IS IT REALLY THE BIRD THAT SAID, GO, GO, GO?: CIRCULATION OF DESIRE IN FOUR QUARTETS

MASAHIKO ABE

Does Four Quartets really mean anything? The argument starts with this question, to which, however, no direct answer will be given. Even when we do not feel like saying 'yes,' saying 'no,' as Hough does by pointing out the failure of the poet to reach any solid statement, is not the only choice left; Ellmann's application of the Bergsonian model of perception may be a good example, through which she sheds light on the fact that the dialectic between oblivion and recollection plays an important role in the generation of meaning in the poem.¹

The purpose of this article is to analyze the lyricism, not the 'meaning,' of the poem—the ancient symbolism of the rose-garden will not be touched.² It is only how the secret is conveyed, how a web of rhetoric is woven around the secret center, that deserves our attention. Therefore another question will be raised: who is talking to whom in Four Quartets? This question is put to suggest my intention of regarding the text as a heap of voices, especially as the voices addressed by someone to another.³ What is to be answered hereafter is how such

² For example, the image of a rose has often been associated with secrecy. See Frances Yates, The Rosicrucian Enlightenment, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
³ After the experience of writing poetic dramas, Eliot grew extremely conscious of the idea of voices. In one of his essays three categories of voices are given: the voice of the poet talking to himself, that of the poet addressing an audience, and the voice of a dramatic character speaking in verse. In our context the third voice requires close attention. Although my argument is based on the idea that Four Quartets is a lyric poem, the dramatic elements of its voices will also be brought under focus when its lyricism is investigated. See 'The Three Voices of Poetry' in On Poetry and Poets, (London: Faber and Faber, 1951).
a dialogic structure can be inferred, and what kind of dialogue it is.

I) Incantational Infiltration

In his later poetry Eliot developed a new technique of repetition different from those in his early years: 'Time present and time past/Are both perhaps present in time future/And time future contained in time past.' ('Burnt Norton,' I, 11. 1-3) Here the repetition of the word 'time' with a stress on it is representative of the narrative style he adopts in 'Burnt Norton,' as well as in the other Quartets. Obviously the effect is not that of sweet sounding sentimentalism. The deliberate, prosaic tone, which continues till the 10th line, initiates, together with the monotonous—almost unnatural repetition, a kind of intellectual hypnosis. This may be one of the reasons why Four Quartets is often called a meditative poem. 'Meditative,' however, is a word too general to denote its narrative style. Meditation is a contemplative, mental act, which is supposed to be committed within one's mind. It is a thoroughly personal attempt to reflect upon something for oneself. Even when it is written down, it usually has a monologic form. We come across in the 12th line the word 'we' and in the 15th 'you,' both of which effectively break the solipsistic tone characteristic of meditation. A didactic tone should also be remarked: 'If all time is eternally present/All time is unredeemable.' (11. 4-5) The slight hesitancy suggested by 'perhaps' in the 2nd line has somehow been replaced by a flow of resolute reasoning. The insertion of 'all,' though logically quite natural, subtly indicates, when repeated, the extensive applicability of the argument. The word 'unredeemable,' used in such a predicative sentence, inevitably connotes the authoritative trustworthiness of the narrator, because the mere idea implied in the word that there is, at least, something 'unredeemable' suggests that the world is based on the firm ground of unchangeable truth, whatever it is, and that strict reasoning can really be trusted, as the existence of the firm truth vindicates its validity and secures it against the chaos of endless scepticism. The next sentence more effectively adds to the authority of the narrator: 'What might have been is an abstraction/Remaining a perpetual possibility/Only

---

in a world of speculation.' (11. 6–8) The narrator carefully rules out 'What might have been,' 'abstraction,' 'perpetual possibility,' and 'speculation' as something irrelevant to the truth he is arguing about. The contrast between 'might have been' and 'is,' shown impressively through juxtaposition in the 6th line, indicates how much stress he lays on the indicative mood shown by 'is.' The validity of the narrative is thus emphasized, since the narrative is mainly based on the indicative mood of 'is.' Through the topic of time the narrator demonstrates that his argument is exactly of the type that can convey a truth which a fanciful 'speculation' cannot reach. He is a person who can tell the truth in a definite, accurate manner.

The hypnotic meditative mood effected through redundant repetition of words, such as 'time,' 'past,' 'future,' and 'what,' should be considered in connection with this didactic authoritativeness. It is noticeable, first of all, that the discourse is addressed to the listening 'you.' However, a peculiarity is that the speaker and the listener are always ready to interchange their roles. On the one hand, while the narrative consists of the speaker's voices addressed to the listener, the speaker is also speaking to himself; for reflective repetitions combined with philosophical abstractness can be regarded, in a sense, as words from man's inner consciousness. The speaker is listening to his own voices because, since they come from his inner unknown part, they are new even to him. It is a dual role of the speaker that this partial monologic style indicates: the speaker is at once the conveyer of the message and the receiver, that is, he is both the speaker and the listener. Then, what about the listener—or the listeners—spoken to as 'you'? The listener is, indeed, listening to the speaker's voices, but just as the speaker is at once the speaker and the listener, so is the listener at once the listener and the speaker. As the tone of the narrative is made as anonymous and as impersonal as possible through repetition, hypnotic mistiness, and philosophical abstractness, the voices drift in the air to be spoken even by the listener: 'My words echo/Thus, in your mind.' (11. 14–15) The voices sneak toward the listener from behind and secretly enter his mind, pretending to be his own. Just in the way people repeat the priest's words at church, here the supposed listener is expected to repeat the narrator's words. The indistinctness between speaker and listener, or subject and object, may be reminiscent of incantational language, whose occult power is obtained through
the infiltration of anonymous voices into the objects to be brought under a spell.

II) The Authoritative Narrator

But to what purpose
Disturbing the dust on a bowl of rose-leaves
I do not know. (11. 16-18)

Here 'I do not know' is not a humble confession. The narrator does not feel ashamed of his ignorance. The actual implication is this: I know everything that can be understood, most of which you may not be familiar with yet; you should ask me, therefore, for knowledge, if you are to escape from the darkness of ignorance; as for what I do not know, you can never understand it, either, for it is completely beyond your understanding, and you should rather note that even I do not know it. The narrator emphasizes the unknowability of his 'purpose' rather than his own lack of knowledge.

A similar self-assertive confidence can be observed at the opening of 'The Dry Salvages': 'I do not know much about gods; but I think that the river is a strong brown god—sullen, untamed and intractable, / Patient to some degree, at first recognized as a frontier;' (11. 1-3) The paradox is that, though the narrator admits his ignorance, he somehow attains dignity as a speaker as he goes on to describe mighty brutality of 'the river.' It is the admission of ignorance, as well as the grand style of the description, that serves to establish the dignity of the narrator. The listener is told that what is important is whether 'I,' the speaker, knows or not. The compact precision of the phrase, 'I do not know,' also renders it convincing and authoritative.

In the second section of 'Burnt Norton,' after mystical descriptions of the state of beatitude, the narrator refers to himself: 'I can only say, there we have been: but I cannot say where. / And I cannot say, how long, for that is to place it in time.' (11. 22-23) The effect is quite the same. The didactic aloofness of the narrative, enhanced by its anonymity, is by no means undermined by the intrusion of a subjective 'I.' The narrator is quite subtly arranging the logical premiss of his own argument. Although, at the beginning, he lays stress on the general applicability of the narrative by choosing the topic of 'time'
and by employing incantational language, he attributes the right to make judgements to himself. It is only the narrator himself who can judge whether what he says is true or not.

The latter part of the first section brilliantly illustrates, through vivid images, such a quality of the narrative. Truth is concealed in the secret 'rose-garden' which lies at the end of the long passage. The listener is led by the narrator through the passage to the door. This image symbolizes the argumentative process by which the narrator gives information to the listener. The same structure of spatial image can be observed in 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock':

Let us go, through certain half-deserted streets,
... 
Streets that follow like a tedious argument
Of insidious intent
To lead you to an overwhelming question... (11.4-10)

The narrator forces the supposed listener to follow him through the long passage of argument toward his own truth. The didactic authoritativeness can already be detected in this early work, though here didacticism is not yet the prevalent tone. In 'Burnt Norton' the narrator emphasizes that the secret truth is concealed in a hidden small corner which only the narrator knows. To be sure, it is 'the bird,' not the narrator, that directly speaks to the listener: 'Quick, said the bird, find them, find them,' Round the corner. Through the first gate,' (11.21-22). The narrator only suggests, 'Shall we follow?' (1.20) in what is perhaps a patronizing manner. However, it is clear that, although the narrator descends to the same level as the listener by saying 'we,' he knows more than 'we' know. He says 'we,' instead of 'I,' only to pretend to be as ignorant as the listener. In Four Quartets 'I' represents the authority who knows everything that can be known; 'you' the ignorant listener who needs to receive knowledge from the authoritative speaker; 'we,' though logically including both the authoritative speaker and the humble listener, is regarded, symbolically, as referring to ignorant explorers travelling through the passage to the truth of 'the rose-garden.' The narrator may once have experienced the mysterious journey, so, by remembering it, he may be able to re-experience the exploration with the listener. However, the didactic authoritativeness, as well as the cool dispassionate
description of the exploration, shows the detached aloofness of the narrator. It is quite natural to surmise that he, the narrator, knows the secret, the truth.

However, there is also a passage like this: 'Go, go, go, said the bird: human kind/Cannot bear very much reality.' (11. 43-44) While contriving to establish the authority of his own voices by means of anonymous incantational language, as well as by the didactic attitude toward the listening 'you,' the narrator stresses, on the other hand, the unknowability of the truth. Only the mysterious voice of 'the bird' transmits the truth. The impenetrability of the 'rose-garden' is heightened by negatives and paradoxes, such as 'invisible,' (1. 25) 'unseen eyebeams,' (1. 30) 'Moving without pressure,' (1. 26) or 'The unheard music.' (1. 29) In the second section the narrator mentions the secret of 'the rose-garden': 'At the still point of the turning world. Neither flesh nor fleshless; / Neither from nor toward; at the still point, there the dance is, / But neither arrest nor movement.' (11. 16-18) The mystical paradoxes indicate the inexplicability of the secret. Truth really exists somewhere, but human language cannot convey it, nor can human perception grasp it. This is the same impenetrability as is represented by the indirect contact with truth through the mysterious voice of the invisible 'bird."

However, the narrator can, it seems, interpret the voices of the bird. The narrator's paradoxical explanation, though not understandable because of its strategic paradox, vindicates, as a matter of fact, that he knows the truth, for at least he can explain. Perhaps he knows quite as much as the bird knows. Only such a person as really knows the secret can talk about its unknowability in such an authoritative way. Thus, the stress on unknowability adds to his own authority. Although the unknowability of the secret naturally includes his own ignorance, he speaks as if he were different from other human beings. By taking on the role of an instructive prophet, he distinguishes himself from others. Since he avoids offering any substantial information about the truth even while giving suggestive descriptions of it, he can enclose and monopolize it.

III) The Rhetoric of Negative and Restriction

Compared with the visual descriptions of the former part, the latter part of the second section of 'Burnt Norton' is full of abstract explana-
tions. As the strategy of the speaker is to stress the unknowability of the secret truth and thus to monopolize 'the rose-garden,' his narrative aims to discourage the listener from all attempts to grasp the truth. In the first section the phrase, 'I do not know,' serves as a dignified statement to forbid the listener to peep into the truth. Unlike the speaker, the listener has no more right 'not to know' than to know, so it is completely impossible for him to approach the secret. In the argument of the second section the narrator uses, together with the paradoxical 'neither...nor' construction, rigorous restrictions: 'I can only say, there we have been: but I cannot say where.' (i. 22) The effect of 'only' may not stand out at first sight, but as we move on we come across the word again and again, and it starts to take effect:

But only in time can the moment in the rose-garden,
The moment in the arbour where the rain beat,
The moment in the draughty church at smokefall
Be remembered; involved with past and future.
Only through time time is conquered. (II. 40–44)

The frequency of the word in the opening of the fifth section is even more remarkable:

Words move, music moves
Only in time; but that which is only living
Can only die. Words, after speech, reach
Into the silence. Only by the form, the pattern,
Can words or music reach
The stillness... (II.1–6)

Indeed, 'only' is used to clarify and stress the point the narrator wants to make. The underlying argumentative strictness of these passages requires accuracy of statement. Distinctions have to be made clearly: what is should be strictly distinguished from what is not. The logic of the narrator is, therefore, mainly dependent on negative subtraction rather than on positive addition: 'Erhebung without motion, concentration/Without elimination,' (II, II.28–29), 'Neither movement from nor towards, / Neither ascent nor decline. Except for the point, the still point/There would be no dance, and there is only the dance.' (II.19–21) However, this strictly definitive narrative does not present a definite truth. The meticulous argument never leads to an intel-
ligible conclusion. Therefore, the negative method itself stands out. It is as if the argumentative strictness, brought to an extremity, is about to fall into a pit of obfuscation, where all the words deny each other endlessly. Instead of reaching any palpable thematic core, the poem continues to perform a melody of negatives. What is left might be called the lyricism of negative. A marvellous combination of negative 'not' and restrictive 'only' with deliberate argumentative obfuscation can be observed in the fifth section:

Not the stillness of the violin, while the note lasts,
Not that only, but the co-existence,
Or say that the end precedes the beginning,
And the end and the beginning were always there
Before the beginning and after the end.
And all is always now. (11. 8-13)

The beauty of this carefully arranged obscurity of the argument should be remarked; it can be realized only on the verge of intelligibility. What is also important is that, although the narrator subtly avoids presenting a solid truth, he still retains the ground for truth. The negative rigidity confirms the belief that there really is a truth somewhere. This confirmation, on the other hand, indicates by contrast that the listener does not know the truth yet. A binary opposition between the world with the truth and the world without the truth is firmly established by the rhetoric of negatives. Without showing sacredness itself, the narrative cleverly draws a distinctive line between the sacred world and the secular world.

IV) The Order to Descend

At the end of The Waste Land a remedy is sought for the emptiness of modern life in the voices of the thunder. As thunder is associated with the image of water, the poet expects a blissful solution for dryness and sterility:

Ganga was sunken, and the limp leaves
Waited for rain, while the black clouds
Gathered far distant, over Himavant.
The jungle crouched, humaped in silence.
Then spoke the thunder
DA (11. 295-400)
Whatever the message of the thunder may be, the piercing destructiveness of its sound is noteworthy. Destruction is associated with purgation through the violence of the sacred thunder. The beneficency of a negative extremity is thus suggested. A similar suggestion is made in The Hollow Men. The hollowness of the 'men' is attributed to their oscillation between extremities:

Between the desire
And the spasm
Between the potency
And the existence
Between the essence
And the descent
Falls the Shadow

(V, ii. 17-23)

Either evil or good helps one escape from 'this hollow valley,' (IV, ii. 4) if only it is brought to an extremity and performs a purgative function. In 'Burnt Norton' the remedy for 'Tumid apathy with no concentration/Men and bits of paper, whirled by the cold wind/That blows before and after time,' (III, ii.14-16) is sought in descent: 'Descend lower, descend only/Into the world of perpetual solitude,/World not world, but that which is not world,' (ii. 25-27). There is no choice between evil and good. The only choice left is descent, darkness, and suffering. In order to escape from the emptiness of the world and get in touch with the sacredness above, one has to descend. What the descent means is this:

deprivation
And destitution of all property,
Desiccation of the world of sense,
Evacuation of the world of fancy,
Inoperancy of the world of spirit;

(II. 28-32)

One is required to be completely passive; one has to abandon every self-assertive act. We might be reminded of the numerous versions of stoicism which have appeared in the history. However, immediate attribution of this passage, for example, to the Christian doctrine of
self-negation will rather obscure the point. What should be remarked is the imperative mood at the beginning: ‘Descend.’ And the didactic predication: ‘This is the one way, and the other/Is the same.’ (11. 33-34) And the argumentative strictness with negatives: ‘World not world, but that which is not world.’ (1. 27) What is advocated is, indeed, passive self-negation, but what stands out is the narrative style.

Investigation of the narrative style sheds light on one aspect of the doctrine of self-negation. It is only the listening ‘you’ who ‘descend[s]’ lower,’ not the patronizing speaker. By ordering the listener to descend, the speaker makes a distinction between the listener and himself—as if he no longer needs to descend. The insistence on self-negation serves to separate the speaker from the listener, and the former achieves superiority over the latter.

What can be felt here is a strong power coming from outside the subject. The power, however, cannot be associated with empathy or passion because it does not originate from such emotions, nor does it lead to the generation of them. The source of the sense of power is only an irresistible flow of a succession of rigorous words coming from an unknowable authority. Since the listener is strictly distinguished from the speaker because the speaker’s patronizing aloofness inevitably brings the listener into his subjection, a feeling is bred: a quaintly serene feeling of being under the control of some invisible authority represented by the narrator’s voices. The same emotion can be more clearly observed in ‘East Coker’: ‘You say I am repeating/Something I have said before. I shall say it again, / Shall I say it again?’ (III, 11. 34-36) The speaker presumes, by himself, that he is an authority who tells the truth and that he has to take the trouble to give information to the poor ignorant listener. He demonstrates his own superiority through this pretentious attitude towards the supposed listener: ‘In order to arrive there, / To arrive where you are, to get from where you are not, / You must go by a way wherein there is no ecstasy.’ (11. 36-38) This is representative of the whole narrative style of Four Quartets: didacticism, argumentative strictness, hypnotic repetitions suggestive of incantation, and the subjugation of the listener to the

---

1 Even Murray’s scrupulous study on the sources of the poem has, in spite of his strong insistence on the textual analysis, tendency to stray away from the text because of his presumption that the poem has some hidden meaning behind it. See Paul Murray, T. S. Eliot and Mysticism, (London: Macmillan, 1991).
speaking voice by way of preaching the doctrine of self-negation.

V) Acceptance of Desire
In the fourth section of ‘Burnt Norton’ the tone is slightly changed. Questions are put one after another:

Will the sunflower turn to us, will the clematis
Stray down, bend to us; tendril and spray
Clutch and cling?
Chill
Fingers of yew be curled
Down on us? (II. 3-8)

These meditative, soliloquizing questions are reminiscent of the fact that the speaker is also a desiring subject, not the object of desire, though he seems to know the secret of ‘the rose-garden.’ He is certainly yearning after a distant sacredness, which, in spite of his knowledge, he cannot attain. Here botanical vocabulary gives a pastoral pathos, and, since the focus is on the fragility of plants, with their vulnerable aspects mainly stressed, the convincing advance of the didactic narrative slows down. Under the hopeless situation, the questioning is feeble and nearly resigned, which the peculiar arrangement of words visually expresses. Unlike the patronizing suggestion in the first section, ‘Shall we follow?’ (I. 20) the speaker’s feeble meditative questioning, which is perhaps directed toward himself, indicates the distance between the narrator and the sacred ‘rose-garden.’ The speaker himself is destined to be far away from the sacred world.

At the end of the section, on the other hand, the narrator quietly hints at the image of the sacred centre: ‘the still point of the turning world.’ (I. 10) The meditative questioning has, unnoticed, changed into an impersonal instructive voice. Without giving any answer to the question, the narrator manages to put in the image of a sacred object. Since the narrator has shown how distant he is from the sacred world, the listener, who is certainly away from ‘the rose-garden,’ is obliged to share with the narrator his distance from the sacred world. This also means that the listener shares the narrator’s view of the sacred object. The listener is expected to accept the narrator’s object of desire. In such a case the listener does not really feel he has discovered
his own object. As he is not allowed to be completely identical with the authoritative speaking voice, he is led to desire the speaker’s object, not his own. The emotion is surely motivated by the distance between the desiring subject and the desired object, but the point is that the subject always feels he is desiring the desired object of someone else. A strange combination of positivity and passivity can thus be felt by the reader: the positivity indispensable in the act of desiring and the passivity suggested through the ‘acceptance’ of the desire.

VI) Also the Speaker Accepts

The strange lyrical combination of positivity and passivity can be said to be caused also by a similar ambivalence in the narrator. While, when speaking to the listening ‘you,’ the narrator is imposing, didactic, and authoritative, he lacks confidence when he speaks to himself. The meditative voices in soliloquy are hesitant and feeble: ‘I sometimes wonder if that is what Krishna meant—/Among other things—or one way of putting the same thing:’ (‘The Dry Salvages,’ III, 11.1–2). However, he gradually introduces a round-about way suggestive of his eloquence in denotation: ‘That the future is a faded song, a Royal Rose or a lavender spray.’ (1.3) ‘[F]aded’ indicates invisibility. When his argumentative strictness develops, as always, into deliberate obfuscation, it is the invisible inexplicability of the sacred ‘rose-garden’ that justifies an apparently nonsensical paradox: ‘Pressed between yellow leaves of a book that has never been opened. / And the way up is the way down, the way forward is the way back.’ (11.5–6) It is shown that the attempt to describe what is in ‘the book that has never been opened’ is destined to be beyond understanding. Thus, by concealing the sacred centre, the narrator can secure his monopoly and authority. The hesitant self-conscious oscillation at the beginning can no longer be observed after the germ of paradox is given in the third line. The argumentative didacticism, which is no doubt secured by the succession of negatives and paradoxes caused by the mysterious unknowability of the sacred truth, enhances the narrator’s authoritative rigour. This rigour is stressed again, when the listening ‘you’ appears in the text: ‘You cannot face it steadily, but this thing is sure, / That time is no healer.’ (11.7–8) Only through a dialogic intercourse with the supposed listener can the narrator attain positive self-assertiveness. It is not too much to say that the
narrator is aware of the object of desire only when he explains it to the listening ‘you’ through didactic discourse. The positivity in the act of desiring can be realized only in his relation with the listener.

Just as the listener owes his object of desire to the narrator’s model, so does the narrator owe the recognition of his own object to the passive quiet listener. While in the listener both the passivity of acceptance and the positivity of desiring are mingled, they are also mingled in the speaker. What is common in their passivity is that, although they are positive and self-assertive in desiring the object, both need to be given, by the other, the image of their own objects. Both of them are fundamentally dependent on the interchange with each other in discovering the object of desire. Fundamental passivity is closely linked with the act of desire, though desire is usually supposed to be completely self-centred and solipsistic.

VII) The Master’s Master

In the ‘encounter’ scene of ‘Little Gidding,’ the dialogue is not between the narrator and the listener. It is the narrator himself that is spoken to. He begs the ‘dead master [w]hom [he] had known, forgotten, half recalled’ (II. 39-40) to speak: ‘I said: “the wonder that I feel is easy, / Yet ease is cause of wonder. Therefore speak: / I may not comprehend, may not remember.”’ (II. 55-57) It is suggested that there must be drawn a clear distinctive line between the speaker, who offers the model of the object of desire, and the listener, who receives the model. For, only when the object is guaranteed by a superior authority, whose authority, in turn, is guaranteed only by the distinction made between him and the inferior listener, can the listener receive the object as something valid. The elaborate way the celestial ‘dead master’ is produced out of the desolate dimness is remarkable. The dark cavernous impasse of the narrator’s consciousness is turned into a mysterious spring from which authoritative voices come out: ‘I caught the sudden look of some dead master/Whom I had known, forgotten, half recalled/Both one and many’; (II. 39-41). At first the ‘master’ declines to offer the sacred object, saying, ‘Last season’s fruit is eaten/And the fullfed beast shall kick the empty pail.’ (II. 63-64) The reason he gives is that ‘last year’s words belong to last year’s language/And next year’s words await another voice.’ (II. 65-66) Though humble and feeble compared with the narrator’s
didactic discourse in other parts, the declining of the 'master' undoubtly presumes his superiority as a 'master.' He secures the dignity of his voices in quite an opposite way to that of the narrator. Instead of imposing instructions from above like the narrator, he waits until he is asked to speak. However, once he starts to argue he gradually obtains self-assertive didacticism which he has concealed: '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.' (11. 70–72) This is, together with his pretentious declination at the beginning, a deliberate self-justification combined with self-dramatization, which marks a step towards the authoritative disclosure of his object of desire: 'Let me disclose the gifts reserved for age/To set a crown upon your lifetime's effort.' (11. 76–77) Desolate images of the secular world which the listener inhabits—whose part is taken, here, by the narrator—follow this passage. The order to 'descend' in 'Burnt Norton' might be remembered here. The stresses on both gaps, that between the listener and the speaker, and that between the listener and the sacred world, make both the distinctions clear. At the end, the 'master' hints at the sacred truth the speaker has lost: 'that refining fire/Where you must move in measure, like a dancer.' (11. 92–93) The gradually enhanced didacticism of the 'master' reaches its peak in the command, 'you must.'

The narrative strategy of the 'dead master' is, as we have seen, slightly different from that of the narrator. However, after the long, round-about advance of his discourse, quite a similar effect is made. The basic pattern of acceptance is retained. It is by the didactic intercourse with the 'master' that the narrator is reminded of 'the refining fire,' while the master is also reminded of his own words, words on 'the refining fire,' only when he is asked to take on the role of the master. Both thus receive the model of desire from the other. In this section the narrator escapes from the suffocation of solipsism, not by speaking to the obedient listener, but by being spoken to by another authoritative speaker, the 'master.' The combination, in the lyrical emotion, of passive acceptance and positive desiring cannot be missed.

In this article attempts have been made to describe the lyricism of Four Quartets. We saw how the didactic voices of the narrator serve to lay foundation for the idea that desire is something given and ac-
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cepted. Such a model of the structure of desire may be reminiscent of the triangular model of Girard. Receiving great influence from Freudian theory, he explains through the model how one's desire is formed in accordance with the desire of one's rival. Indeed, my view on the structure of desire owes a lot to Freudian methods, which analyze human motives by objectifying desire as something substantial and tangible.

However, if we are too much absorbed in such a clear-cut paradigm and indulge in the manipulation of the abstract concepts, we may deviate from our main purpose, as is often the case with Freudian critics. The model of the structure of desire is employed only to explain the peculiar lyricism of Four Quartets. Unlike Freudian theory, which is engaged in the enterprise to depict the ambiguous through a definite concept, the purpose of this article was to stick to an ambiguous, emotive element even when it is employing abstract concepts for reasoning. It is not necessary to make a clear interpretation of the complex movement of words in Four Quartets. The verbal drama must be grasped as it is; we should not destroy it by extracting—or believing ourselves to be extracting—its meaning. For there is no such a thing as abstract meaning in poetry.

---