18).

The same preoccupations can also be discerned in Eliot. In *The Waste Land* the final stanza begins with the speaker stating: “I sat upon the shore / Fishing with the arid plain behind me” (*Collected Poems* 69 lines 424-425). The shoreline, as has been observed, is a liminal space as it both connects and divides land and sea. Here the speaker is at a place of boundaries, which is also a liminal threshold. As with Jones’s dissolving perimeters, there is an element of instability in the shoreline as boundary-line. The double sense of “behind” as both a spatial situation as well as related to time past also associates this image with the liminal situation of the present between past and future in *Four Quartets*. The sense of an edge that the shoreline evokes is also included on a micro-scale in “Burnt Norton” with the detail of the “brown edged” pool (*Collected Poems* 178). We are also told that the pool is made of concrete. This unremarkable material carries with it the connotations of “concrete” as an expression of that which is the opposite of abstract or changeable; something solid and intransitively defined. In “Little Gidding”, particularly, Eliot repeatedly includes hedges as boundaries. In this example the hedgerow as boundary

is intertwined with paradoxical and transient imagery:

Now the hedgerow
Is blanched for an hour with transitory blossom
Of snow, a bloom more sudden
Than that of summer, neither budding nor fading,

.....

If you came this way in may time, you would find the hedges
White again, in May, with voluptuary sweetness.
It would be the same at the end of the journey,

(Collected Poems 201)

The hedge produces “transitory blossom” which is simultaneously the petals of May shaken by the spring breezes and the equally fleeting petals of snowflake. But these flowers are described as “neither budding nor fading” and the blooms on the hedge “would be the same at the end of the journey” as they were at the start, suggesting both the permanence of a boundary-marker and that they are liminally suspended between opposite motions or impulses. Eliot perhaps most explicitly connects borders to the liminal uncertainty that Jones presents in his unstable boundaries when he describes the state of being “Caught in the form of limitation / Between un-being and being” (*Collected Poems* 182).

Those lines from “Burnt Norton” also serve as one example of the prevalence of the use of “between” to situate us in an emotional or physical context in Eliot’s and Jones’s poetry. In their work there are both examples of the word “between” to describe these spaces as well as other devices which situate the spaces liminally betwixt and amidst. The liminal space of between-ness is not only diffused throughout the spaces Jones and Eliot present, but is also present at the level of the

vocabulary each employs. Jones presents whole locales of between-ness, such as “in this hollow between the hills” (*In Parenthesis* 131) as well as highlighting the slices of between spaces which present themselves in a scene, as demonstrated by the description of how “with the / door’s slam there is nothing in the street at all but rain be- / tween the buildings” (*In Parenthesis* 85). Equivalent examples emerge from Eliot, too, as in the scene set “Between three districts whence the smoke arose” (*Collected Poems* 204). Eliot also uses “middle” as a variation on “between”, situating the speaker, in Dantean fashion, “in the middle way” (*Collected Poems* 190).

More often than strictly employing “between”, Eliot presents a scenario where the reader is required to supply the “between”. Most of these examples require the “between” in response to a series of negations, which still appear to be co-present despite their mutual disavowal. These examples are another variation of the many opposites Eliot holds in tension throughout his poetry. Eliot creates these variations of between spaces by the use of pairs such as “Neither plentitude nor vacancy” (*Collected Poems* 180) and “neither gain nor loss” (*Collected Poems* 190). The following passage from “Burnt Norton” displays multiple examples of these negative parings at work:

At the still point of the turning world. Neither flesh nor
fleshless;
Neither from nor towards; at the still point, there the dance
is,
But neither arrest nor movement. And do not call it fixity,
Where past and future are gathered. Neither movement from
nor towards,
Neither ascent nor decline. Except for the point, the still
point, (*Collected Poems* 179)

One could argue that these phrases are suggestive of absence, that is, in the absence of both only nothing exists. The “still point” here could therefore resemble a kind of

vacuum. The only exception is the dual assertion that past and future *are* present in the absence of the other elements. But reading these pairings as descriptive of spaces between, situated somewhere amidst the concrete edges of extremes, is suggested by Eliot himself when in “Little Gidding” he presents the space “Between melting and freezing” where “The soul’s sap quivers” (*Collected Poems* 201). Melting and freezing presents a similar pairing of opposites as found in the passage above, but Eliot here makes explicit the very between space which is elsewhere ambiguous, reinforcing it *as* a space by further locating the specific movement of the soul’s life-blood within it.

Between spaces are also conjured at crepuscular times of day, characterised by the between-ness of half-light. In preparation for their channel crossing, the infantry of *In Parenthesis* are paraded “Sometime between midnight and 2am” (*In Parenthesis* 8). In “The Dry Salvages” Eliot expands on the liminality of these hours in the lines: “Between midnight and dawn, when the past is all deception, / The future futureless, before the morning watch / When time stops and time is never ending” (*Collected Poems* 193). Eliot associates paradoxes and irreconcilable opposites with twilight across *Four Quartets* and *The Waste Land*. Tiresias, a liminal figure of many between, announces to readers: “ I Tiresias, though blind, throbbing between two lives, / Old man with wrinkled female breasts, can see / At the violet hour” (*Collected Poems* 61 lines 218-220). Reading one aspect of the connotative violet hour as the colour of twilight places Tiresias’s paradoxical statement in this same between-ness of dusk. In “Burnt Norton” Eliot dwells on “a dim light: neither daylight” which embodies “Time before and time after” (*Collected Poems* 180), two more opposites held in stasis in a liminal, twilight space. While, again, in “Little Gidding” there exists “Midwinter spring” “Suspended in time, between pole and tropic” located at “sundown” (*Collected Poems* 201).

Within “Little Gidding” there is an extended liminal encounter at dawn. After a night of air-raids, the speaker finds himself in the street “Between three districts” (*Collected Poems* 204) “In the uncertain hour before the morning” (*Collected Poems* 203), the “waning dusk” (*Collected Poems* 204), and encounters a

“familiar compound ghost” (*Collected Poems* 204). The ghost was once “known” and is now “forgotten” and “half recalled” (*Collected Poems* 204) in the manner of the “old remembered gate” at the close of the poem. The encounter with the ghost, who is “Both intimate and unidentifiable”, causes the speaker to feel as though he is both himself and “something other” (*Collected Poems* 204). This “concord at this intersection time” (*Collected Poems* 204) is of opposite elements, simultaneously present and unresolved.

This episode itself presents a parenthesis within the poem. It takes place “In the uncertain hour before the morning / Near the ending of interminable night” (*Collected Poems* 203). This location before a beginning, yet not quite at an end, is the experience “Of meeting nowhere” and of there being “no before and after” (*Collected Poems* 204). The ghostly encounter both depicts a parenthetical experience and is located structurally within its own kind of parenthesis in the text. It is prefaced by three stanzas of couplets, which break with the verse form found directly before and after. At the end of the episode “The day was breaking. In the disfigured street” and the ghost finally fades “on the blowing of the horn” (*Collected Poems* 205). With the ghost’s disappearance Eliot directly ends Part II of “Little Gidding”. The light of the new day, and aural pull of the horn close the episode by disrupting the self-enclosed space, pulling it into alignment with the wider world.

Jones’s trench spaces are also characterised by the same half-light central to the liminal episode in “Little Gidding”. The men are described as moving “within the orbit of the light, and away into the half-dark- / ness, undefined, beyond it” (*In Parenthesis* 8). The significance of the association of something undefined or of definitions which have become blurred and indistinct in the same half-light is made explicit by a later passage:

No-man’s-land whitened rigid: all its contours silver fili-
greed, as damascened. With the coming dark, ground-mist
creeps back to regain the hollow places; across the rare atmo-
sphere you could hear the foreign men cough, and stamp with for-

eign feet. Things seen precisely just now lost exactness. Biez
wood became only a darker shape uncertainly expressed. Your
eyes begin to strain after escaping definitions. (*In Parenthesis* 98)

In this extract, the optical phenomenon induced by the half-light also expresses the wider civilizational process Jones documents. The uncertainty of previously sharply defined elements does not only refer to the clarity of the landscape, but to the broader cultural situation.

These small scale instances of parenthetical spaces are also integrally linked to the overarching poetically liminal elements Jones and Eliot employ. Early in *In Parenthesis*, Jones couples one of these examples of between space with an allusive vision, which suggests one of the ways that these parentheses reflect and inform Jones's and Eliot's extensive use of intertextuality. John Ball, who at various times sees things "between", in this instance

could see, half-
left between 7 and 8 of the front rank, the profile of Mr.
Jenkins and the elegant cut of his war-time rig and his flax
head held front; like San Romano's foreground squire, un-
helmeted; but we don't have lances now nor banners nor
trumpets. (*In Parenthesis* 2)

The physical manifestation of the between space, here between 7 and 8, directly proceeds the simile which brings the vision of the Great War into parallel with Uccello's fifteenth-century depiction of battle. This simile is then immediately unsettled, as Jones withdraws the offered analogy. Although this parallel is instinctively, almost unconsciously, perceived the fact remains that "we don't have lances now nor banners nor trumpets". While this likeness is perceived as a connection between the infantry of 1915 to their cultural heritage, it also evidences their disconnection from the same legacy. The vision of Mr. Jenkins in the space

between the men in front leads Jones into another vision which suspends the impulses of continuity and dislocation in tension. What Jones produces here can be perceived in Eliot's expression of "both a new world / And the old made explicit, understood / In the completion of its partial ecstasy, / The resolution of its partial horror" (*Collected Poems* 179).

Jones's and Eliot's use of boundaries and edges produces a sense of the indeterminacy and flux that the dissolution of these boundaries and establishment of liminal, between spaces produces. The internal space of the bracket has the power to spill over its own linear edges and this liminoid space facilitates the simultaneous co-existence of opposites as well as the fading of various forms or ideologies into the twilight of a time of transition. These liminal parentheses have been found in the trench landscape of *In Parenthesis*, the city of "Little Gidding" and pastoral locations across *Four Quartets*. Such parentheses range from the large to the small, bracketing *In Parenthesis* in its entirety as well as manifesting on the level of punctuation. Exploration of the different liminal spaces with Eliot's and Jones's work, which are kinds of diffused parentheses, reveal how these can be both "found" spaces Eliot and Jones weave into their texts and spaces which the texts themselves create.

Chapter Four: Wastelands

In part two of *The Waste Land*, “A Game of Chess”, there is an exchange between two unnamed voices, one of which questions, while the other answers. The questioning voice demands “ ‘What are you thinking of? What thinking? What?’” (*Collected Poems* 57 line 113), to which the other responds: “I think we are in rats’ alley / Where the dead men lost their bones” (*Collected Poems* 57 lines 115-116). This exchange serves a number of purposes, one of which is to make the reader consider where exactly they think the poem is set at any given time. The answer these lines simultaneously offer aligns Eliot’s wasteland with Jones’s depiction of the Western Front in 1916. Both wastelands present a dual vision of the war waste of the trenches and the landscape of the industrialised world. Comparing both reveals their spatially liminal nature, suspended between, as two separate landscapes are experienced simultaneously.

If a first glance at *In Parenthesis* can tempt the reader to enclose the text in a purely WWI context, the same first glance at *The Waste Land* risks its relationship to WWI being almost entirely downplayed. Cole in particular has commented that “one might read many works of modernism, as well as the critical record since midcentury, without understanding the extent of postwar injury” (28). Comments made by Amy Lowell in 1917 reinforce this view. Lowell expressed the impossibility “for anyone writing to-day not to be affected by the war. It has overwhelmed us like a tidal wave. It is the equinoctial storm which bounds a period” (342). Reading both *In Parenthesis* and *The Waste Land* as companions solidifies the link between this major event in world history and the poetry of the subsequent decades. This pairing highlights how one of the most important reasons for reading *In Parenthesis* within the wider modernist canon is that by combining modernist preoccupations of both form and content in a work which directly addresses the war, Jones’s text pulls from other modernist works their less overt (but not less significant) ties to the origins and legacy of the conflict. While Jones’s waste motif

has certainly been seen in parallel, if not as downright homage, to Eliot, the titular landscape of *The Waste Land* is newly informed by a levelled comparison with its counterpart in *In Parenthesis*.

Jones and Eliot approach the First World War from opposite points of view. In his preface to *In Parenthesis*, Eliot particularly distinguishes Jones from his modernist, literary contemporaries. Eliot notes that “The lives of all of us [referring to Joyce, Pound and himself] were altered by that War, but David Jones is the only one to have fought in it” (*In Parenthesis* viii). Jones also spent more time in active service than any other British First World War writer, totalling one hundred and seventeen weeks at the front (Dilworth, *David Jones in The Great War* 14). Eliot, in contrast, spent the duration of the war in England, studying first at Oxford and then employed by Lloyds Bank in London. Based upon his medical examination Eliot was cleared for limited service (Eliot, *Letters Vol. 1* 274-284, 286-292). But the swathes of red tape he encountered as the various branches of the navy and army tried to decide where to assign him saw Eliot eventually accept the bank’s offer to file an appeal to exempt him from service. This exemption was never required as shortly after this decision was made the armistice was announced, closing Eliot’s window to enter the Great War (*Letters Vol. 1* 296-97, 299-302, 304-8).

It is an interesting, if unanswerable, question as to whether or not Jones would have turned to poetry at all had he not served during the war. *In Parenthesis* took shape out of experiments Jones was making with captioned images of his wartime experiences.⁷ This development suggests that the purely visual media he had previously worked with, such as painting and printmaking, were not entirely suitable to express his feelings and experiences. An anecdote from Jones’s friend Tom Burns offers another perspective on this issue. Burns recalls how Jones, who read most of the books produced by ex-servicemen, closing *All Quiet on The Western Front* and declaring: “Bugger it, I can do better than that. I’m going to write a book”

⁷ The origins of the poem, as detailed by Jones, can be found in several draft letters among his papers at the National Library of Wales. These include drafts of a letter to John. H. Johnston dated 27th April 1962, an undated letter to a Miss Jones (Letters About Published Work CF 1/4), and Bernard Bergonzi in 1965 (Letters to Bernard Bergonzi CF 1/6).

(*David Jones in The Great War* 216). Jones himself reflected in the essay “Art in Relation to War” that “as far as I can see the last war [WWI] stimulated, in some artists at all events, the creative ability – provided some element that might otherwise have been lacking” (*The Dying Gaul* 135). But he does not specify whether he is speaking of his own work or purely his observations of others.

Their different levels of involvement in the war are evident by the wasteland each poet predominantly focuses on. The majority of *In Parenthesis* is located in the war-ravaged waste, which is infused with the urban, industrial imagery of peacetime. Eliot reverses this relationship in *The Waste Land* where the waste is predominately an urban, civilian setting. A combination of significant details and phrases carry connotations of the war into Eliot’s text, of which “rats’ alley” and the dead men’s lost bones are two, but the war itself never directly appears.

Jones hinted at the implications of the relationship between these two landscapes, asking us to consider

the effects of war experience, as we know it, upon some kinds of artist. A trench lived in in 1915 might easily “get into” a picture of a back garden in 1925 and by one of those hidden processes, transmogrify it – impart, somehow or other, a vitality which otherwise it might not possess. (*The Dying Gaul* 140)

Jones here describes half of the liminal process at work in his and Eliot’s wastelands. The equation of the warscape with civilian spaces works both ways, additionally transforming representation of the trenches.

This doubling and overlay of the two spaces in both wastelands has been noted by critics since *The Waste Land*’s and *In Parenthesis*’s respective publications. Cunningham summarises how it “became a convention of the times to depict the landscapes, geographical and spiritual, of the post-war, as war-devastated waste lands” (52). Using *The Waste Land* as an example, she argues Eliot’s waste “was itself,

of course, generated out of an immediate response to the War. And it was a vision that rapidly proved indispensable to the post-war sense of the city, of modern life: it became *the* touchstone, the most convenient shorthand way of defining the modern plight” (52). The doubled waste as a “shorthand” reflects the simultaneity, compression, and concertinaed layers of liminality present both in their wastelands as well as throughout Jones’s and Eliot’s work.

Fussell assisted the canonisation of the wartime reading of *The Waste Land* in *The Great War and Modern Memory*, which was developed by the new historicist critics of the 1980s (Cole 311 note 56). Fussell stated that if “seen in its immediate postwar context, a work like *The Waste Land* appears much more profoundly a ‘memory of the war’ than one had thought” (325-326). Fussell produced a list of details tying the text to the war, highlighting “its archduke, its rats and canals and dead men, its focus on fear, its dusty trees, its conversation about demobilization, its spiritualist practitioners reminding us of those who preyed on relatives anxious to contact their dead boys, and not least its setting of blasted landscape and ruins” (326).

Cole points out that the tradition of linking the text to the war, highlighted by Fussell, goes back to the time of its publication. Although early reviews and Eliot’s own attitude turned focus upon “universal themes” and away from “historical interpretation”, Cole perceives that readers have long seen the text as an “epochal statement of the postwar condition” (311 note 56). She supports her reading by compiling a similar list to Fussell’s, establishing how “thematics and imagery of the war underlie the poem at many levels, beginning with its memorial opening and encompassing its burning cities, soldier songs, shell-shocked London citizenry, ubiquitous dead, burial phobias, even the rats” (66).

Fussell is also one of the earliest critics to identify the duality of Jones’s wasteland, observing the “similarity of the trench scene to the modern urban, industrial squalor” (149). Which Ward further affirmed, arguing “the wasteland of the Somme Forward Area *is* the Waste Land of post-war industrial suburban England” (110). Jack Dudley has additionally seen a direct link to Eliot in Jones’s

double vision of the trenches, perceiving that Jones recasts

the civilian imagery of Eliot's *The Waste Land* and "The Hollow Men" (1925) in terms of the incoherent trench experience. Whereas Eliot articulates a modern vision of death-in-life amid Civil Society, "Starlight Order" makes the navigation of war trenches by darkness an analogy for modern life. (109)

While Dudley's argument pushes for direct allusion, his comments nevertheless highlight the double action of the waste in *In Parenthesis*. What Dudley does not explore is the reverse relationship of the wartime landscape on Eliot's "civilian imagery".

Charles Andrews has also highlighted the manner in which "the metropolis infuses Jones's war imagery" in "War Trauma and Religious Cityscape in David Jones's 'In Parenthesis'" (2007) (91). Andrews discusses how "part of the value of the metropolis comes from its similarity to war in squalor, isolation, and technocracy. Jones's poetry renders [...] battlefields metropolitan" (87). His argument provides a new reading of the urban imagery of Jones's wastelands by developing the implications of this parallel towards a transformation of "the war-torn trenches into a sanctified city" (88) or "symbolic biblical city" (93).

The rats of rats' alley, which populate both texts, provide a starting point for a close reading of the liminality of these wastelands. The rats in both *In Parenthesis* and *The Waste Land* offer a clear example of the double vision of wasteland as warscape and urban setting. Rats were a fact of life in the trenches and Jones could hardly have chronicled his time at the front without including them. They are given particular symbolic connotations within the text, which go beyond the kind of documentary aspect of the realistic drawings of rats made in his wartime sketchbooks (see Fig. 1). Rats are also a recurrent motif throughout World War I literature. Well-known examples include Rosenberg's "queer sardonic rat" (*Collected*

Works 73) from “Break of Day in the Trenches”, Owen’s rumination on the life of rats in “A Terre”, as well as Sassoon’s “Dreamer” and “Aftermath”. But the same rats which infested the trenches are also the scourge of large modern cities. Both environments allow the rodents to flourish and their presence in both texts act as a connective motif, which merges the two landscapes into a liminal space. The rat fulfills much the same function in Rosenberg’s “Break of Day in the Trenches”. Here the English soldier muses on how the rat, casually brushing past him, will do much the same to a German soldier. Unlike the soldiers, the rat can traverse the parenthesis of no-man’s-land lying between them. Nationalist boundaries dissolve when imaginatively inhabiting the psyche of the rat who can, physically and symbolically, occupy liminal space. The following passage from *The Waste Land* demonstrates how the rats contribute to this duality of the space as that between modern industrialised life and the First World War:

A rat crept softly through the vegetation
 Dragging its slimy belly on the bank
 While I was fishing in the dull canal
 On a winter evening round behind the gashouse
 Musing upon the king my brother’s wreck
 And on the king my father’s death before him.



Figure 1: Pencil sketch made by David Jones during his time in the trenches. This image is inscribed “November 1916 / Rats shot during the pulling down of an old dugout in Ploegsteert Wood” and initialled DJ. Held at the Royal Welch Fusiliers Museum.

Source: The First World War Poetry Digital Archive:

<http://www.oucs.ox.ac.uk/ww1lit/collections/item/6159>

White bodies naked on the low damp ground
 And bones cast in a little low dry garret,
 Rattled by the rat's foot only, year to year.

(*Collected Poems* 60 lines 187-195)

Here the “white bodies naked on the low damp ground” reinforces the association of rats with the casualties of the First World War, although in an ambiguous fashion.

James E. Miller Jr. has made a direct connection between this passage and Gallipoli in *T. S. Eliot's Personal Waste Land* (1977) (21). Miller bases his extremely specific connection to Eliot's friendship with Jean Verdental, who died while attending to wounded soldiers as a medic at the Dardanelles in 1915. Miller's analysis is part of a body of Eliot criticism which explores the possible significance of this friendship and Eliot's supposed romantic feelings for Verdental in relation to his poetic engagement with the war.⁸ The gashouse in this scene presents a piece of modern technology which, similarly to the rats, is entwined with both civilian life and the particular character of modern warfare. The structure represents the use of gas in its civilian capacity as power for homes and businesses, but gas is also one of the technologies adapted during the war in a new and devastating way. Like the rats, gas provides a bridge between modern city life and the experience of the trenches.

The texture of the “slimy belly” of the rat as it makes its way through the landscape is very similar to the “amphibious paradise” of the rats in *In Parenthesis* (54). Jones blackly describes how the flourishing rats “redeem the time of our uncharity” (*In Parenthesis* 54). This same dark sentiment is also present in Eliot, as the rat is the only visitor to the bones in the garret, seemingly forgotten by any human mourners.

The kind of industrial urban wastes, such as neglected pockets surrounding a

⁸ For other discussions of what little is known about Eliot and Verdental, as well as the larger amount of conjecture which surrounds their relationship, see: “Quest for a Frenchman” (1976) by George Watson, “Mrs Dalloway and T. S. Eliot's Personal Waste Land” (1983) by Erwin R. Steinberg, “Outing T. S. Eliot” (2005) by Suzanne W. Churchill, as well as letters Verdental wrote to Eliot in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 1 1898-1922*.

factory or unkempt suburban yards, are overlaid onto Jones's wartime waste. Jones displays this double vision at work in Part Three:

Saturate, littered, rusted coilings, metallic rustlings, thin
 ribbon metal-chafing— rasp low for some tension freed; by rat,
 or wind, disturbed.

.....

Margarine tins sail derelict, where little eddies quivered,
 wind caught, their sharp-jagged twisted lids wrenched back.

(In Parenthesis 39)

While later he describes the waste's appearance as

sordid and deprived as ill kept
 hen-runs that back on sidings on wet-weekdays where waste-
 land meets environs and punctured bins ooze canned-meats
 discarded, tyres to rot, derelict slow-weathered iron-ware
 disintegrates between factory-end and nettle-bed.

(In Parenthesis 75)

The "factory-end" recalls Eliot's "behind the gashouse" while the metal offcuts could just as easily be found in a factory yard. The "littered" tins of margarine and meat and the old tyres suggest the debris produced by modern urban living and the associated relationships between mass production and consumption. The tyres and tinned goods were also integral to the progress of this modern war, again doubling the connotations attached to the landscape. The presence of the rat here too, cements it as a connective symbol between the two overlaid, merging wastes. The rat's footsteps disturb the metal shavings in no-man's-land just as it disturbed the bones in Eliot's garret. While one rat draws attention to the wartime anxiety of lost

bones in the urban waste, the other does the same for industrial detritus in no-man's-land.

Two of Eliot's early poems demonstrate an early preoccupation with these urban wastes, filled with the refuse of modernity. The pre-war, industrial wasteland these poems contain suggest that Eliot's vision of a waste is not confined to that of the inter-war years, but engages the war waste with the larger phenomenon of industrialisation. The second stanza of "First Caprice in North Cambridge" describes:

Bottle and broken glass,
Trampled mud and grass;
A heap of broken barrows;
And a crowd of tattered sparrows
Delve in the gutter with sordid patience.

Oh, these minor considerations! (*March Hare* 13)

While the sequel, "Second Caprice in North Cambridge" distills:

This charm of vacant lots!
The helpless fields that lie
Sinister, sterile and blind –
Entreat the eye and rack the mind,
Demand your pity.
With ashes and tins in piles,
Shattered bricks and tiles
And the debris of a city. (*March Hare* 15)

Louis Menand has paraphrased the lines from "First Caprice" as "an abrupt exclamation at the triviality of the entire experience" (17). Menand also reflects that

“[i]t is impossible to tell whether the contempt is directed at the world for providing such rubbishy material for the imagination to work with, or at the self for being betrayed into such shabby feelings by its incurable habit of trying to manufacture significance from second-rate objects like these” (17). The triviality of experience the urban waste encapsulates underlies a similar feeling connected to the war. The experience of Jones’s soldiers is not that of the great epic heroes they have grown up reading about. A sense of uniformity, tedium, and drudgery saturates their time at the front. Less the stuff of legends, it is more as if they worked one section of an assembly line day in and day out, year after year.

Like the variety of debris littered throughout Jones’s wasteland, the rats are only one of multiple embedded details which carry First World War associations into *The Waste Land*. While the rats are suggestive of the experience of the war itself, other details look back to the origins of the war as well as forward to its aftermath. Although based upon an anecdote told to him by Countess Marie Larisch, niece of the Austrian Empress Elizabeth, (*Facsimile* 125-6) the incident involving the “archduke” (*Collected Poems* 53 line 13) cannot fail in the post-war world to be charged with the political origins of the conflict. The archduke in the poem is not explicitly tied to the archduke Franz Ferdinand, however, the frightened state of the children and the downward motion of the sled have evoked, at least for T. A. Birrell, overtones of “the fall of an empire” (525). This episode is also significant as a memory, told in the past tense. The interaction with memory is in itself liminal, as what has past is transformed by, perpetually shifting, present perspectives.

The past tense of this episode contrasts with the present tense depictions of Mr. Eugenides and of the conversation about Lil and Albert in a public house. These are two instances where, rather than directly referencing the war, Eliot presents ties to post-war political and social climates. In the course of discussing Lil’s and Albert’s marriage, it becomes clear that Albert is a veteran of the First World War, as he is now “demobbed” and wanting “a good time” having “been in the army four years” (*Collected Poems* 58 lines 139, 148). This reflects the kind of micro post-war effect on personal relationships, while Mr. Eugenides engages with the European political

aftermath.

Critics, such as David Roessel, have discussed the connection Mr. Eugenides offers between the text and the impact of the post-war reorganisation of Europe. However, Roessel is careful to qualify in “ ‘Mr. Eugenides, The Smyrna Merchant,’ and Post-War Politics in *The Waste Land*” (1989) that as well as the “political theme” of *The Waste Land*, Mr. Eugenides “also contributes to the sexual and commercial themes of the poem” and a “full interpretation” of his character “requires a synthesis of all three” (176). This comment demonstrates that focusing on the details which offer a war context for *The Waste Land* should not be purported to unlock the “true” meaning of the text, eclipsing all others. All examples triggering associations with the war serve multiple purposes in the text.

One of Mr. Eugenides’s functions is to express “the present decay of Eastern Europe”, which Eliot described as one of the main themes of the poem (*Collected Poems* 74). Eugenides is a merchant from Smyrna (*Collected Poems* 61 line 209), part of the area of Asia Minor transferred from Turkey to Greece in the aftermath of the war (Roessel 171). The arrival of Greek troops in Smyrna in 1919 resulted in the massacre of the Turkish population, which ignited a cycle of retaliation (Roessel 172). Eugenides’s Greek name particularly alerts readers to Eliot’s engagement with the debate over Smyrna, which was much discussed in English newspapers around the time Eliot began writing (Roessel 172-3). Cole, too, has noted that “anyone reading the papers from 1919” until *The Waste Land*’s publication would have been aware of this political situation (70). Eliot’s engagement with this media coverage is demonstrated by a letter to the *Daily Mail*, published on January 8th 1923, in which he praises the manner in which the paper has been reporting on “the Turkish question” (*Letters Vol. 2* 8). This not only reveals Eliot’s own engagement with these issues, but supports the assumption that Eliot would have expected his readership to, almost immediately, decode the combination of details brought together in Eugenides and link the poem with the political aftermath of the Great War.

Roessel points out that British interest in this particular issue mainly resulted from concerns over trade (173). Seen in this light, Eugenides’s “pocket full

of currants" (*Collected Poems* 61 line 210) acts both as a pun on currency and as an emblem of the kind of goods Britain imported. "Currant" also connects commerce to currents, tides, and directional forces. One can speak of "tides" in regards to public opinion and political regimes. These metaphorical aspects of currents also gestures forwards to Phlebas the Phoenicia. The subtle association of the politics surrounding the war and concerns of trade is one Jones slips into *In Parenthesis* as well. Most notably this occurs when a grenade expert, who addresses the troops, is described like "a departing commercial traveller" (*In Parenthesis* 13). Again, a kind of doubled or blurred vision between the civilian world of manufacturing, technology, and trade with the First World War is created.

One of Pound's editorial suggestions found on the original manuscript increased the political overtones of Mr. Eugenides. Pound changed Eliot's initial "abominable French" to the "demotic French" which appears in the published text (*Facsimile* 43). The use of "demotic" immediately ties Eugenides to the debate raging in the 1920s about whether to restore demotic Greek over the "purified form" instituted after Greece regained independence (Roessel 175). That it is "demotic French", rather than Greek, makes a significant comment on the nature of the debate, which connects to another closely related issue surrounding the census in Asia Minor (Roessel 173-5). This census classified individuals based upon religion, rather than language, producing a situation where Orthodox Greeks, who spoke not a word of the Greek language, were incorporated into this cultural group (Roessel 173). The phrase "demotic French" is perhaps as meaningless as the distinctions this census and the broader reorganisation of Europe instituted in regards to the information it can provide. Here we find individuals in national and cultural parentheses, out of place, or between places, due to forces outside of their control.

The details Eliot chooses to create Eugenides's character highlight the messy political landscape following the First World War, particularly the issues of definition both in terms of criteria for national identity and ownership of territories. Eugenides connects this post-war climate outside of the text to Eliot's formal concerns which see boundaries blurred and ambiguous or fractured meanings

created. Concrete definitions or explanations are largely impossible in *The Waste Land*. As a picture of modern life, this reflects the fruitless, often also destructive, nature of trying to institute such political and cultural distinctions. Cole argues that Eugenides “simultaneously brings the complex legacy of modern war into view and obscures the picture, as the poem ultimately pursues its goal of erecting new monuments on the site of still smoldering ruins” (71).

Cole’s evocation of the building of new monuments in relation to *The Waste Land* is explored in depth by Joanna Scutts in “Battlefield Cemeteries, Pilgrimage, and Literature after the First World War: The Burial of the Dead” (2009). In this article Scutts discusses the context of post-war pilgrimages to First World War cemeteries in relation to *The Waste Land* and the nature of these memorial spaces themselves. Much of what Scutts discusses also reflects how *In Parenthesis*, in its capacity as war memoir, is also a kind of pilgrimage to connect with the dead. As fascinating as Scutts’s analysis is in respect to *The Waste Land*, many of her points are even more pertinent to a discussion of *In Parenthesis*. When considered in regards to Jones’s poem, Scutts’s argument provides the basis for conclusions which develop further upon her already excellent analysis. Scutts’s suggestion that *The Waste Land*’s concerns mirror the “memorial-obsessed environment” (404) immediately following the Great War cannot be extrapolated to the extent of claiming that *The Waste Land* is a version of these war memorials in verse. However, such a claim could be made in regards to *In Parenthesis*.

Scutts establishes a relationship between the quest motif, the poetic fragment, and unsettling interaction with the dead in the creation and experience of these memorial sites. She suggests the poetic fragments chosen as inscriptions on monuments bear “a surprising affinity with modernist poetry of the same immediate postwar period” (399). She argues that the “relationship of the inscriptions to the cemetery space suggests that they can explain the losses, the war, the cemetery – yet in their fragmentary quality they seem at the same time to be evading explanation, putting the onus of interpretation back onto the visitor” (399). The same active participation on the part of readers is certainly required by those who approach *The*

Waste Land and *In Parenthesis*.

This relationship to the reader or visitor relates to another intention lying behind the cemeteries' design, which has interesting implications for reading Jones's and Eliot's poetry. Scutts describes how "in the planning documents the cemeteries are talked of as enduring for a thousand years and were thus always understood as eventually changing their primary purpose from spaces for grieving and recovery into sites that had to communicate with those who were not personally affected by the war, who would come as readers rather than mourners" (399). The process of composing *The Waste Land* and *In Parenthesis* functioned in part as a cathartic act, seeking to express and attempt to order contemporary trauma and upheaval. To readers seventy-seven to ninety-two years following their publication, they act not as an expression of our own trauma but as a way for us to understand what it was to be in the midst of events which have determined who and where we are in the present. These cemeteries resemble threshold space, where the intersection of past and present affects a change by imparting knowledge to the visitors who enter the space.

Scutts's discussion pays particular attention to the visit made by King George V to the sites of these battlefield cemeteries in 1922, the year of *The Waste Land*'s publication. Also published that year was Kipling's poem, "The King's Pilgrimage" which both commemorated the King's journey and explored its spatial aspects. Scutts perceives a parallel between the manner in which George V's tour was depicted as "a chivalric quest" which progressed "through a ruined postwar landscape in pursuit of coherent meaning" to the movement of *The Waste Land* (402, 404). This sense of forward motion and progression through different landscapes is also important to the structure of *In Parenthesis*. The troops leave England for France and gradually progress towards the climax of the Somme. In Kipling's poem, Scutts argues, the King's progress is marked by his eventual arrival at " 'fair and level ground' both topographically and morally" (402). It is crucial that Scutts describes the affinity between George V's perceived chivalric quest and that employed by modernist poets as a "pursuit" of meaning, rather than an attainment. Both Jones

and Eliot close rather ambiguously with the reaching after meaning palpable, but ultimately unrealised. Eliot's open ending leaves the promise of rain unfulfilled. The final repeated chant of "Shantih" which closes *The Waste Land* epitomises this, as Eliot glosses it as "The Peace which passeth understanding" (*Collected Poems* 76). Readers are left with a sense of something, such as the feeling of peace, without being able to fully feel that it is understood or achieved. Jones closes with an enigmatic textual fragment from *la Chanson de Roland*. Our narrator's parting words conclude:

The geste says this and the man who was on the field... and
 who wrote the book... the man who does not know this
 has not understood anything. (*In Parenthesis* 187)

Like the door never opened, the conclusion or ending to these transitional journeys are withheld, freezing the texts in their liminal phases.

The same failure to fully realise a concrete meaning also relates to Scutt's discussion of the issue of burial itself, which connects the cemetery site to the fused urban- wartime wasteland. A sense of concrete meaning associated both with the act of burial and the cemetery site was, Scutts argues, rattled by the war in significant ways. She detects this new unease and anxiety in *The Waste Land* and it is also prominent in *In Parenthesis*. She points out how the picture of burial typified by Rupert Brooke's "The Soldier" becomes irreconcilable with the realities of the war as the Brookeian stance assumes the "idea that a body may be buried in one piece and left undisturbed" (393). Instead soldiers became "horribly familiar with the violent disintegration and total disappearance of bodies" (Scutts 393). This association of fragmentation with dead bodies is reflected in Eliot's description of the "dead men who *lost* their bones" (emphasis mine) and in the fact that the Queen of The Woods at the close of *In Parenthesis* cannot find Dai Greatcoat anywhere, despite calling "both high and low" (*In Parenthesis* 186). As a goddess of the woods, she has the power to preside over the dead, but we are left wondering whether

modern warfare has rendered her impotent when the dead on a battlefield cannot be located or identified.

The WWI battlefield as a space in which comrades could disappear into the mud or be blown apart lingers in Eliot's urban waste. Scutts perceives that the fear that the dead may not be safely buried was one "pervasive across the postwar literary scene" (403). *The Waste Land* in Scutts's words is "populated with the dead" (404) and so is *In Parenthesis*. Dilworth in particular interprets the voyage of the soldiers across the channel and entry into the trenches as a version of the classical hero's journey across the Styx into Hades (*Shape of Meaning* 125). Along with their dead comrades, the soldiers occupy a "myth-charged underworld" (*Shape of Meaning* 60), where the many allusions to heroes and warriors from the past conjure their ghosts to walk alongside the infantry at the Somme. Eliot's dead reflect the same categories as Jones's. There are actual corpses, such as that buried in a garden at the close of "Burial of the Dead" and which lie on the muddy riverbank (*Collected Poems* 55 line 71; 60 line 193). The sense of ghosts in the underworld is also particularly distilled in the urban scenes, such as with the Dantesque crowd which flows over London Bridge or which swarm over otherworldly plains (*Collected Poems* 55 lines 62-3; 67 lines 359-360). Scutts associates the collective term of "the Dead" for Britain's war casualties with the reaction of the speaker to the ghosts on London Bridge. Thinking of the fallen as a single collective entity facilitates understanding and closure. However, as "*The Waste Land* makes clear, horror lies in those moments of recognition that the collective is made up of hundreds of thousands of individuals" (Scutts 405). Here the jolt of understanding at the sheer numbers of dead the speaker experiences while watching the procession over London Bridge, reflects the process of acceptance and understanding required by the post-war world. The procession of the dead over a body of water also reinforces Dilworth's reading of the channel crossing as synonymous with a voyage across the Styx.

The presence of the dead, Scutts argues, reflects "the anxiety that burial may not represent permanent closure" (405). This is especially pertinent for thinking of these two texts as inter-war documents since it was during this period that the seeds

sown by the First World War would blossom into the second. Again, the indeterminate ending of both texts supports Scutts's argument, as does the corpse buried in the garden at the close of "Burial of the Dead". One of the speakers asks if it has begun to sprout and warns against letting the dog dig it up (*Collected Poems* 55 lines 71-5). The position of the corpse here seems more reminiscent of one half-buried in the mud of the battlefield than those safely and securely lodged in cemeteries that will endure for millennia. In these scenes, the liminal space where living and dead can intermingle is established.

Another spatially liminal aspect of *The Waste Land*, which situates it in the inter-war parenthesis, is the poem's combination of world maps. Eleanor Cook, in "T. S. Eliot and the Carthaginian Peace" (1979), connects the various maps that can be plotted from locations which appear in *The Waste Land* to those which chart the boundaries of the Great War as well as the Roman Empire:

The Waste Land is not only a London poem; it is also a European poem, or more precisely a Mediterranean poem. It was always so through the early drafts, and it became noticeably so when in Part V London was listed as the last in a series of five great cities, Jerusalem, Athens, Alexandria, Vienna, London. The poem therefore requires a second map for those place-names that are not from the London area, leaving aside the names of Ganga and the Himavant. If those place-names are plotted on a map, they may be seen to ring the Mediterranean in the following sense. The northerly names are not seen as centers, in the way our twentieth-century eyes see them. Rather, they balance Carthage and Mylae to the south, and Jerusalem and Smyrna (now Izmir) to the east. This map coincides roughly with

the Roman Empire at its most expansive, and therefore also coincides roughly with the theatre of war during World War I. The center of this second map is Rome.

This leaves us with the names of Ganga and the Himavant. The map that is useful here is a very simple and very symmetrical one; it is Dante's map of the inhabited world. The exact center of this world is Jerusalem. Ninety degrees to the east is the eastern limit, the mouths of the Ganges, which is also the eastern limit of *The Waste Land*. Precisely halfway between Gibraltar and Jerusalem is Rome. We have thus three maps, one of a city, or of an empire, one of a world. (35-6)

What is most important about Cook's cartographic analysis of the text is her identification of the relationship between these various maps within the text. Cook argues that they "are not set side by side; that is, we do not make orderly progression from one map to the next in the poem. Rather, it is as if they were layered, and we read meaning from one map into another. Urban vision, imperial vision, world vision: each illuminates the other" (36). The arrangement of the list of cities Cook singles out visually suggests this very relationship. In the final section of *The Waste Land* "Jerusalem Athens Alexandria / Vienna London" are not separated by punctuation marks or conjunctions (*Collected Poems* 67 lines 375-6). Only the blank space of the page sits between them, presenting a penetrable space. The partial refrain of "Unreal" which appears to characterise these five cities also reinforces combining these real places into a vision of unreal, heterotopic space such as the layered maps produce (*Collected Poems* 67 lines 377). The layered vision of maps, intermingling and informing each other, again recalling Unger's analogy of images on glass slides, function as another example of liminal spatial arrangements in which

established boundaries dissolve.

David Harvey has also discussed the significance of maps in regards to conceptions and constructions of space in relation to the First World War. Harvey states that the

vast expansion of foreign trade and investment after 1850 put the major capitalist powers on the path of globalism, but did so through imperial conquest and inter-imperialist rivalry that was to reach its apogee in World War I – the first global war. En route, the world's spaces were deterritorialized, stripped of their preceding significations, and then reterritorialized according to the convenience of colonial and imperial administration [...] The map of domination and of the world's spaces changed out of all recognition between 1850 and 1914. Yet it was possible, given the flow of information and new techniques of representation, to sample a wide range of simultaneous imperial adventures and conflicts with a mere glance at the morning newspaper. (264)

The “deterritorilization” and “reterriotlization” Harvey describes are present in the connections Mr. Eugenides makes with the post-war reorganisation of Europe. Harvey's comment about the glance at the morning newspaper also returns us to Eugenides as signifier of a debate raging in English tabloids about events in spaces simultaneously far removed from and interconnected with Britain. These forces are also reflected in how Eliot plays with the maps Cook identifies as textual spaces. Through the liminal dialogue Eliot facilitates between the maps he invokes contemporary shifting boundaries and reclassifications.

It is significant that the centres of these maps, as arranged by Cook, point to

Rome. Jones connects the Romans with surveying techniques in *The Anathemata*. Mars assumes the role of a surveyor in the lines:

west he took himself off, on the base-line he
traced and named when he traced it: *decumanus*. West-turn
from his kardo I saw him go, over his right *transversus*.

(*The Anathemata* 87)

In a footnote Jones tells the reader that this refers to “the sacred routine followed by the Roman surveyors in the laying out of sites: the north-south bearing was called *kardo* and the east-west was called *decumanus*” (*The Anathemata* 87 note 3). He here presents the systems of classification that underpin international organisation and control on an Imperial scale. These organisational processes facilitated the creation of the maps Eliot overlays. But the way Eliot has deployed these demonstrates the changes that have occurred in the experience of space between the kind of demarcations of *kardo* and *decumanus* and the liminal mingling and layering of the present era.

These links back to empires, to engagement with maps, cartography and surveying highlight additional spaces within which to begin to think about modernist texts in new ways. Thacker has argued that “our critical understanding of modernism must involve the various journeys across and between ‘first world’; metropolitan spaces and ‘third world’ imperial spaces” (6). Such liminal journeys between spaces are exactly what Eliot has generated by his use of overlaid maps.

These liminal wastelands are generated by each poet’s fusion of two discrete landscapes. The ghosts which haunt both texts are paralleled by the overlaid topography. These transparent overlays demonstrate how the war landscape haunted the post-war environment, which in turn came to influence how the trenches were portrayed. Thacker’s general comments on *The Waste Land* support this spatial reading. He proposed that “[a]nalysis should attend not only to the particular significance of each discrete space, but to their interconnection and the

quarrels between them” (19).

The double vision of these wastes transforms the landscape of both texts into heterotopic spaces. Both types of wastelands are real spaces, but the liminal amalgamation of one on top of and within one another is unreal. The simultaneous experience within both spaces is materially impossible and can only occur in these poetically liminal spaces. The reflective relationship of one waste to the other additionally demonstrates the mirroring nature of the heterotopia. The cemetery as a heterotopia is also evident in these spaces on both metaphoric levels as well as in more material terms, as Scutts’s article suggests.

The “real-and-imagined” of Thirdspace is also at work in these spaces, as their combination does rely on the transformation of real experience by poetic imagination. However, the material existence of these wastes, both of which Jones directly experienced, brings the vocabulary of the heterotopia to the fore. Thirdspace, however, encapsulates the liminality of Eliot’s and Jones’s urban spaces as the reality of the city is transformed by imaginative, archaeological engagement.

Chapter Five: The City

In addition to an association with wastelands, the city-space functions in other liminal ways. The city is often thought of as the “natural habitat” of modernism (Harvey 25), a sentiment certainly shared by Andreas Huyssen, who argues that the “geography of classical modernism is determined primarily by metropolitan cities and the cultural experiments and upheavals they generated” (6). As the primary environment of modernism, it is only fitting that Jones’s and Eliot’s cities display the simultaneity characteristic of the period and which is central to liminal space. Rather than the simultaneous, liminal experience of discrete landscapes made into one, the liminality of the city comes from the archaeological engagement of imagination with the multiplicity of the metropolis. These urban liminal spaces display the “real-and-imagined” quality of Thirdspace, as the spaces become fusions of the contemporary, material “real” of the city and imagined engagement with history and literature. The multiple layers preserve the material and time of many singular urban places, which in combination become “real-and-imagined” urban spaces.

It would be easy to label Eliot as the more obviously urban poet while ascribing to Jones a more pre-modern, almost chthonic, focus. Charles Andrews identifies that despite “the crucial role of the urban in Jones’s literary explorations of war trauma, some readers have too quickly ascribed to [him] a pastoralism” (89). Not only does Jones explore the urbanity of the trenches, but elsewhere demonstrates that he is a poet of the city in his own right. Jones lived in and around London for most of his life and shares Eliot’s focus on the city. In *The Anathemata* Jones revisits the London of different periods in history. Comparing representation of urban space in their poetry assists us in considering Jones’s urbanity in more detailed terms.

London, for Jones and Eliot, is a rich archaeological site. In *The Anathemata* Jones uses geological imagery of rock layers: “Piercing the eskered silt, discovering every stria, each score / and macula, lighting all the fragile laminae of the shales”

(74). He also talks of cultural “deposits” as if speaking of seams of coal or tin (*The Anathemata* 14). This vision of geological layers is coupled by an archaeological vision of the strata of the city. Jones draws attention to the archaeological layers of the ancient city of Troy, describing it epithetically as “Nine-strata'd Hissarlik” (*The Anathemata* 55). This same vision of geological and archaeological strata can be transposed onto both poets’ vision of London although rather than discrete bands there is a merging and interpenetration of different historical strata in their poetic rendering of the space. It is not only the twentieth century façade of London but, reminiscent again of Unger’s overlaid glass slides, it is a vision of the many Londons that have existed before, or may imaginatively exist in the mind of its inhabitants. We have seen this at work already in Jones’s reference to Newgate.

Thomas Bender has singled out this layered characteristic as intrinsic to the city itself. He suggests that “historically and in the present, the gift of urbanism is thickness, texture, partly the result of history, but also produced by the overlapping of activities and uses, the conjuncture of types of people, and the multiplicity of purposes – all located within a sense of a larger whole ” (222). It is this legacy of the metropolis that is preserved in Jones and Eliot. In addition, by virtue of multiplicity, overlappings, and conjunctions Bender describes the archaeological liminality inherent in the urban space.

Other critics have highlighted this same quality in the city. Rolf Lindner has argued that the city

is not a neutral container, which can be arbitrarily filled, but a historically saturated, culturally coded space already stuffed with meanings and mental images [...]. A culturally coded space is not only a defined space, but also a defining one, determining the possibilities and limits of what happens within or what can be projected into it. (210)

Lindner's qualification that the city space itself *determines* the kind of imaginative engagement with and within it is reflected in Jones's comment that Joyce "depended upon a given locality" and "the complex historic strata special to that site" (*The Dying Gaul* 46). What Jones discerned in Joyce made its way into his own work and is particularly highlighted by his description of the process of writing *The Anathemata*. Jones noted that "part of my task has been to allow myself to be directed by motifs gathered together from such sources as have by accident been available to me" (*The Anathemata* 9). Although Jones's statement reflects the wide range of historical, artistic, literary, and cultural sources he has combined in *The Anathemata*, London as an urban space is undoubtedly one such resource which has had a bearing on the text's spatial features by the very "accident" of what the city itself makes available.

While the city is a powerfully determining factor, Iain Chambers also argues for the importance of agency involved in imaginative engagements with urban space. In *Border Dialogues* (1990) Chambers proposes:

The metropolis is, above all, a myth, a tale, a telling that helps some of us to locate our home in modernity [...]. The metropolis is an allegory; in particular it represents the allegory of the crisis of modernity that we have learnt to recognize in the voices of Baudelaire, Benjamin, and Kafka. To go beyond these bleak stories of exile and that grey, rainy country of the anguished soul, is to establish a sense of being at home in the city, and to make of tradition a space of transformation rather than the scene of a cheerless destiny. For this metropolis is not simply the final stage of a poignant narrative, of apocalypse and nostalgia, it is also the site of the ruins of previous orders in which diverse histories,

languages, memories and traces continually entwine
and recombine in the construction of new horizons.

(112)

Jones's and Eliot's urban spaces demonstrate how it is via active, imaginative engagement that the city's tale is told. History, culture, and memory are all material which is archeologically explored, or mined, in the urban space. The entwining and recombination in pursuit of new meaning is the liminal endeavor both Jones and Eliot actively pursue amid the "ruins of previous orders" through their poetic rendering of the city.

It is the human experience of the space which ensures that the presence of tradition in the city becomes Chambers' "space of transformation". Jones and Eliot produce poetic cities from their physical engagement within the space but also through their imaginative interaction with it. As James Donald argues in "Metropolis: The City as Text":

there is no such *thing* as a city. Rather, *the city* designates the space produced by the interaction of historically and geographically specific institutions, social relations of production and reproduction, practices of government, forms and media of communication, and so forth [...] *The city*, then, is above all a representation [...] I would argue that the city constitutes an *imagined environment*. (422)

Several critics combine material and imaginative urban experience into a liminal reading of textual cities. Andrea Rummel has applied Thirdspace to *The Waste Land* to define this combination of engagement which renders the city simultaneously "a 'real and imagined space' " (60). Rummel argues that this dual "empirical-material" and "imaginative-emotional" engagement with the city is one

example of Eliot's objective correlative (61), but it is also another example of the many opposites held in tension within his work. Similarly, Stefan L. Brandt, summarising his own reading of Soja, shares the sense that "the tactile fabric of the city seems constructed as a mirror image of the mental constitution of its inhabitants" (553). Brandt's "mirror image" also recalls Foucault's heterotopic, liminal mirror as a site of both reality and unreality. For Crawford, Eliot's city appears more in line with the real-and-imagined of Thirdspace, as he reads "Eliot's urban landscape [as] a strange mixture of lived and literary experience"(3). As will shortly be explored, the imaginative engagement with the liminal, polyphonic city space encompasses both historical archaeology as well as literary and artistic excavation.

As noted earlier, postmodern literary critics have made use of "liminal" in relation to the city space. Although the cities of the twenty-first century are in many ways light-years away from the London both Jones and Eliot knew, much of what critics, such as Brandt, have to say about postmodern cities and liminal space is suggestive of Eliot's and Jones's work. Blurring some of distinctions between "modernist" and "postmodernist" can provide new ways of considering both Jones's and Eliot's cities and also suggest part of the legacy modernism has generated. In *Postmetropolis* Soja suggests the importance of seeing these kinds of connections between modernism and postmodernism. Although his focus is slanted towards geography and urban planning, his comments are of use to literary criticism. He writes that he rejects any

implied categorical opposition between modernism
and
postmodernism, and find it challenging and revealing
to draw selectively upon both. Modernist critical
theory and modes of interpretation continue to
inform my explorations of the postmetropolis,
especially in understanding what remains the same

today as it was in the past. (xiv)

Placing these two into a closer acquaintance is also supported by Carol L. Yang. She suggests that “of all the intellectuals writing in the first great heyday of modernism, in my view it is Eliot who turns out to be the one who speaks most eloquently to the postmodern sense of de-centralization, fragmentation, syncretism, hybridization, and indeterminacy” (“Virtual Europe” 5). Yang’s view is shared by Rummel, who states that “in many ways the modernist texts [...] seem to almost pre-enact postmodern spatial theories” (58). Staudt has also claimed that Jones’s work engages with issues “that have preoccupied modernist and post-modernist poets” alike (*At the Turn of a Civilization* 4).

In “The City as Liminal Space: Urban Visuality and Aesthetic Experience in Postmodern U.S. Literature and Cinema” (2009) Brandt discusses the postmodern city in liminal terms. But, in direct validation of Yang’s, Rummel’s, and Staudt’s assertions, several of Brandt’s main points assist understanding Jones’s and Eliot’s modernist liminal city. Brandt argues that what “these ‘postmodern’ texts seem to have in common is that they point to the liminality of the city experience – that is, to the transitory and ultimately inersive character of postmodern urbanity” (555). The quotation marks Brandt places around “postmodern” suggests his sensitivity to the murky nature of iron-clad classifications of literary texts. For indeed, the modernist texts of Jones and Eliot present exactly what Brandt describes and share the focus on the liminal *experience* of the city, where the raw material of the space renders it liminoid via imaginative archaeological engagement.

Furthermore, Brandt argues that in postmodern fiction “the reader is put in a position where he or she learns about urbanity through a set of liminal experiences manifested in the text” (557). These comments also suggest considering the imaginative engagement of Jones and Eliot as readers in respect to their presentation of liminal cities. Brandt elaborates that “more often, the ‘real’ city could no longer be distinguished from the fictional or semi-fictional product in the cultural imagination” (558). Considering the textual influences, such as Dante, which filter

Jones's and Eliot's experience and depiction of the city, their urban spaces seem to engage more and more with a fictional, or historical-fictional conception of the city.

Brandt describes the physical layout of the liminal city thus:

At first glance, the postmodern city seems to figure as a closed space – a labyrinth that leaves protagonists and readers in a state of disorientation, fragmentation, and constant decentering. At second glance, however, the maze-like organization of the “postmetropolis” also offers numerous opportunities, making aesthetic experience, and movement in particular, a central motor of the production of meaning. The protagonists as well as the readers become involved in a “rhetoric of the body” – or, more specifically, a “walking rhetorics” (de Certeau 131) –that turns the fictional city into a tactile, almost visceral event. (553)

Brandt's description highlights the importance of moving through the city to the experience of the space. This is something manifested in Jones's and Eliot's work by the presence of figures which resemble the flâneur. Walter Benjamin's discussion of the flâneur in *The Arcades Project* describes both the experience of the flâneur characters in Jones and Eliot as well as what readers experience, not only in the urban settings, but in traversing all of Jones's and Eliot's composite, liminal spaces. Benjamin describes how:

The street conducts the flâneur into a vanished time. For him, every street is precipitous. It leads downwards – if not to the mythical Mothers, then into a past that can be all the more spellbinding

because it is not his own, not private [...] In the asphalt over which he passes, his steps awaken a surprising resonance. The gaslight that streams down on the paving stones throws an equivocal light on this double ground. (416[M1,2])

The “double ground” is suggestive of the doubled wasteland both poets explore. In their cities the apparently doubled relationship of past and present is shown to be even more polyphonic, as layer upon layer of the city’s “ground” is excavated. In the course of their travels Benjamin’s flâneurs become imaginative archaeologists, which are roles both Eliot and Jones assume as poets and that Jones’s soldiers, among other characters, assume within the texts.

Yang has written extensively on the flâneur in Eliot’s work. She argues:

Eliot’s writings on the city engage with a number of recurrent themes, motifs, and methodological concerns which elucidate the intricate dimension of the cityscapes. Among them, the most significant recurrent motif [...] is the shifting perspective of the flâneur figure. Eliot has continued to evolve his flâneur from “the man of the crowd”, to “the man at the window”, then to the producer of literary texts, and finally to the collector of the city archive.

(“Virtual Europe” 7)

Yang suggests Eliot uses the flâneur as “the key phenomenon to understanding the emergent, metropolis of modernity, as well as providing a methodological apparatus to indulge in a kind of textual *flânerie*, a kind of double-codedness of perspectives to upset any traditional narrative resolution” (“Revisiting” 90). She perceives a direct relationship in Eliot’s work between the flâneur as the archaeologist of a city and

the experience of liminal space. For Yang, the meeting with the “compound ghost” in the street of “Little Gidding” is a prime example. This moment spotlights multiplicity and hybridization as facilitated by the urban setting. The speaker is, in Yang’s words, “neither inside nor outside; [they are] instead in an alternative third space of liminality, where one is inside and outside at the same time” (“Virtual Europe” 19-20). Without reference to Soja or the concept of Thirdspace, Yang nevertheless presents the same “third space” in reference to the liminal city. Yang’s combination further reinforces adopting Soja’s term as part of a developing analysis of urban space in modernist texts.

Eliot’s city is full of the movements of people through urban space, presenting multiple opportunities for speakers or figures to assume the role of flâneur. In *The Waste Land* there is first the line “A crowd flowed over London Bridge” (*Collected Poems* 55 line 62) which then develops to: “Flowed up the hill and down King William Street, / To where Saint Mary Woolnoth kept the hours” (*Collected Poems* 55 lines 66-7). Later there is a similar description of the movement “along the Strand, up Queen Victoria Street” (*Collected Poems* 62 line 258). Similarly in “Little Gidding” the encounter with the ghost figure is with “one walking, loitering and hurried” on the asphalt of the city street (*Collected Poems* 204).

In addition to the metropolitan dimensions already identified in Jones’s war wasteland, the trenches in *In Parenthesis* present a parallel to Eliot’s movements through the city. Jones includes in his text the manner in which the trench system was named using city streets. In Part Three, directions through the trenches are given thus: “it’s a plumb straight road — you’ve three hundred yards to / the communication trench — turn left into Sandbag Alley — / right at the O.B.L — left into Oxford Street” (40). Jones crafts these directions so that the image morphs from the trenches into a trench-city composite. He begins with the “communication trench” and “Sandbag Alley” both names which could only belong to the trench network. Yet his use of “road” and “alley” already carries distinctly urban associations. The final location of “Oxford Street” most overtly provides a simultaneous parallel and juxtaposition between the metropolis and the Western

Front. The movement along these named streets parallel's Eliot's depiction of the city in *The Waste Land*, although in an urbanesque, subterranean world. Eliot's city also carries a shadow of this underground location, as the city includes associations of the underworld and is described as "Under the brown fog of a winter dawn" (*Collected Poems* 54 line 61). The real world fog casts a kind of otherworldly, underground pall over the metropolis.

This trench nomenclature also suggests how the soldiers reflect qualities of Benjamin's flâneurs as the explorer of a city's network of streets. Jones and his characters in *In Parenthesis* engage in cultural archaeology, as they attempt to order their experience in the fluctuating world of the trenches. Parallels with heroes of the past and the alignment of landscapes, images, and experiences with those from recalled texts, while limited in their power, provide the reassurance that meaning and order still exist in one shape or form. Yang has suggested that the flâneur in Eliot's work is part of the "history of the quest for urban legibility, as it represents the desire to read and make sense out of an immense, intangible, and increasingly alienating urban field" ("Revisiting" 95). Jones too invokes the quest motif within *In Parenthesis* both by his incorporation of intertextual material from quest narratives, such as Arthurian legend, and by what we can perceive of his own authorial quest to achieve meaning and a resolution from his wartime experiences. The manner in which the setting of *In Parenthesis* is a composite of urban and wartime wastes places it within the broader quest for meaning Yang identifies. If the war is viewed as an extreme culmination of the modern forces which have also produced within the civilian urban environment these "intangible" and "alienating" qualities, there are stronger ties than ever to bind the similarities in Jones's and Eliot's poetry to a broader modern endeavour.

Flâneurs are littered across Eliot's work, such as in the episode with the ghost in "Little Gidding" and with Prufrock and his "half-deserted streets" (*Collected Poems* 3). The capacity for archeological engagement during these episodes of flânerie is displayed in "The Fire Sermon" when, having progressed "along the Strand, up Queen Victoria Street [...]. Beside a public bar in Lower Thames Street"

and past “the walls / Of Magnus Martyr” the speaker reaches the river and engages with a layered, liminal vision of the Thames (*Collected Poems* 62-3 lines 258, 260, 264). Upon the river which “sweats / Oil and tar” there appears a vision of Elizabeth and Leicester (*Collected Poems* 63 lines 266-7). The uncovering of this historical layer of the city is parenthetically situated in a manner reminiscent of the ghostly encounter in “Little Gidding”. The peal of the city’s church bells “ Weialala leia/ Walla leialala” (*Collected Poems* 63 lines 277-8, 290-1) bookends the stanza and embeds it within the contemporary city. Prior to the first peal of the bells is the image of the modern, polluted river while the second peal then gives way to “ ‘Trains and dusty trees”, bringing the text back to the present (*Collected Poems* 63 line 292). Thinking in terms of Jones’s strata, the interpenetration of this sixteenth century scene in the midst of twentieth appears as an excavated site. The flâneur in this episode has cut down to a lower layer, producing a liminal space where different versions of London can co-exist. The speaker’s exploration of the city has conducted him into a vanished time quite apart from his own personal past, as Benjamin described.

Also located in London is a significant episode of flânerie in *The Anathemata*, but one which is interestingly inverted from the kind displayed in Eliot’s work. At the heart of the poem is the dramatic monologue delivered by Londoner and lavender-seller Elen Monica to a visiting sea captain she encounters in the street. Dilworth has argued that Elen “symbolizes London” and that her “symbolic identification with her city affects her consciousness, which is that of London throughout time, including anachronistically, its later history up to the twentieth century” (*Reading* 145-6). As Dilworth has identified the poem’s centre with Elen’s dramatic monologue, it follows that London, therefore, is the setting and space at the heart of the *The Anathemata*. In the course of this section, the sea captain becomes a version of the flâneur as he listens to Elen’s story, which is that of the space of London.

Elen, as one of Jones’s composite figures, directly represents the composite nature of a city. Jones commented on his very deliberate choice of the time period in

which to situate Elen and her monologue, stating:

She had to represent to some extent the British sea
thing which rose only after the end of the 15th Cent.,
so that the figure had to combine Hogarthian,
Turneresque, even Dickensian worlds with the
Catholic world of ‘Dick Whittington’, Chaucer,
Langland, Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Trojan-London
myth, and so on & so on. Consequently the
interpenetration backwards & forwards & up and
down of all the images historical, legendary *and*
mythological (both Xtian Mythos & the non-Xtian)
must be taken as the main *subject* of the section.

(*Inner Necessities* 69-70)

Jones’s comments demonstrate how Elen occupies a particular position in order to be able to link these different eras and distinct experiences of the world. Elen exists in a time of between-ness and becoming, paralleled by Eliot and Jones in the early twentieth century. These periods of becoming can link old, new, and future spaces becoming limens in their own right.

Jones’s description of the “interpenetration” of past and present on a vertical axis directly relates to the flâneur. Indeed, the same term appears in Benjamin (although in English as the choice of the translator), when he says that “in the course of the flânerie, far-off times and places interpenetrate the landscape and the present moment” (419 [M2,4]), as the insertion of Elizabeth and Leicester has already demonstrated. What Jones describes is, therefore, an archaeological dig, as Benjamin has previously suggested flânerie embodies. During an excavation, one is engaging in the back and forth between the past and present while uncovering the vertically layered strata of the archaeological record of a given site. Benjamin argues that “space winks at the flâneur; What do you think may have gone on here?” (418-

419 [M1a, 3]). Elen as the embodiment of this experience offers the sea captain a real wink and a tale containing history and information relating to the city. One of the clearest instances of Elen as the mediator of imaginative archaeology is in her reference to “the Fisher with the ring, ‘pon Cornhill” (*The Anathemata* 160). Jones explains in an extended footnote the “tangle of legend” and history which constitute the physical, as well as cultural, archaeological layers which lie beneath the site of St Peter upon Cornhill, by popular twelfth century tradition, the oldest church in London. (*The Anathemata* 160-1 note 3). Unlike Eliot, who offers us the perspective of the flâneur, Jones gives us the oration of the city to the flâneur through Elen and silences the meditation and response of the flâneur figure. This contrast demonstrates how Jones and Eliot, considered side by side, more often than not, focus on opposite sides of the same coin. Comparing their treatment of similar devices, subjects and techniques presents the fully rounded picture of the poetic concerns they both engage with in different ways.

London also facilitates another sort of archaeological encounter, those between ghosts and the living inhabitants of the city. In these cases the city’s liminal space allows for a co-existence of living and dead, similar to what occurs in the wastelands. Read alongside these other examples, the vision of Elizabeth and Leicester on the Thames could be read as a ghostly apparition, appearing on a Styx-like Thames at the threshold between past and present.

The presence of these urban ghosts is informed by Eliot’s reading of other poets, adding another ghosted layer of intertextuality to these episodes. Eliot’s vision of the dead flowing over London Bridge in *The Waste Land* has long been recognised as an allusion to Dante’s *Inferno* and variously analysed as such. Conrad Aiken recalled that while he lived in London during 1921 and 1922 he and Eliot “lunched together two or three times a week in the City” and that Eliot “always had with him his pocket edition of Dante” (188). Crawford interprets this anecdote as Dante having “replaced Baedeker” (44) as a guide to the metropolis. Craig Raine, as others before him, has pointed out that the particular reference to Dante’s *Inferno* in the London bridge scene does not describe Hell itself but rather “the anteroom to Hell –

which is Limbo" (16). Raine argues that this state of Limbo makes a crucial distinction between the city inhabitants being imagined as deceased and acknowledging "that they are not fully alive" (17).

The space between life and death is inherently liminal and relates to the interpenetration of ghosts into the spaces of the living and living beings into the underworld. A Christian conception of limbo also carries with it a sense of the anxiety attached to some of these liminal spaces, such as burial sites in the wastelands, which in turn reflects the anxiety of the inter-war period. Fairley has associated the "sorrowful unease" of *In Parenthesis* with purgatory as a transitional period. The concept of Limbo informs Fairley's reading of the "Lack of closure at the conclusion" of *In Parenthesis* (45). She perceives that "Unlike Robert Graves's *Goodbye to All That*, the ghosts are not exorcised through the act of writing; the unease percolates through to, and beyond, the time of composition" (45). This apprehension of purgatory in the liminal space of the trenches provides yet another link between the experience of the First World War and the urban environment, which is populated with these very ghosts.

Northrop Frye has uncovered further strata behind Eliot's depiction of the city as the afterlife of the *Inferno*. Frye points out that Dante himself took the idea of a descent into hell from Virgil's *Aeneid* (141). Taking us down another layer, he relates Virgil's underworld vision to that which he knew from Homer's *Odyssey*. This third layer additionally connects the origins of the Dante allusion to Tiresias, whom Odysseus consults in Hades, as the liminoid, central consciousness of *The Waste Land* (142).

Crawford has also discussed the ways Dante informs Eliot's depiction of a phantom city and has proposed other literary deposits which these allusions uncover. He argues that Eliot's use of Dante in the city is filtered through his reading of other poems, particularly Baudelaire's and James Thomson's *The City of Dreadful Night*. Crawford suggests that

Eliot's linking of Baudelaire and Dante in *The Waste*

Land and again in ‘What Dante Means to Me’ only serves to stress that he had read his Dante in a particular way. Baudelaire was clearly the poet of a modern city, but it was Thomson who let Eliot see Dante as a poet of modern London, who let Eliot connect Dante with other modern urban writing, and who showed him that London, like Dante’s infernal city, could be seen as a city of the mind as well as a city of the external world. (45)

He also connects the relationship of Dante and Thomson with the appearance of the ghost in “Little Gidding” (51). Here Crawford asserts Eliot “goes once more to a Dante passage, used in *The City of Dreadful Night*, just as, when speaking of the doomed businessmen of modern London in part three of ‘East Coker’ with its ‘O dark dark dark. They all go into the dark’ ”(51). Crawford reads Eliot’s city as becoming “the Thomson city of death-in-life where men and phantoms are indistinguishable from one another” (47). Crawford’s argument presents the liminal merger of material and imaginative engagement in the city space in a specifically textually focused manner. The indistinguishable living and dead figures also recall Jones’s wraith-like infantry at the Western Front.

Jones’s undead soldiers trudging along the streets of the trenches are also evoked by Crawford’s comment on the influence from the poetry of John Davidson he finds in Eliot’s city. He suggests Davidson’s “ghostly city” is “a place like Eliot’s London, where phantoms move among actual street names. The world of real and unreal, of dead and living can seem uncertain in Davidson’s poetry as they can in *The Waste Land*” (55). Eliot’s label “Unreal city” (*Collected Poems* 54 line 60) highlights the unreal aspect these phantoms bring with them into the city, transforming the streets into a liminal space.

The liminal city space exists between the real-and-imagined, in line with Soja’s conception of liminal-like Thirdspace. Both poets use various speakers

situated within the metropolis in order to construct these liminal urban spaces via imaginative, archaeological engagement. Both Eliot's and Jones's cities show how the mind can transform material experiences through an engagement with cultural and literary history. Identification of flâneur-like figures in both Eliot's and Jones's London strengthens the case for considering Jones more prominently as an urban poet. Understanding urban space as liminal space highlights how setting, characterisation, and intertextual allusions function together to create their visions of the metropolis.

Chapter Six: Woods and Gardens

Woods and gardens present a very different manifestation of liminal space than the landscapes of the city and the wasteland. These spaces displayed a diffused liminality, produced by different forms of layering. Woods and gardens instead present a landscape counterpart to a discrete parenthesis. They are clearly marked by boundaries or thresholds and it is within these spaces that transparent layering and suspended tensions create liminal networks of imagery and experience. The opposites embodied by the blossoms on the hedgerow of “Little Gidding” herald a greater number of these same liminal microcosms contained within these natural and botanical spaces. The relationship between the hedgerow as a defined structure and flowers as liminal entities also demonstrates how woods and gardens are spaces which contain and facilitate liminal elements, rather than embodying liminality themselves.

Reinforcing a parenthetical reading of these spaces, medieval scholar David Rollason has concluded that the original meaning of “forest” “seems to have been an area of land set apart” (430). Rollason traces the possible etymology of “forest” to both the Latin *foris* for “outside” or from the word in Continental Germanic for “enclosure”, *first* (430). His commentary demonstrates how the concept of a self-contained, separated parenthesis is bound up with the origins of defining the wooded space. This separation reflects the liminal stage in rituals and the idea of separation and reintegration as bookends for the liminal space/state (Gennep 21). The application of Thirdspace and heterotopian qualities to the city and the wasteland focused on the fluid porousness of these spaces. The wood and garden, by contrast, display the element of isolation which Foucault paired with “penetrable” in his fifth principle of the heterotopia. While the wood and garden are closed and separated spaces in these texts, within the spaces themselves liminal mergers and interpenetrations of imagery and experience occur.

The relationship between Eliot’s gardens and Jones’s woods is also

significantly different to the comparisons of wastelands and cities in their work, which presented relatively straightforward counterparts. While Eliot makes extensive use of the garden as a landscape, he rarely uses natural, wild woods. Similarly, Jones almost always uses an organic wooded landscape rather than a cultivated garden. One of Jones's only gardens is the vegetable patch of a French villager in *In Parenthesis* (117), while Eliot inserts a rare wood reference into "East Coker" as an allusion to Dante (*Collected Poems* 187). While the man-made, cultivated garden is essentially different from the wild, wooded space these function in such analogous ways across both poet's work as to make a comparison between them worthwhile. Both poets do, however, employ woods as part of their discussions of poetics. Understanding the spaces of the wood and garden in their poetry provides the opportunity to look further afield and adapt a spatially focused close reading of their poetry to the ideas they put forth in their essays.

The separated and enclosed space of the wood and garden is established by both Jones's and Eliot's use of thresholds and boundaries. The wood in *In Parenthesis* is depicted as set apart and at a remove. While on sentry duty, John Ball keeps watch on a wooded area:

John Ball, posted as 1st Day Sentry, sat on the fire-step;
and looking upward, sees in a cunning glass the image of:
his morning parapets, his breakfast-fire smoke, the twisted
wood beyond.

Across the very quiet of no-man's land came still some
twittering. He found the wood, visually so near, yet for the
feet forbidden by a great fixed gulf, a sight somehow to
powerfully hold his mind. (*In Parenthesis* 65-6)

The wood is "beyond" "the great fixed gulf" of no-man's-land, which functions as an additional spatial parenthesis. Ball experiences the wood mediated through the mirror's reflection. The reflection of the wood recalls the mirror as a heterotopic

site.

Rather than viewing the separation of the garden from the outside, Eliot draws us into this enclosed space. The opening of “Burn Norton” describes the passage which conducts one to the door which, if opened, leads into the rose garden (*Collected Poems* 177). Eliot also describes movement “in a formal patter, / Along the empty alley, / into the box circle” (*Collected Poems* 178). These lines draw further into the very interior of the garden, along an additional passage, to be encircled by the box hedging. Eliot also focuses attention on what is within the garden, such as when we are told that echoes “*Inhabit* the garden” (*Collected Poems* 177 emphasis mine), without any suggestion of a movement of these echoes to or from other spaces. Raine also picks up on Eliot’s use of “inhabit”, pointing out that it is

an unusual verb, suggesting residence [...] where
‘throng’ or ‘sound’ would be more readily
acceptable. Acceptable were it not for the fact that
gardens do not echo. An echo requires acoustic
conditions – in particular, confinement, hard
surfaces to trap sound and reflect it –that a garden
does not supply. (100)

While a garden purely as a garden may not supply the conditions for echoes, the garden as a parenthetical space offers the enclosure and confinement in which various liminal relationships may “echo”.

Thresholds reinforce this parenthetical enclosure of space. Eliot depicts the door opening into the rose garden of “Burnt Norton” as well as the garden gate at the close of “Little Gidding”, while Jones presents “the gate of the wood” (*In Parenthesis* 186), which is also described as:

this

wooded rise as the gate of their enemies, a door at whose

splintered posts, Janus-wise emplacements shield an automatic fire. (*In Parenthesis* 66)

Again, the wood is described in terms of a limen, as a “gate” and a “door”, but this description is elaborated to include the “Janus-wise emplacements.” The metaphor of the Roman God with two faces heralds the liminally held, inseparable opposites found in the space within the wood as well as in Eliot’s garden.

Once inside the garden or wood, the interior space facilitates liminal experience and a liminal combination of imagery. This is particularly established in Mametz Wood by a stripping away of distinctions held in the space outside the wood, which parallels what occurs in a ritually liminal space. One key phrase Jones uses to create this environment is brought to the fore by a parallel to the wood in Kipling’s “The King’s Pilgrimage” as discussed by Joanna Scutts in relation to *The Waste Land*.

As Scutts points out, “The Kings Pilgrimage” charts the journey from “shoal / and banky ground” (lines 9-10) to “low / and hollow ground” (lines 24-5) then onto “bare / and hilly ground” (line 35) until finally reaching “fair / and level ground” (line 48-9). *In Parenthesis* also charts a progression through different landscapes, ultimately arriving at the battle in the wood. The final landscape of “fair and level ground” in Kipling’s poem is suggestive of a kind of wooded area. Kipling describes its features as including:

a carven stone,
And a stark Sword brooding on the
bosom of the Cross
Where high and low are one;
And there was grass and the living trees,
And the flowers of the spring, (lines 50- 55)

While both Kipling’s and Jones’s wood share the obvious features of trees and

flowers, it is the phrase “Where high and low are one” which is of particular interest. High and low significantly become one in Jones’s wood, as the Queen bestows her flowers in an equal fashion upon Major Lilywhite, Fatty, Mr. Jenkins, and Billy Crowther. Indeed, the Queen “calls both high and low” (*In Parenthesis* 186) as she searches for the heroic Dai Greatcoat. In light of Kipling’s poem this rather unremarkable turn of phrase takes on a double meaning, both alluding to the extent of her search and the breaking down of boundaries, erected by rank, in the wood. Without taking a cue from Kipling’s text, Dilworth independently discerns the equalising force inherent to the Queen’s ritual (*Shape of Meaning* 141). Indeed, Scutts’s discussion of First World War cemeteries points out that one of the most radical aspects of their design was the uniformity of the monuments, which did not visibly distinguish between ranks (388). The Queen of the Wood’s conduct reflects this shift in perception and emphasis. Status and previously meaningful distinctions are part of what falls away when an initiate enters the intermediary liminal stage of a ritual. Jones was a professed Kipling reader once describing his childhood as like living “in a kind of Kipling-conditioned world without knowing it” (*Dai Greatcoat* 184). He also read most books written by WWI veterans (*David Jones in The Great War* 216), making it even more likely that “The King’s Pilgrimage” would have caught his attention. It is therefore, highly possible, that the funerary and memorial rites carried out by the Queen align the ritualistic loss of distinctions in the wood with the similarly liminal sites of the war graves.

Jones alludes to the association of the wood to a ritual space of transition earlier in *In Parenthesis*. John Ball reflects:

To groves always men come both to their joys and their un-
doing. Come lightfoot in heart’s ease and school-free; walk
on a leafy holiday with kindred and kind; come perplexedly
with first loves— to tread the tangle frustrated, striking—
bruising the green. (*In Parenthesis* 66).

In John Ball's vision the wood is a space which facilitates the significant, transformative events of a human life. But the wood here is also the site of both "joys" and "undoing", uniting opposites in a suspended, liminal tension.

Additional liminal melding of opposites within the space of the wood break down boundaries between distinct sets of imagery, just as the distinctions of rank are removed in the same space. In the following description of the wood the organic imagery of flora and foliage is fused with man-made materials, sharpened edges and mass produced textiles:

stamen-twined and bruised pistilline
 steel-shorn of style and ovary
 leaf and blossoming
 with flora-spangled khaki pelvises
 and where rustling, where limbs thrust—
 from nurturing sun hidden,
 late-flowering dog-rose spray let fly like bowyer's ash
 disturbed for the movement
 for the pressing forward, bodies in the bower

(*In Parenthesis* 170-1)

In the same way Jones and Eliot make two wastelands into one, the metal weapons and flora merge as do the figures and foliage. Jones elaborates on a liminal melding of humans and trees with reference to Birnam Wood in *Macbeth*. In *The Anathemata* there are "Birnam boughs" (114), while in *In Parenthesis*

the trembling woods are vortex for the storm;
 through which their bodies grope the mazy charnel-ways—
 seek to distinguish men from walking trees and branchy
 moving like a Birnam copse (179)

The liminoid blurring of men and trees connects directly to Jones's wartime experiences. Jones grouped "wounded men and wounded trees" together as an "abiding image" and "hang-over" from the war in a letter written to David Blamires in 1966 (Blamires 3).

Eliot's garden also encloses and facilitates the existence of a range of liminal elements and relationships. In an echo of Keats's "Ode On A Grecian Urn", there is "unheard music hidden in the shrubbery" (*Collected Poems* 178). The paradox of silent music presents the tension between contrasts which may be sustained in liminal space. This is also reflected in the episode when the speaker returns from the hyacinth garden in *The Waste Land*, stating: "I was neither / Living nor dead" (*Collected Poems* 54 lines 39-40). The garden space facilitates the experience of this liminal state. The speaker here both expresses the feeling of being and non-being (relating to the tensions between reality and unreality) as well as being simultaneously of the past and of the present. This liminality found in the hyacinth garden also connects to the motif of a descent to the underworld and the presence of ghosts in cities and wastelands.

Kipling's situation of the Cross alongside the "living trees" in "The King's Pilgrimage" also points towards the liminally layered religious imagery both Jones and Eliot situate in the wood and garden. Throughout *The Anathemata* Jones develops a threefold vision of the Cross, a tree, and a mast, while Eliot embeds a single layered image of a tree as a Cross in "Burnt Norton". The extended development of this liminally presented imagery in *The Anathemata* provides a reading to apply to Eliot's single "bedded axle-tree" (*Collected Poems* 178).

The space of the wood as well as the homonym of wood as material is significant throughout Jones's work. While in the space of the wood, wounded and debating whether to abandon his rifle, John Ball dwells upon the "fair flaw in the grain" of the stock (*In Parenthesis* 184). The attention to the texture of wood grain gains further prominence in *The Anathemata*, where Jones dwells upon the "run o' the grain" (97), even "marking the grain of the gale" (107). The homonymic

connection between wood and wood is echoed in the use of the archaic term “Barke” (*The Anathemata* 141) and “barques” (*The Anathemata* 142) for ships, connecting the vessels back to the tactile nature of wood. In the “Redriff” section, wood as a material takes centre stage in the conversation between the ship-builder Eb Bradshaw and one of his clients. Bradshaw replies to the request for a hurried job that:

we scamp no repairs here; no botched Riga
deal nor wood that’s all American, softs nor hards, hewn or
sawn, heart n’r sap, cis- or trans- Gangem-land teak, or fair-
grained *ulmus* from sylvan wester lands or goodish East Mark
oak via Fiume in British bottoms
let lone
heart of island-grown
seasoned in m’ neighbours year
leaves this bench

.....
We’ll fay that hounding trim and proper—and of
the best spruce, to rhyme with her mainmast, we’ll square
true and round to a nicety the double piercin’s o’ that cap—
and of keel elm. (*The Anathemata* 120-1)

Bradshaw’s speech expresses the intricacies of working with wood, the textures, and varieties. In the final few lines he suggests a direct connection between a mast and a tree, underscored again when he states his workshops will “set that aspen transom square to the Rootless Tree” (*The Anathemata* 121). The connection between wood as a material, originating from the space of the wood, being transformed by human craftsmen into a mast develops into an example of a liminoid play on imagery.

Forests and woods are manifested in *The Anathemata* most significantly as

the forest of ships' masts. Jones adapted the image of a forest of masts from a book on naval history, from which he lifted the description of the British column at Trafalgar having "closed like a forest" (*The Anathemata* 114). Jones also rephrases the borrowed simile, describing "the top-/ trees in the anchored forest of Llefelys" (*The Anathemata* 124). The mast is presented as a tree, mainly through the use of repeated epic-style epithets to describe both the mast and the crew who tend to the rigging as in the case of "Mast tree" (*The Anathemata* 102), "top-tree boy" (*The Anathemata* 96), "trestle-tree boy" (*The Anathemata* 98) and "steer tree" (*The Anathemata* 102, 150, 158). The merger of a group of masts and trees into one image parallels Jones's use of Birnam wood as liminoid soldiers who are simultaneously men and trees.

In addition to the merger of the ship's mast, tree imagery becomes liminally fused with the Christian Cross. The closing image of *The Anathemata* is the very "Axile Tree" (243) which has been threaded throughout the text in references such as "sweet Christ's dear Tree!" (138), "the axile stipe" (237), and "the dreaming *arbor/* ornated *regis purpura*" (240). The same "axle-tree" is found in section two of "Burnt Norton" (*Collected Poems* 178).

Jones flags the significance of the relationship between trees and the Cross in the preface to *The Anathemata*. He states that the artist must "lift up valid signs; that is his specific task ... It is precisely this validity and availability that constitutes his greatest problem in the present culture-situation" (*The Anathemata* 23). Jones chooses the following example in order to illustrate his point:

If the poet writes 'wood' what are the chances that the
Wood of the Cross will be evoked? Should the answer be
'None', then it would seem that an impoverishment of some
sort would have to be admitted. It would mean that that
particular word could no longer be used with confidence to
implement, to call up or to set in motion a whole world of
content belonging in a special sense to the mythus of a
particular culture and of concepts and realities belonging to

mankind as such. (*The Anathemata* 23-4)

The choice of this particular example, when he could have drawn on so many, highlights the significance of the association between wood and cross in the poem. By imbedding this remark in a general discussion of the arts in his preface, Jones ensures his readers immediately flag this use of symbolism in the text. These comments not only highlight what is at work in regards to these particular motifs but the broader artistic and poetic concerns they are, on deeper levels, engaged in expressing.

Jones transforms these double visions of the tree as mast and tree as Cross into a tripartite, simultaneous vision of the tree, mast, and Cross. This presents three transparent images overlaid upon each other forming a micro-scale example of the liminality displayed by the wasteland and the archaeology of the city. That the shape of a mast is suggestive of a Cross combined with the traditional correlation between trees and the Cross, such as in *The Dream of the Rood*, brings these three signs together to form a functioning unit within the text. "Tree nailed" is an example of one of the threads that pulls these symbols together (*The Anathemata* 174). The transformation of timber as raw material into a ship's mast by Bradshaw's builders requires nails, but nails also allude to the most gruesome aspects of the crucifixion. The "tree-nailed" epithet also recalls the manner in which the Rood as a tree-Cross composite in *The Dream of the Rood* suffered alongside Christ during the crucifixion. The Rood itself describes how it was pierced "through with dark nails" (288 line 46). The Rood also narrates how it was hewn down in the forest and then transformed into the Cross (287 lines 28-32), a narrative collapsed in Jones's overlying of living trees with masts and the Cross.

The three images are drawn together with the vision of masts and trees by associations such as in these lines: "beyond the gangways aft / abaft / the trembling tree / Down / far under him / the central *arbor* / the quivering elm on which our salvation sways" (*The Anathemata* 173). The title of section VI of *The Anathemata*, "Keel, Ram, Stauros", is perhaps the most succinct expression of these interlinked

motifs and ideas. Stauros represents the Cross, such as in “Agios Stauros”, the “Holy Cross Standing” (*The Anathemata* 180). While “Keel”, referring to the ship, connects to the mast motif, but also, in conjunction with “Ram” references the band of Argonauts Jones develops throughout the text. The term “Argonauts” references Jason and the pagan, Greek mythological tradition, but Jones also employs “Argonauts” in a decidedly Christian sense. In a footnote to the phrase “his / argonauts whose argosy you plead,” Jones writes:

What is pleaded in the Mass is precisely the argosy or voyage of the Redeemer, consisting of his entire sufferings and his death, his conquest of hades, his resurrection and his return in triumph to heaven. It is this that is offered to the Trinity (Cf. ‘Myself to myself’ as in the *Havamal* is said of Odin) on behalf of us Argonauts and of the whole argosy of mankind.

(*The Anathemata* 106 note 2)

It is also interesting to note in Jones’s explication that he uses “hades” and “heaven” side by side, when he could just as easily retained a purely Christian vocabulary and used “hell”. This argosy taps into significant liminal elements which have already surfaced in discussion. The voyage itself, as Eliot has expressed in “The Dry Salvages”, occupies a liminal space. The metaphor of a sea voyage as the journey of “mankind” also echoes Jones’s perception of a human life as its own parenthesis. The connection Jones here draws to a descent to the underworld and to resurrection has also been reflected numerous times in his and Eliot’s use of ghosts or ghosted references to create a liminal poetic space where living and dead may interact.

The liminal relationship created by the layering of these symbols facilitates the meeting and merger of different traditions within the wood and garden space. The overlaying of tree imagery with the Cross in *The Anathemata* and “Burnt Norton” creates a liminal space which combines pagan and Christian imagery offering suggestions of the enduring connections and continuities between them.

This reflects the anthropological focus of the early twentieth century, which charted the ancient origins of rites and symbols through to their contemporary manifestations. Jones's hanged offerant on a tree not only connects to the double vision of humans and trees, but also connects pagan gods with Christ (*In Parenthesis* 67). Jones explicitly footnotes Odin in regards to such an image in *In Parenthesis* (67), but the connection with Christ is easy to make, especially when considering the liminal melding of tree imagery. This reading is strengthened by the conflation of "the Yggdrasil for mast" (*The Anathemata* 200), where the vision of the Cross, tree, and mast additionally incorporate an aspect of Norse mythology. Odin, or the pagan sacrificial god on the tree, also recurs in *The Anathemata*: "Nine nights of the windy tree? / Himself to himself? / Who made the runes would read them— / wounded with *our* spears" (225). The inclusion of "runes" in this passage not only reinforces the pagan tradition, but also picks up on the runic inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross, while "wounded with *our* spears" directly references the events of the crucifixion.

This liminal merger of pagan and Christian imagery is not only present in Jones's woods, but surfaces in Eliot's garden. The "bedded axle-tree" carries with it the same connotations Jones presents more explicitly and which are manifested in other ways in the garden space. Eliot's garden has connotations of an Edenic, or re-lapsarian space. This sense of innocence, naivety, and humanity's beginnings, associated with almost all gardens post-Eden, is enhanced by the description of coming "through the first gate, / Into our first world" (*Collected Poems* 117). An Edenic garden also carries with it the connotations of an enclosed garden, separated from the space outside. But at the same time as this Christian imagery is manifested in the garden, the talking bird and the voices coming from the foliage have an air of paganism about them like spirits found in natural wooded areas. Raine has read the voices in the garden as belonging to ghosts, specifically in terms of an allusion to the ghost children in Kipling's short story "They" (100). Like Jones's wood, Eliot's garden presents a liminal space where the motifs associated with different religious traditions and time periods can intermingle. This liminal relationship also carries

associations of ghosts and the afterlife, as resurfaced in Jones's discussion of the argosy of the Redeemer.

The liminality between different times and traditions this religious imagery brings into the wood and garden is paralleled in Jones's and Eliot's use of the wooded landscape to express their views on poetic and artistic practices. Departing from a single focus on their poetry to explore woods in their poetics further illuminates their use of woods and analogous gardens in verse.

In the preface to *The Anathemata* Jones proposes, quoting from Thomas Gilby's *Barbara Celarent*, that "the mind is a hunter of forms, *venator formarum*" (15) and proceeds to develop this idea through the metaphor of the hunter in a woodland setting. Jones continues:

But the particular quarry that the mind of the poet seeks to capture is a very elusive beast indeed. Perhaps we can say that the country to be hunted, the habitat of that quarry, where the "forms" lurk that he's after, will be found to be part of vast, densely wooded, inherited and entailed domains. It is in that "sacred wood" that the spoor of those "forms" is to be tracked [...]. It is within such a topography that he will feel forward, from a find to a check, from a check to a view, from a view to a possible kill: in the morning certainly, but also in the lengthening shadows. (*The Anathemata* 19-20)

The wooded space in this passage becomes a metaphor for the poet's active liminal engagement with cultural history. Jones's use of "sacred wood" in inverted commas immediately recalls Eliot's collection of essays of the same name and connects this passage to the implications of Eliot's choice of this title.

Eliot's title is significant and has been the focus of scholarly decoding. The volume contains no essay entitled "The Sacred Wood" and is, as Peter White has

described in “New Light on *The Sacred Wood*” (2003), certainly an “enigmatic title” (497). The general consensus surrounding Eliot’s title is that it is an allusion to Frazer’s study of rituals in *The Golden Bough* (White 505), although other sources have also been proposed. The Frazerian allusion was proposed by Elizabeth Drew in *T. S. Eliot: The Design of his Poetry* (1954). Drew states that Eliot uses the title

as a symbol for the immortal poetic tradition, always dying and being reborn. The opening chapter of Frazer traces the story of the wood of Nemi, which was the scene of the bloody ritual by which the old priest of the grove was slain by a younger one, who succeeded both priest and king until he in his turn was slain. (65)

George Watson developed the implications of this allusion, arguing it

provides a key to the unity of Eliot’s first critical essays. A youthful poet turns critic to justify his own place in the line of succession, to stake a claim. He is priest and murderer. Perhaps the metaphor is doubly suggestive: Eliot, the new priest of the ‘tradition’, inherits by a kind of critical massacre, belittling the rights of dead poets to historical existences and boldly plundering their remains.

(*The Literary Critics* 169)

C. K. Stead in 1977 was more sceptical about these Frazerian interpretations of the title, pointing out that “none of the old priests really ‘dies’. They form, rather, a ‘familiar compound ghost’ with whom the new priest conducts his dialogues”(203-4).

Stead's interpretation marries Eliot's choice most closely with Jones's metaphor of the wooded space as that which contains our vast, dense cultural inheritance. Stead's link between the wood and Eliot's "familiar compound ghost" further reinforces the idea of conceptualising the parenthetical wood as a space in which boundaries (such as that between past and present, the self and other) become blurred. Here in the liminal wood poets can discover their cultural inheritance and enter into conversations with their literary ancestors. Liminal relationships are facilitated within the wood in the same way that irreconcilable opposites and layered imagery inhabit other the woods and gardens.

Other critics have discerned a Virgilian allusion in the title *The Sacred Wood*, which reinforces a conception of the wood space as the facilitator of liminal experiences. E. J. Stormon suggests that critics look to Virgil's *Georgics* (15) while David Huisman has made an intriguing case for an echoing of Dryden's translation of the *Aeneid*, which refers to the Trojan horse as "the Sacred Wood" (226-7). In line with this train of thought, Huisman also suggests that Frazer's use of the phrase "sacred wood" "regularly refers to sacramental objects made of wood, while the phrase 'sacred grove' refers to the scene of the ritual slaying of the priest of Nemi" (227). Huisman brushes aside the distinction he makes, however, as "really beside the point" (227). But looking at Jones's use of wood as a space and wood as a material, it is perhaps closer to the point in this instance. In the same passage in which John Ball sees the wood in the periscope's mirror and reflects on the rituals that take place in the wood, he refers to the space as "groves" (*In Parenthesis* 66). Huisman's comments suggest that "grove" may in fact be a more appropriate word to characterise the space of the wood in order to distinguish it from the material wood, a component part of the space.

Most importantly in regards to liminal experiences, Huisman goes on to explore the possibility that the title refers to the Golden Bough which Aeneas, at the Sibyl's instruction, used to enter the land of the dead (227). The golden bough or "the sacred wood" read as the symbolic passport of the living hero into the underworld strengthens the association of wood as both space and material object as

a means of mediating between past and present, between life and death.

The wood and garden in Jones's and Eliot's poetry are parentheses which contain liminal relationships. In woods and gardens there is a bringing together of the liminal elements separately identified in Jones's and Eliot's poetry. The enclosed nature of the space is established by boundaries and thresholds and the between space facilitates liminal meldings of imagery and imaginative engagements with the past. The inclusion of liminally presented religious imagery within these spaces and use of the wood in their discussions of poetics suggest that liminal space does not only express their experience of modern space, but also comes to embody their spiritual and intellectual viewpoints.

Conclusion

This thesis has pursued two concurrent, yet interconnected, agendas. It has argued that Jones and Eliot constitute a legitimate critical pairing in their own right and that carrying out a levelled, in-depth comparison of their poetry offers a multitude of rewards. The critical toing and froing between Jones's and Eliot's work that this thesis has shown to be possible proves that Eliot should not be relegated to an eternal side note within Jonesian scholarship and that Jones needs to become more frequently integrated into considerations of Eliot. Neither should comparisons of Eliot and Jones only affirm instances of pure similarity. Exploring liminal spaces in their work highlights many parallels, but also instances where each poet displays a different slant on the same space. These differing approaches are evident in the asymmetrical focus of their wastelands, the analogies between their uses of the different spaces of woods and gardens, and the different voices they give prominence to in the city space. Often it is in these points of difference that the greatest insight into their work can be found.

A focus on liminal space in their work has facilitated this revisionist reading while also proving to be equally as rewarding by providing a fresh approach to their work. Connections between different liminal spaces not only highlight aspects of space within their work but draw out their engagements with historical contexts, industrialism, anthropology, cultural history, technology, literature, archaeology, imperialism, and religion. All of these additional fields which this spatial reading has touched upon present their own opportunities for similarly intricate comparisons between the two poets, strengthening the case for greater comparative work to be done.

Such a spatial focus has additionally demonstrated that applying the postmodern spatial turn to these modernist poems provides new perspectives on textual and contextual elements. This is not only the case with respect to Eliot and Jones, but to modernist literature as a whole, as the work of critics such as Thacker reinforces. In 1972, A. Walton Litz wrote of *The Waste Land* that "few works, can

have remained *avant garde* for so long. But now that ‘modernism’ has passed into the realm of literary history, *The Waste Land* must pass with it” (455). But *The Waste Land*, like *Four Quartets*, *The Anathemata*, and *In Parenthesis* does not exist merely as a historical artifact. The original contexts and contextual ties of these four poems are coupled with an understanding of them within our own contexts as readers.

Applying postmodern and contemporary literary terms and models to modernist literature demonstrate that these texts reflect, even anticipate, our contemporary experience. Such readings reveal how modernist works engage with us in our own time and place while at the same time providing us with connections to the origins of contemporary experience.

While this thesis has explored the prevalence of liminal space in four texts by Eliot and Jones, it has by no means exhausted the liminal spaces to be discovered in the rest of their work. Within their shorter poems – “A,a,a, Domine Deus”, “The Hunt”, “The Hollow Men”, “A Note on War Poetry”, “To Walter de la Mare” and “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” to name only a few – the same spaces are manifested. The discussion of woods in their work also highlights how their poetics can engage with liminal spaces. Their essays, broadcasts, and letters present material for additional considerations of liminal space, especially with regard to the liminal situation of the poet in the modern age. Furthermore, the possibilities for considering Jonesian and Eliotic liminal space, or spatiality more generally, in the company of other writers, both modernist or otherwise demonstrate how there are, in Gennep’s words, “always new thresholds to cross” (189).

Works Cited

- Ackroyd, Peter. *T. S. Eliot*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1984. Print.
- Aldington, Richard. "The Poetry of T. S. Eliot." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 4-10. Print.
- Andrews, Charles. "War Trauma and Religious Cityscape in David Jones's *In Parenthesis*." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 40.1 (2007): 87-96. JSTOR. 10 July 2013.
- Bender, Thomas. *The Unfinished City*. New York: New Press, 2002. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002. Print.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982. Print.
- Birrell, T. A. "A Reception of T. S. Eliot: Texts and Contexts." *English Studies* 69. 6 (1988): 518- 533. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 2 October 2013.
- Blamires, David. *David Jones Artist and Writer*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971. Print.
- Brandt, Stefan L. "The City as Liminal Space: Urban Visuality and Aesthetic Experience in Postmodern U.S. Literature and Cinema." *American Studies* 54.4 (2009): 553-581. JSTOR. Web. 5 June 2013.
- Brooker, Peter and Andrew Thacker, ed. *Geographies of Modernism: Literatures, Cultures, Spaces*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Brooks, Cleanth. "The Waste Land: Critique of the Myth." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 319-348. Print.
- Chambers, Iain. *Border Dialogues: Journeys in Postmodernity*. New York : Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Churchill, Suzanne W. "Outing T. S. Eliot." *Criticism* 47.1 (Winter 2005): 7-30.

- JSTOR. Web. 14 April 2013.
- Cole, Sarah. *At the Violet Hour: Modernism and Violence, in England and Ireland*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. Print.
- Cook, Eleanor. "T. S. Eliot and The Carthaginian Peace." *ELH* 46. 2(1979): 341-55. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Crawford, Robert. *The Savage And The City of T.S. Eliot*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987. Print.
- Cunningham, Valentine. *British Writers of the Thirties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987. Print.
- Davie, Donald. *Under Briggflatts: A History of Poetry in Great Britain, 1960-1988*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. Print.
- Deane, Patrick. "David Jones, T. S. Eliot, and the Modernist Unfinished." *Renascence* 47.2 (1995): 74-88. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 28 March 2013.
- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. 1980. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988. Print.
- Dilworth, Thomas. *David Jones in The Great War*. London: Enitharmon, 2012. Print.
- . *Reading David Jones*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2008. Print.
- . *The Shape of Meaning in The Poetry of David Jones*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988. Print.
- . "T. S. Eliot and David Jones." *The Sewanee Review* 102. 1 (1994): 70-85. JSTOR. Web. 2 March 2013.
- Donald, James "Metropolis: The City as Text". *Social and Cultural Forms of Modernity*. Ed. Robert Boccock and Kenneth Thompson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992. 417-471. Print.
- "The Dream of the Rood." *Longman Anthology of Old English, Old Icelandic and Anglo-Norman Literatures*. Ed. Richard North, Joe Allard, and Patricia Gillies. Harlow: Longman 2011. Print
- Drew, Elizabeth. *T. S. Eliot: The Design of His Poetry*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1954. Print.

- Dudley, Jack. "Transcendence and The End of Modernist Aesthetics: David Jones's *In Parenthesis*." *Renascence* 65.2 (2013):103-124. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 22 Jan 2014.
- Eliot, T. S. *Collected Poems 1909-1962*. 1974. London: Faber and Faber, 2002. Print.
- . *Inventions of the March Hare: Poems 1909-1917*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. London: Faber and Faber, 1996. Print.
- . *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 1: 1898-1922*. Ed. Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton. London: Faber and Faber, 2009. Print.
- . *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 2: 1923-1925*. Ed. Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton. London: Faber and Faber, 2009. Print.
- . *The Sacred Wood*. 1920. London: Methuen, 1960. Print.
- . "Scylla and Charybdis." *Agenda* 23. 1&2 (Spring-Summer 1985): 5-21. Print.
- . *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Faber and Faber, 1975. Print.
- . *To Criticize The Critic and Other Writings*. 1965. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991. Print.
- . *The Use of Poetry and The Use of Criticism: Studies in The Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Print.
- . *The Waste Land: a facsimile and transcript of the original drafts including the annotations of Ezra Pound*. Ed. Valerie Eliot. London: Faber and Faber, 1971. Print
- Fairley, Jennifer. "David Jones's Thirties". *Recharting The Thirties*. Ed. Patrick J. Quinn. London: Associated University Presses, 1996 40-50. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." 1967. Trans. Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics* 16.1 (1986): 22-27. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 June 2013.
- Francisoi, Robert. "The Poetic Space of *The Waste Land*." *American Poetry* 2.2 (1985): 17-29. Print.
- Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Two Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.2 (1945): 221-240. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 November 2013.
- Frazer, James George. *The Golden Bough Volume 2*. Third Edition. London:

- Macmillan, 1936. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. "Unreal City." *Critical Essays on T. S. Eliot's The Waste Land*. Ed. Lois A. Cuddy and David H. Hirsch. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1991. 140-144. Print.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975. Print.
- Gennep, Arnold van. *Rites of Passage*. Trans. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee. London: Routledge, 1960. Print.
- Hargrove, Nancy D. *Landscape as Symbol in the Poetry of T. S. Eliot*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1978. Print.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. 1989. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990. Print.
- Heywood, Christopher. "Frances Hodgson Burnett's 'The Secret Garden': A Possible Source for T. S. Eliot's 'Rose Garden.'" *The Yearbook of English Studies* 7 (1977): 166-171. JSTOR. Web. 16 October 2013.
- Huisman, David. "Title and Subject in The Sacred Wood." *Essays in Criticism* 39.3 (1989): 217-232. Print.
- Huyssen, Andreas. "Geographies of modernism in a globalizing world." *Geographies of Modernism: Literatures, Cultures, Spaces*. Ed. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker. New York: Routledge, 2005. 6-18. Print.
- Johnston, John. H. *English Poetry of the First World War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964. Print.
- Jones, David. *The Anathemata*. 1952. London: Faber and Faber, 2010. Print.
- . *Broadcast Notes 1953-1954*. 1953-4. MS LA 4/3. National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.
- . *Dai Greatcoat : a self-portrait of David Jones in his letters*. 1980. Ed. René Hague. London: Faber and Faber, 2008. Print.
- . *Draft Letters: Letters About Published Work*. 1958-1972. MS CF 1/4. National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.
- . *Draft Letters: Letters to Bernard Bergonzi*. 1965. MS CF 1/6. National Library of

- Wales, Aberystwyth.
- . *The Dying Gaul and Other Writings*. Ed. Harman Grisewood. London: Faber and Faber, 1978. Print.
- . *Early Manuscript Drafts of In Parenthesis*. 1927-1933. MS LP 1. National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.
- . *Epoch and Artist*. 1959. Ed. Harman Grisewood. London : Faber and Faber, 2008. Print.
- . *Inner Necessities: The Letters of David Jones to Desmond Chute*. Ed. Thomas Dilworth. Toronto: Anson-Cartwright Editions, 1984. Print.
- . *In Parenthesis*. 1937. London: Faber and Faber, 2010. Print.
- Jones, Gwyn and Thomas Jones trans. *The Mabinogian*. London: Dent & Sons, 1949. Print.
- Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. 1983. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003. Print.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The King's Pilgrimage." *The King's Pilgrimage*. Frank Fox. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1922. *California Digital Library*. Web. 2 November 2013.
- Linder, Rolf. "The Imaginary City." *Toward a New Metropolitanism*. Ed. Gunter H. Lenz, Friedrich Ulfers and Antje Dallmann. Heidelberg: Winter, 2006. 209-216. Print.
- Litz, A. Walton. "The Waste Land Fifty Years After". *Journal of Modern Literature* 2.4 (1972): 455-471. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 January 2014.
- Lowell, Amy. "From Preface to *Tendencies in Modernist Poetry* 1917." *Modernism: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*. Ed. Vassiliki Kolokotroni, Jane Goldman and Olga Taxidou. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998. 342-343. Print.
- Matthews, Steven. "Provincialism and The Modern Diaspora: T. S. Eliot and David Jones." *English* 58. 220 (2009): 57-72. *Oxford Journals*. Web. 24 October 2013.
- McDiarmid, Lucy. *Saving Civilization : Yeats, Eliot, and Auden Between the Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Print.

- Menand, Louis. *Discovering Modernism: T. S. Eliot and His Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. Print.
- Miller, James E. *T. S. Eliot's Personal Wasteland: Exorcism of the Demons*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977. Print.
- More, Paul Elmer. "Review of *Selected Essays*." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 24-29. Print.
- Raine, Craig. *T. S. Eliot*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Rainey, Laurence, A. Walton Litz, and Louis Menand Ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume 7, Modernism and the New Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.
- Richards, I. A. "The Poetry of T. S. Eliot." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 216-220. Print.
- Roessel, David. "'Mr. Eugenides, The Smyrna Merchant,' and Post-War Politics in *The Waste Land*." *Journal of Modern Literature* XV:1 (Summer 1989) 169-174. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 14 March 2013.
- Rollason, David. "Forests, parks, palaces, and the power of place in early medieval kingship." *Early Medieval Europe* 20.4 (2012): 428-449. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 12 October 2013.
- Rosenberg, Isaac. *The Collected Works of Isaac Rosenberg*. Ed. Gordon Bottomley and Denys Harding. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937. Print.
- Rummel, Andrea. "People in the Crowd: British Modernism, the Metropolis and the Flâneur." *Literature in Society*. Ed. Regina Rudaityte. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2013. 57-76. Print.
- Savage, D.S. "The Orthodoxy of T. S. Eliot." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 138-157. Print.
- Scutts, Joanna. "Battlefield Cemeteries, Pilgrimage, and Literature after the First World War: The Burial of the Dead." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* 52.4 (2009): 387-416. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 12 April 2013.
- Simon, John. "From Waste To Wonderland", *The New Republic* 146.21 (1962): 21-23.

- Academic Search Alumni Edition*. Web. 24 April 2013.
- Soja, Edward J. *Postmetropolis: critical studies of cities and regions*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. Print.
- . *Thirdspace: journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996. Print.
- Spanos, William V. "Repetition in *The Waste Land*: A Phenomenological Destruction." *Boundary 2* 7.3 (1979): 225-286. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 7 November 2013.
- Staudt, Katheleen Henderson. *At The Turn of a Civilization*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1994. Print.
- . "The Language of T. S. Eliot's Four Quartets and David Jones's The Anathemata." *Renascence* 38.2: 118-130. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 14 April 2013.
- Stead, C.K. "Eliot, Arnold, and the English Poetic Tradition." *The Literary Criticism of T. S. Eliot: New Essays*. 1977. Ed. David Newton-De Molina. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. 184-206. Print.
- Steinberg, Erwin R. "Mrs Dalloway and T. S. Eliot's Personal Waste Land." *Journal of Modern Literature* 10.1 (1983): 3-25. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 26 March 2013.
- Stormon, E.J. "Virgil and The Modern Poet." *Meanjin* 6 (1947): 6-15. Print.
- Symons, Julian. *Makers of The New: the revolution in literature, 1912-1939*. New York: Random House, 1987. Print.
- Tally, Robert T. Jr. *Spatiality*. New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.
- Thacker, Andrew. *Moving Through Modernity: space and geography in modernism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003. Print.
- Thompson, T. H. "The Bloody Wood" *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 161-169. Print.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. "The Otherwise Modern: Caribbean Lessons from the Savage Slot." *Critically Modern: Alternatives, Alterities, Anthropologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002. 220-237. Print.

- Turner, Victor. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974. Print.
- Unger, Leonard. *T. S. Eliot*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961. Print.
- . "T. S. Eliot's Rose Garden." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 374- 394. Print.
- Wagner, Robert D. "The Meaning of Eliot's Rose Garden." *PMLA* 69.1 (1954): 22-33. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 October 2013.
- Ward, Elizabeth. *David Jones: Mythmaker*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983. Print.
- Watson, George. *The Literary Critics: A Study of English Descriptive Criticism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962. Print.
- . "Quest for a Frenchman." *The Sewanee Review* 84.3 (Summer 1976): 465-475. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 March 2013.
- White, Peter. "New Light on *The Sacred Wood*." *Review of English Studies* 54. 216 (2003): 497-515. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 23 October 2013.
- Williamson, Hugh Ross. *The Poetry of T. S. Eliot*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932. Print.
- Winters, Yvor. "T. S. Eliot or The Illusion of Reaction." *T. S. Eliot: A Selected Critique*. Ed. Leonard Unger. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948. 75-113. Print.
- Yang, Carol L. "Revisiting the Flâneur in T. S. Eliot's 'Eeldrop and Appleplex - I'." *Orbis Litterarum* 66.2 (2011): 89-120. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 26 July 2013.
- . "T. S. Eliot's Virtual Europe: The Flâneur and the Textual Flânerie." *Yeats Eliot Review* 29.3-4 (2012): 3-24. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 26 July 2013.

Other Works Consulted

- Ackerman, Robert. *J.G. Frazer: His Life and Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1987. Print.
- Alldritt, Keith. *David Jones: Writer and Artist*. London: Constable, 2003. Print.
- Austin, D.L. "Literature as History: Misreading David Jones's *In Parenthesis*." *The Dalhousie Review* 67. 2/3 (1967): 217-227. Print.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. 1958. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994. Print.
- Bergonzi, B. *Heroes' Twilight: a study of the literature of the Great War*. London : Macmillan, 1980. Print.
- . *T. S. Eliot*. London: Macmillan, 1978. Print.
- Blissett, William. *The Long Conversation: A Memoir of David Jones*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1981. Print.
- Campbell, Andrew. "Strata and Bedrock in David Jones' Anathemata." *Renascence* 46.2 (1994): 117-132. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 14 Jan 2014.
- Dilworth, Thomas. "David Jones and Fascism." *Journal of Modern Literature* 13.1 (1986): 149-162. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 14 March 2013.
- . "The Spatial Imagination of David Jones." *Twentieth Century Literature* 37.2 (1991): 240-253. *Master FILE Premier*. Web. 15 March 2013.
- Eliot, T. S. *Selected Essays 1917-1932*. London: Faber and Faber, 1932. Print.
- Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.3 (1945): 433-456. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 November 2013.
- . "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts." *The Sewanee Review* 53.4 (1945): 643-653. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 November 2013.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. "'Rats' Alley': The Great War, Modernism, and the (Anti)Pastoral Elegy." *New Literary History* 30.1 (1999): 179-201. *Project MUSE*. Web. 15 March 2013.
- Grimes, Ronald L. "Victor Turner's Social Drama and T. S. Eliot's Ritual Drama."

- Anthropologica* 27.1/2 (1985): 79-99. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Nov 2013.
- Hooker, Jeremy. *The Presence of The Past: Essays on Modern British and American Poetry*. Bridgend: Poetry Wales Press, 1987. Print.
- Ingelbien, Raphael. "They Saw One They Knew: Baudelaire and the Ghosts of London Modernism." *English Studies* 88.1 (2007): 43-45. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 15 December 2013.
- Jain, Saskya Iris. "Ancestral Memory, Ancient Unity: Footnotes as Poetic Device in David Jones's *In Parenthesis*." *Literary Imagination* 13.1 (2011): 37-46. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 12 August 2013.
- Jones, David. *The Roman Quarry*. New York: Sheep Meadow Press, 1981. Print.
- . *The Sleeping Lord*. London: Faber and Faber, 1974. Print.
- Kaye, Richard A. "'A Splendid Readiness for Death': T.S. Eliot, the Homosexual Cult of St. Sebastian, and World War I." *Modernism/Modernity* 6.2 (1999): 107-134. *Project MUSE*. Web. 15 April 2013.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991. Print.
- Miles, Jonathan. *Background To David Jones: A Study in Sources and Drafts*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1990. Print.
- Omer, Ranen. "'It is I Who Have Been Defending a Religion Called Judaism': The T. S. Eliot and Horace M. Kallen Correspondence." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 39.4 (Winter 1997): 321-356. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 June 2013.
- . "Rethinking Eliot, Jewish Identity, and Cultural Pluralism." *Modernism/Modernity* 10.3 (September 2003): 439-445. *Project MUSE*. Web. 13 June 2013.
- Peter, John. "A New Interpretation of The Waste Land." *Essays in Criticism* 2 (1952): 242-266. Print.
- Sherry Jr. Vincent, B. "A New Boast for *In Parenthesis*: The Dramatic Monologue of David Jones." *Notre Dame English Journal* 14. 2 (1982): 113-128. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 February 2013.
- Smith, Grover. *T. S. Eliot's Poetry and Plays: A Study in Sources and Meaning*.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. Print.

Spear, Jeffrey L. " 'The Burial of the Dead': Eliot's Corpse in the Garden in a Christian Context." *American Literature* 50.2 (1978): 282-285. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 12 August 2013.

Spencer, Michael D. "The Garden in T. S. Eliot's Four Quartets." *Cithara* 44.2 (2005): 32-45. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 1 October 2013.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: structure and anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine, 1969. Print.

Viljoen, Hein, and Chris N. van der Merwe, eds. *Beyond The Threshold: Explorations of Liminality in Literature*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007. Print.

Yang, Carol L. " Rhapsody on a City of Dreadful Night: The Flâneur and Urban Spectacle." *Yeats Eliot Review* 26. 3-4 (2009): 2-14. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 26 July 2013.