

**UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES**

**OBSESSION WITH LANGUAGE AND ACT OF COMMUNICATION
IN WILLIAM SYDNEY GRAHAM'S POETRY**

BA thesis

ANNEMARI ÕUNPUU

SUPERVISOR: Ene-Reet Soovik

TARTU

2024

ABSTRACT

The present thesis is aimed at analysing representation of language as facilitator and obstructor of communication in selected works of the Scottish poet W.S. Graham (1918-1986). Graham`s work has been mostly associated with Dylan Thomas and neo-romantics, and although praised by T.S. Eliot it remained largely unrecognised during his lifetime. It is only within the recent decade and with the support of Nobel-winning British dramatist Harold Pinter that his work has become more recognised.

The thesis consists of an introduction, a literature review, an empirical part, and a conclusion. The literature review gives an overview of the main themes and related critical perspectives in W.S. Graham`s works as discussed by scholars. The literature review provides a basis for the following empirical part. The empirical part of the thesis deals with creating the space for the communication act and language as mediator in three poems by W. S. Graham through close reading. The poems selected for the analysis are „The Constructed Space” (1958), “The Beast in the Space” (1970), and “What is the Language Using Us For?” (1974). The poems have been selected based on their representation of the development of Graham`s ideas on language throughout the years. The conclusion summarizes the main findings of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
INTRODUCTION	5
1. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
1.1. Previous Research on W.S. Graham	8
1.2. Influence of the Heideggerian Concepts of Language and Post-War Modernist Art on Graham`s Poetry	12
2. ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE FOR COMMUNICATION ACT AND LANGUAGE AS A MEDIATOR IN THREE POEMS BY W.S.GRAHAM	22
2.2. Construction of Space for Communication Act.....	22
2.2. Language as Mediator.....	27
CONCLUSION	32
REFERENCES	35
RESÜMEE	37

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NOPOR W. S. Graham, "Notes on a Poetry of Release" (Poetry Scotland, 1946) in *The Nightfisherman. Selected Letters of W. S. Graham* (1999), ed. by Michael Snow and Margaret Snow, Manchester: Carcanet Press

INTRODUCTION

William Sidney Graham (1918-1986) was a Scottish poet born in 1918 at Renfrewshire, Scotland. Following the path of his engineer father Graham took up apprenticeship as a draughtsman at an engineering firm and later studied engineering at Stow College in Glasgow. During his time at the college Graham also took up evening classes at Glasgow University to study art appreciation and literature. In 1938 Graham was awarded a bursary to Working Mens` College at Newbattle Abbey where he spent a year studying literature and philosophy. His studies in philosophy included a term devoted to the pre-Socratics to which Graham took a keen interest which shows up especially in his later poems (Lopez 1989: 1-2). Although Graham took paid employment for brief periods as a young man, also in Ireland and Scotland, for most of his life he worked only at his poetry and was dependent on the small fees and grants received for his writing and on the generosity of his friends (Francis 2004: ix).

First collections by Graham were published in the 1940s with small presses before T.S. Eliot took him on at Faber and Faber. Graham published altogether seven poetry books and collections with Faber as his main publisher. The first two collections published by Faber were *The White Threshold* (1949) and *The Nightfishing* (1955) (Pite, Jones 2004: 1). After publication of *The Nightfishing* there was a longer gap before next publications appeared in the 1970s, when Graham published *Malcolm Mooney`s Land* in 1970, *Implements in their Places* in 1977 and *Collected Poems, 1942–1977* in 1979. After Graham`s death in 1986 three collections were published - *Uncollected Poems* published in 1990 by the Greville Press, and two collections published by Faber and Faber, *Aimed at Nobody*, a selection of unpublished work from notebooks, in 1993, and *Selected Poems* in 1996 (Pite, Jones 2004: 1).

When W. S. Graham died in 1986, he was a poet whose work, although admired by other writers (Harold Pinter has said his work is "an inspiration"), and intriguing to the academy due to his Modernist-Beckettian fascination with silence, was not at all a strong presence for general readers (Motion 2004: para. 2). It has been stated that the reasons for Graham's relative neglect, both during his own lifetime and today, lie partly in the poems themselves, partly in the circumstances of their publication, and partly in Graham's character being difficult (Drexel 2007: para. 6). Even after the publication of his *Collected Poems, 1942–1977* in 1979, Graham did not gain wide recognition as a poet, which has been explained by the reason that Graham's work turned inwards in ways that are similar to British and American poetry in the Pound and Eliot tradition, but at the time did not coincide with the literary fashion, and more specifically, the Movement with its emphasis on the traditional poetics as opposed to the innovations of the modernist poetry (Lopez 1989: 9-10). Graham's early writing contradicted all the characteristics of the Movement as his poetry was not down-to earth and prosaic, but, on the contrary, his poems from the 1940s are hard to make out at first reading (Sansom 2004: 11; Lopez 2004: 35). The fact that Graham's collection *The Nightfishing* was published at the same year as Larkin's *The Less Deceived*, did not contribute to Graham's success as a poet (Pite, Jones 2004: 2).

Although Graham wrote about Scotland and often used Scottish dialect words, his residence in Cornwall where he moved in 1944 and spent most of his working life, and the fact that his work seems to have no root in the Scottish soil, has prevented him from being considered as a major Scottish poet (Sansom 2004:12; Lopez 1989: 10-11). This explains the relative neglect of his works in the Scottish poetry scene.

Graham has been called an anomaly who, although praised during his lifetime by T.S. Eliot, remained largely unnoticed by mainstream critics (Sansom 2004: 11). This also explains why Graham's works have not been widely studied. The first studies on Graham's

works were published in the 1980s by Damian Grant (1980), James Dickey (1981), Vivienne Koch (1984, 1988), and Tony Lopez (1989). In 2004 a study by Matthew Francis and a collection of articles edited by Ralph Pite and Hester Jones were published. More extensive archival research was undertaken by David Nowell Smith from 2016 to 2020, uncovering notebooks, drafts, and letters that had never previously received scholarly attention, resulting in the publication of the first substantial study on Graham`s poetry since the 1980s, *The Poem as Art Object* (Nowell Smith 2022).

Graham seemed to aim to produce poetry that would reflect the struggles of communicating through poetic means. As Graham admitted in his note to the Poetry Book Society bulletin in 1970: “I am always aware that my poem is not a telephone call. The poet only speaks one way. He hears nothing back” (Drexel 2007: para. 24). Graham`s preoccupation with the act of communication and language is most apparent in his later poems, where the words `language`, `words` and `voices` recur. It was one of Graham`s preoccupations that through imagination and, especially, through language, people may come into contact with the deep past. At the same time Graham was wary of the process where the writer might “inherit” the past through language which predetermines perception as much as expression (Pite, Jones 2004: 6). For Graham, language was never neutral but had a will of its own which could be either hostile or kind to the speaker (Francis 2004: 1).

The aim of this paper is to study how the act of communication and language as the mediator are discussed in scholarly works published on Graham`s poetry and represented in some selected works of Graham. Three poems have been selected for the latter purpose, “The Constructed Space (1958)”, “The Beast in the Space” (1970), and “What is the Language Using Us For?” (1974). The poems have been selected based on how they represent the development of Graham`s ideas on language and act of communication, starting with one of

his earlier poems on language from 1958 and ending with one of his later poems on language from 1974.

The literature review provides a brief overview of previous research on W.S. Graham`s poetry to summarize interpretations of his works with regard to representation of means of communication and difficulties of communication through poetry with specific focus on how Graham`s representations are related to Heideggerian concepts of language and post-war Modernist art. The empirical part provides a close reading of the poems by identifying how Graham creates the space for the communication act and how language as a mediator of communication is represented in the selected poems.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. Previous Research on W.S. Graham

The aim of the following literature review is to point out the key themes of language as facilitator of communication in Graham`s poetry as discussed in scholarly literature. As noted in the introduction, research on Graham`s works is relatively scarce and originates first from the 1980s, and most recently from the years 2004 and 2018 to 2022, marking a newly revived interest in Graham`s poetry. The main body of critical research on Graham`s poetry consists of articles by John Drexel, studies by Matthew Francis, Tony Lopez, Adam Piette, Hester Jones, and David Nowell Smith.

Graham himself was uncomfortable with poetic labels and schools. In his work, one can feel the sense of self-doubt –was he a neoromantic, a surrealist, or a high modernist (Drexel 2007: para. 6). Pite and Jones (2004:3) have stated in their critical study published in 2004 that it is difficult to label Graham as his writing is eclectic, having some roots in Modernism, some in the Apocalyptic school and others in the tradition of Scottish poetry. Graham draws on Burns, Eliot, Beckett and Joyce, but also Browning, Malory, Tennyson and even Plath (Pite, Jones 2004: 3). The theme that is most prevalent in scholarly work on

Graham is his obsession with language – the use of words as poet`s material. Much of Graham`s writings, from every period and in every style, betrays Graham`s obsessional interest in trying to define the communicative act and art of poetry itself (Pite, Jones 2004: 4-5). As Nowell Smith notes (2023: para. 1), Graham sought to present in his works a broader reflection on language as a medium for art-making, borrowing from plastic and visual arts of the 20th century. Articles written on Graham`s works deal with his pronounced sense of how difficult maintaining contact between people can be. So Sansom (2004: 19) draws attention to Graham`s central and urgent desire that his reader should be made to “listen”. Robinson (2004:111, 115) sees Graham as peculiarly alert to the writer`s dependence upon language – language which may obstruct as much as facilitate the communication that the writer seeks. To Robinson (2004: 111), three related areas of dependence can be seen in Graham`s work: dependence upon words; dependence upon an interlocutor; and dependence upon a reader. However, in Graham`s poetry the direction of dependence may equally be reversed; language is dependent upon its users; listeners are dependent upon what they are hearing; readers are dependent upon the poet. Dependence is strong in Graham`s poetry as it does not rely on knowing or assuming the effect upon which it depends and as the dependence can be reversed there is no subjection or subordination relationship but reliance upon each other in an uncertain environment (Robinson 2004: 111).

Two major influences have been pointed out in academic writings on Graham which are seen as having affected Graham`s views on language as a mediator, namely, pre-Socratic and Heideggerian philosophy on language (as highlighted e.g. by Piette 2004: 46, 47-49, 51, 56, 60n, 62n; and Lopez 1989: 93, 101, 105-7, 108, 109, 126, 129) and Modernist art (a connection referred to by e.g. Pite, Jones 2004: 66-67, 77; and Francis 2004: 54-56). The first academic study on Graham`s work, *The Poetry of W.S. Graham* (1989), by Tony Lopez, offers discussions of Graham`s poetry with the focus on the poetic relationship between

Graham and T.S. Eliot, between Graham`s poetry and the art world of St Ives in Cornwall, and the influence of Heideggerian philosophy on Graham`s work. It is the latter discussions which are of interest for the present thesis. According to Lopez Graham takes up and develops certain ideas embodied in Heidegger`s *Being and Time*, especially the idea of language as inhabited space and what we mean by being-in-the-world, of how we know the world, and how our being is revealed to us (Lopez 1989: 105). According to Lopez (Lopez 1989: 101), by using the material which is most private and personal in his life and assembling it in a way to prove the formula which Heidegger developed in his writings on Holderin, Graham is proving Heidegger`s claim that poetically a man dwells on this earth.

Starting from 1990s, Graham seems to have found his way into general surveys of British (or Scottish) poetry of the 20th century which although briefly, but still mark the philosophical nature of Graham`s poetry with the emphasis on the nature of language. The *English Poetry since 1940s* (1993) by Neil Corcoran in the Longman Literature in English Series also includes Graham along with Dylan Thomas and George Barker in the chapter on New Romanticism. Although Graham`s earlier work is called “parasitic on Dylan Thomas”, his later work is already marked by Corcoran as a “more philosophically interesting kind of Modernism” pursuing a self-reflexive dialogue which is preoccupied with language (Corcoran 1993: 49). *The Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth-Century Scottish Literature* (2009) and *The Cambridge Companion to British Poetry 1945-2010* (2016) both include Graham`s poetry as part of 20th century Scottish Poetry. The former includes an article by John Corbett with the focus on linguistic concerns represented in the works of two poets, Graham and Hugh MacDiarmid (Corbett 2016: 112-122). Corbett concludes that, while MacDiarmid can be seen to express the view that the substance of language is a guarantee of its meaning, Graham struggles with the contrary notions that there is no guarantee that he will find the right words to convey his ideas, and even if he is satisfied by his own wordings,

he still cannot be sure that they will have communicated his thoughts effectively (Corbett 2009: 121). *The Cambridge Companion to British Poetry 1945-2010* includes an article by Alan Riach on Scottish poetry in the years 1945-2010 (Riach 2016: 148-161) which gives Graham limited attention and emphasizes two aspects of his life and work – that Graham spent most of his life in Cornwall and that his poems are “explorations of loneliness and searching, and appraisals of the use and uselessness of language” (Riach 2016: 152).

In 1999 a collection of Graham`s personal letters to his friends, family and publishers titled *The Nightfishing: Selected Letters of W. S. Graham* was published by Michael and Margaret Snow. The collection includes Graham`s letters from 1938 to 1986, divided into chapters to coincide with the completion of major poems or collections, which offer a better understanding of Graham`s ideas on poetry. Most notably the collection also includes the only critical essay Graham ever wrote on poetry, titled “Notes on a Poetry of Release” (1946) in which Graham deals with language as relation and words as material which allow to create spaces of communication within poetry (Graham 1946: 379-380).

Matthew Francis` monograph on W.S. Graham titled *Where The People Are*, published in 2004, does not directly focus on Heidegger`s influence on Graham, but does explore the metaphorical equation of language and community in Graham`s works and Graham`s ideas that language is a collective entity that rebukes the individual will and that it has inherited the communal `commotion`, a state of continual change which accounts for the elusiveness of meaning (Francis 2004: 51). In the same year a collection of articles on Graham`s poetry, *W.S. Graham: Speaking Towards You* (2004), was published, edited by Ralph Piette and Hester Jones. It is the article by Adam Piette (*Roaring between the lines` : W.S.Graham and the White Threshold of Line-Breaks*, Piette 2004: 44-62) in the latter collection that specifically deals with common ground between Graham`s later poems and

late Heidegger. In Piette`s opinion, Graham had intuitively anticipated Heidegger`s later writings on language (Piette 2004: 47).

In 2022 the most comprehensive study on Graham to date *The Poem as Art Object*, was published by David Nowell Smith. Among other themes, Nowell Smith explores how verbal artwork is bound up in reference and communication at the level of its materials and how Graham`s poetry moved from treating words primarily as `material` towards understanding words as furnishing an `environment` and at the same time a mode of inhabiting our environments (Nowell Smith 2022: 82-83).

The thesis will next concentrate in more detail on the two influences highlighted in the above-mentioned articles and studies – the Heideggerian philosophy on language and Modernist art.

1.2. Influence of the Heideggerian Concepts of Language and Post-War Modernist Art on Graham`s Poetry

1.2.1. Heideggerian Concepts of Language

It cannot be said that Graham had any specific philosophical theorists in mind when developing his own understanding of language as a mediator (Piette 2004: 46). Graham had studied philosophy at Newbattle Abbey College concentrating on the pre-Socratics. This, in itself, is an indication that Graham was in a Heideggerian territory, since Heidegger advocated the pre-Socratics as the forgotten source of true being (Lopez 1989: 109-10). Lopez (1989: 109-10) marks that Graham`s belief in the mystique of language is Heideggerian, particularly in the emphasis on the phenomenological situating of the poetic voice in an abstract printed territory which lies somewhere between the abstract spirit of the language and the ordinary language of the people. Graham was obsessed with language and how it can be used as a facilitator of communication between the speaker and the reader. In NOPOR, the critical essay Graham wrote on poetry, Graham marks that words are both his

material and immediate environment, making the poet halfway the victim and halfway a successful traveller. Further, Graham states:

The most difficult thing for me to remember is that a poem is made of words and not the expanding heart, the overflowing soul, or the sensitive observer. (/.../) All the poet's knowledge and experience is contained in the language which is obstacle and vehicle at the same time. The shape of us is in this language. (/.../) Each word is touched and filled with the activity of every speaker. Each word changes every time it is brought to life (/.../) (Graham 1946: 379-380).

The poem itself is dumb but has the power of release. Its purpose is that it can be used by the reader to find out something about himself (/.../) he must face that words are ambiguous but realise that this has to do with the fundamental force of poetry and is to be used to a positive end (/.../). The poem is the replying chord to the reader. It is the reader's involuntary reply. (/.../) A poem is a mountain made out of the containing, almost physical language, and with the power to release a man into his own completely responsible world larger than that outward solid geography (Graham 1946: 381-382).

Graham's poetry is anticipatory especially of Heidegger's post-war years writings [Heidegger's lectures "The Nature of Language" and "The Way to Language" published in 1959 in the collection *Unterwegs zur Sprache*] in which Heidegger turned to language as phenomenological environment (Piette 2004:48). To understand how Graham's poetry reflects Heideggerian concepts of language and spatiality, a short overview on most fundamental aspects of Heidegger's views on language is necessary. First, the idea that language is an environment. Secondly, the space and distance relation in the poetic language.

According to Heidegger, "the ability to speak is what marks man as man, we are within language and with language before all else" (Heidegger 1971: 112). Heidegger's rethinking of language extends from linguistic analysis to a fundamental rethinking of the human experience in the world, to how we perceive and experience ourselves in the world (Meservy 2014: 8). Heidegger is delving into the question of what makes language possible, i.e., what is the human being's relationship to language at its most fundamental level (Meservy 2014: 35). There is an intimate connexion between the interdependence of words and speech on the one hand and the reality and its source on the other. The words that designate beings are not arbitrary signs that are imposed on the real world, but inseparable from the being itself (Bennett-Hunter 2007: 8). According to Heidegger (1971:57), if a man finds the proper abode of his existence in language, the experience that we undergo with

language must touch the nexus of our existence. Language must reveal itself to us (Heidegger 1971: 72). The poetic experience with the word points to something thought-provoking with which thinking has been charged from the beginning though in a veiled manner as it shows to us both what there is and is not (Heidegger 1971: 87). For Heidegger, language calls beings into presence from out of an originary openness to beings; language depends on this openness as one can speak of beings only if those beings have already in a certain sense revealed themselves (Meservy 2014: p 38). The poet must bring the manifestation of beings to language and maintain it in language through their speech (Bennet-Hunter 2007: 8).

Heidegger was concerned to show how language speaks itself, how writing or speaking in a poem might better be constructed as an act of listening to what language has to say (Piette 2004: 48). The simultaneousness of speaking and listening has a larger meaning as speaking is of itself a listening. Speaking is listening to the language which we speak. Thus, it is a listening not while but before we are speaking (Heidegger 1971: 123). Heidegger therefore suggests that speaking is in essence `in advance` also a hearing because we are only able to speak due to the reason that we have previously already listened to the language (Bennett-Hunter 2007: 7). It is in our speaking, which is at the same time a listening to language, we say again the saying we have heard (Heidegger 1971: 124).

The only source in which Graham deals with poetry on theoretical level is his essay NOPOR. In Piette`s (2004:48) opinion, Graham`s NOPOR rhymes astonishingly with Heidegger`s views on poetics, as there is the same emphasis on language as environment. Graham states in NOPOR that: “With words my material and immediate environment/ I am at once halfway the victim and halfway the successful traveller (/.../) There is the voluntary war between me and that environment flowing in on me from all sides and there is the poetic outcome.” (Graham 1946: 379). According to Lopez (2004:27) the sense of a poem as a construction made of words rather than a piece of self-expression is clear in Graham`s

writing. This view is supported by research on Graham`s working method which included drawing lists of interesting and striking words typed out in advance of his drafting of a poem which he composed by inventing material to join the listed words together (Lopez 2004: 27).

Piette (2004:48) sees Graham`s views on language and poetry as very close to Heidegger`s complex representation of the double nature of language in terms of a voyage along language`s own road, language as at once a forcefield of words that speak through us as we listen to ourselves speak, and a human arena of expression which reveals itself as our own. The material, i.e. the words, does not exist in a vacuum but in the environment. By treating words both as `material` and `environment` means that Graham is focusing on properties of individual words and the social life of the language (Nowell Smith 2022: 82). The verbal medium is always already bound up in reference, and communication, at the level of its materials (Nowell Smith 2022: 83). As Graham notes in NOPOR: “Each word is touched by and filled with the activity of every speaker. Each word changes every time it is brought to life” (Graham 1946: 380). In Graham`s later work he focuses on how people `inherit` the past through language (Pite, Jones 2004: 6). As Graham put it in the poem “Implements in their Places”, language is `a terrible surround of everything`, predetermining perception as much as expression (Pite, Jones 2004: 6). As Graham states in NOPOR: “All the poet`s knowledge and experience is contained in the language which is obstacle and vehicle at the same time. The shape of all of us is in the language” (Graham 1946: 380). In “Malcolm Mooney`s Land”, language is described as an `obstacle`, while “What Is the Language Using us For?” and “Language Ah Now You Have Me”, lament the opportunities it presents for mistakes of communication (Francis 2004:1). Language for Graham has a will of its own (Francis 2004: 1).

The space and distance relation in poetic language that Graham speaks about in his NOPOR and as reflected in his poems is reminiscent of Heidegger`s treatment of `nearness`

and a space which Heidegger refers to as `neighbourhood` (which Heidegger deals with in his 1959 lectures “The Nature of Language” and “The Way to Language”) (Heidegger 1971: 92-93, 102-105). The voices we hear within the empty lines of poetry, in Heidegger`s view, should not be so easily identified with the human voice of the historical person but rather be treated as amalgam of the spirit of language, and the (absent) presence of the poet as printed voice (Piette 2004: 48). The encounter between the speaker and the addressee happens within the space created by the poem, where the speaker and the addressee are near each other in a neighbourhood. In Heidegger`s view (1971:103) this neighbouring nearness by its nature, is outside and independent of space and time (Heidegger 1971: 103). To Heidegger, space should be understood as something that “throws open locality and places, vacates them and at the same time gives them free all things and receives what is simultaneous space-time” (Heidegger 1971: 106). Space itself rests in stillness and the encounter happening within this space is excluded from the parametric concept of time (Heidegger 1971: 104). The encounter which takes place within poetic language can create nearness in a space, in a `neighbourhood`, which is not dependent on classical spatial-time relation of nearness. However, for the nearness to exist there still has to be encounter between the speakers (Heidegger 1971: 103). Speaking must have speakers who are present in the way of speaking together with whom they speak, i.e. in whose neighbourhood they dwell (Heidegger 1971: 120). Neighbourhood, then, is a relation resulting from the fact that one is face-to-face with the other (Heidegger 1971: 82). To the calculating mind, space and time are parameters for the measurement of nearness and remoteness, and these in turn are static calculated distances (Heidegger: 1971: 102, 105). If one would take these calculated distances as the basis for nearness to which a neighbourhood belongs, then the nearness can never be experienced. As Heidegger (1971: 103) puts it, “if nearness and neighbourliness could be conceived

parametrically, the distance of one millimetre would mean the nearest possible neighbouring nearness, compared with distance of a yard representing extreme remoteness”.

The only physical world the writer and the reader have in common is the page itself, which is an impersonal, timeless space. In such a space, communication between the writer and the reader can never really take place because the text is indeterminate as the writer and reader see neither each other nor the same objects (Francis 2004: 24). As the poem is made of `words` then the making of the poem also entails what lies `between` the words, and its exactly in this `between` that Graham sees the possibilities for communication (Nowell Smith 2022: 84). The poem as a `space` for Graham (1946: 381) is “itself dumb but has the power of release (/.../) it can be used by the reader to find out something about himself (/.../). The poem is the replying chord to the reader. It is the reader`s involuntary reply”. When Heidegger is referring to space “throwing open locality and places”, Graham speaks about the same kind of releasing power of poetic language by referring to the `releasing power` of the poem as a space.

Graham states in NOPOR: “A poem is a mountain made out of the containing, almost physical language, and with the power to release a man into his own completely responsible world larger than that outward solid geography” (Graham 1946: 382). Within language, there is a space that has to be crossed and an inner space. There are times when the difference between the two is elided and language is seen as distance and interiority simultaneously (Francis 2004: 11). The title of one of Graham`s poems “The Constructed Space” implies both the interiority of a `constructed` receptacle and a separating distance, and indeed, the poem tells us that it stretches between writer and reader, and that `lonely meanings` are read `in` it (Francis 2004: 11).

The imagery of Graham`s poems, i.e. the space created where the encounter between the poetic voice and the reader could take place, is rather abstract and unvisual – characteristics that can be at least partly attributed to the influence post-war Modernist art had on Graham`s poetic style.

1.2.2. Influence of Post-War Modernist Art on Graham`s Poetry

In addition to being influenced by philosophical (Heideggerian) concepts of language, another great influence on Graham`s work seems to have been post-war Modernist art of the period. As noted by Nowell Smith (2018: para. 1), major advances in modernist poetics have long occurred through contact with experiments in the visual and plastic arts. Often this engagement results in poets adapting compositional practices and techniques of their artist peers, leading to renewed focus on the medium-specificity of poetry – both the peculiar possibilities of language as material and resource for art-making (Nowell Smith 2018: para. 1).

Graham was a poet among painters already in Scotland. In his early 20s, Graham was a central figure in a vibrant community of artists congregated around Sandyford Place in Glasgow (Nowell Smith 2018: para. 20-21). Graham closely associated with the Ayrshire painters, printmakers and expressionists such as Robert Colquhoun (Carruthers 2019: 41). In 1944, Graham moved to Cornwall and in 1956 located to St Ives area (Corbett 2009: 113; Pite 2004: 65). His friends among the St Ives painters included those who became Britain`s most influential abstract painters (Lopez 1989:127). Abstraction had been connected with St Ives artists since before the war, in the work of Ben Nicholson and Barbara Hepworth. However, the new abstraction, which developed after the war and came to prominence after 1956, tended to move away from the mathematical precision and cool formalism generally characteristic of pre-war abstract art (Pite 2004: 66). In Pite`s (2004:67) view, it may be that the presence of so many St Ives painters among his friends kept Graham focused on

characteristically modernist forms and hence on modernist precursors, making Graham into a late modernist by contrast to his contemporaries – the Movement, the Group, Expressionists such as Ted Hughes – who were rejecting or departing from modernist positions. Critics, notably Neil Corcoran and Tony Lopez, have suggested that Graham's work after his move to Cornwall echoes the interests of modernist painting in St Ives (Corcoran 1993: 49-50, Lopez 1989: 8-9). Lopez notes that Graham's continual interest in writing a voyage poem which explores the nature of the self through the experience of language, takes up what he finds in the subjects and methods of the younger abstract or near abstract painters of St Ives (Lopez 1989: 9). Corcoran notes how the art and the poetry both draw attention to their medium, making language or paint the focus and the problem of the work (Corcoran 1993:50). As Corcoran observes, the way abstract painters moved away from figuration towards self-reflexively “painterly” values, towards a primary concentration on the material itself and the material's behaviour, undoubtedly influenced Graham's own linguistic experiments (Corcoran 1993:50). Graham shares with the painters a concern with work in which the abstract and the figurative meet – that is, in which the medium (paint or language) encounters something other than itself: a landscape or the selfhood of the artist or the effects which things produced (Pite 2004: 67). Graham himself wrote to St Ives artist Roger Hilton, in 1956:

“The strange thing is this, Roger, I found when I returned here that your pictures and `timbre of voice` of your painting has affected me more strongly than I had realised. In the same way that one sees influences of contemporary abstract painting in Landscape/.../that particular kind of graphic disturbance which is your `voice` in painting suggested itself more and more in things. (Graham to Roger Hilton, December 13, 1956, in Snow, Snow 1999: 154)

If poetry's aspiration is to “disturb” the language through its making, painting disturbs light itself: its medium would be not just the plastic support, but the visual field as a whole (Nowell Smith 2018: para. 12). Like the later work of Wallace Stevens, Graham's poetry makes an abstract space in which readers may meet him (Lopez 1989:127).

Graham spent most of his later life in Cornwall, among a community of artists who, although they had begun as figurative painters, gradually moved towards abstraction. When abstraction is displaced from painting to poetry, it abstracts away from the visual as such, adopting, and adapting, post-cubist treatments of perspective onto poetry's own verbal-plastic medium (Nowell Smith 2018: para. 23).

Abstract works of art were defined by Herbert Read in 1948 as those which, though they may start from the artist's awareness of an object in the external world, proceed to make a self-consistent and independent aesthetic unity in no sense relying on an objective equivalence (Pite 2004: 71). Graham seems to think of the process as going in the opposite direction: starting with bareness, prosaicness, the unvisual, with the abstract pattern of verse, Graham establishes communication between one human world and another (Pite 2004: 71). This process is evidenced by Graham's own description of his 1955 poem "The Constructed Space": "Don't be frightened at the bareness and prosaicness of this section. It is meant to be as 'abstract' as I can make it, unvisual in its images and suggesting no place or atmosphere." (Graham to Alan Clodd, February 9, 1955, in Snow, Snow 1999: 143). "The Constructed Space" concludes by affirming that the self becomes present to the other via the establishment of something purely abstract – a pattern, a space, a silence (Pite 2004: 71). In his later work, Graham moves to abstraction where his expression is relatively simple but where that simplicity draws the reader into paradox (Lopez 1989: 127).

Nowell Smith (2018: para. 33) is of the opinion that where Graham's painter contemporaries were turning to abstraction in order to disturb what light was expected to do, Graham's poetic abstraction was part of a thematization of the sites and problematics of communication. According to Nowell Smith (2018: para. 33) it is possible to distinguish two kinds of analogy with painting: firstly, where painting turns to abstraction to explore the modalities of vision, Graham's abstraction concerns the modalities of communication;

secondly, Graham adopts from painting an attentiveness to the plasticity of his own verbal medium. This implies a fissuring, in painting, of the visual from the plastic – that Graham adopts plasticity at the expense of the visual (Nowell Smith 2018: para 33). By making his readers follow him on the voyage into `language`, Graham takes us into a territory similar to that in which the abstract painters work (Lopez 1989: 127). In creating the abstract space in which to meet his readers, a great deal is left out and left unsaid in Graham`s middle and later work (Lopez 1989: 127). Lopez (1989:127) is of the view that Graham was deliberately seeking parallels in literature for what was happening in painting. Some of Graham`s poems, like “The Constructed Space”, are direct treatments of language as an abstract matter with the print on the page [a surface-like matter like the paint for the painter] both joining and separating the writer and the reader - an abstract space in which his reader may meet him (Lopez 1989: 127). Throughout Graham`s work, the idea of the poem as `letter` recurs, which intensifies the view (lying at the heart of Graham`s aesthetic) of a poem as a private communication in a public arena (Corcoran 1993: 50).

Nowell Smith (2018: para. 30) states that the poet`s vocation is to create a space for, space of, communication and what is `constructed` then is the space in which we communicate - an `abstract scene` opened up by an `abstract act`. It is within this `abstract scene` that it becomes possible to read meaning into words put there by another. Francis (2004: 54) has noted that there is no doubt that Graham saw himself experimenting with words in the same way as modernist painters experimented with paint. As much as Graham`s `construction` of a poem is borrowing from the manual labourer it is also borrowing from the post-Cubist painter (Nowell Smith 2022: 83). When painterly abstraction shifts away from individual visible figures to focus on the field of the visual itself, Graham`s poetic abstraction abstracts away from individual acts of meaning-making towards the emergence of the field in which meaning-making takes place (Nowell Smith 2022: 103). What is

striking, in Nowell Smith's opinion (2022:109), is that Graham would suggest that a poem entitled "The Constructed Space" and which attempts to articulate this space with intricacy should "suggest (/.../) no particular place or atmosphere". In doing so, the poem absorbs Graham's attempts to think through the medium of poetry, and the conceptual vocabulary of contemporary pictorial arts: from the central image of constructing a space for communication through its depiction of this space as `abstract` (Nowell Smith 2022:109).

2. ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE FOR COMMUNICATION ACT AND LANGUAGE AS A MEDIATOR IN THREE POEMS BY W.S.GRAHAM

2.2. Construction of Space for Communication Act

Graham's poems "The Beast in the Space" and "The Constructed Space" resonate with Heidegger's ideas on `space`, `nearness` and `neighbourhood` and the post-war Modernist abstract painting in how Graham constructs the poetic terrain in which the speaker and the addressee are to meet.

The poem "The Constructed Space" refers directly to a `space` constructed for the two persons to meet face to face: a `space` inhabited by language which is meant to transfer meaning within the `space` constructed by the poet so that `something may move across/the caught habits of language`.

Meanwhile surely there must be something to say,

Maybe not suitable but at least happy

In a sense here between us two whoever

We are. Anyhow here we are and never

Before have we two faced each other who face

Each other now across this abstract scene

Stretching between us

(/---/)

I say this silence or, better, **construct this space**

So that somehow something may move across

The caught habits of language to you and me.

Graham is leaving the space abstract and untainted by any particulars of a specific geographical place. The process of abstraction, tacit in Graham's NOPOR becomes more explicit in "The Constructed Space", when the face-to-face encounter of the two interlocutors is grasped as `this abstract scene/stretching between us` and the poetic speech which facilitates this encounter is called an `abstract act`. Graham's notebook from the period suggests that the poem's initial title was "The Abstract Space" (Nowell Smith 2022: 101). According to Nowell Smith (2022: 111), although Graham's spaces are spaces of communication, they remain impersonal, to be overcome and populated by gestures and impulses of speech.

In a sense here between us two whoever
We are. Anyhow here we are and never
Before have we two faced each other who face
Each other now across this abstract scene
Stretching between us. This is a public place
Achieved against subjective odds

"The Constructed Space" absorbs both Graham's earlier attempts to think through the medium of poetry, and the conceptual vocabulary of contemporary pictorial arts: from its central image of constructing a space for communication through to its depiction of this space as abstract. This was something that was already sketched in Graham's 1949 workbook, where he elaborates a conception of `poetry` as a `space`. The poem becomes a space through "the creating of a stillness a/solitude a silence upon it forms itself" (Nowell Smith 2022: 109). The space thus created is traversed by `Impulse`, which leaves its signature` in this space as it crosses it – the impersonal `its` implying that the impulse both is and is not of the poet (Nowell Smith 2022: 109-110).

According to Piette (2004:47), for Graham, the page becomes a terrain shared by two time zones, the time of creation by the poet, and the time of reading, the strangeness being that the poet, by inscribing his voice upon the white space, enters into a space between, a

threshold liminal both to his own real surroundings and to the reader`s imagined environment. This transitional terrain is a space of language for Graham and is therefore constructed (Piette 2004: 47).

From where we are it is not us we see
And times are hastening yet, disguise is mortal.
The times continually disclose our home.
Here in the present tense disguise is mortal.
The trying times are hastening. Yet here I am
More truly now this abstract act become.

This is exactly the kind of poetic space that allows for nearness which transcends different time zones, that of the reader and the addressee, and brings them together in the poetic terrain or `neighbourhood` which Heidegger referred to. As noted before, Heidegger uses the term `neighbourhood` to mark a relation resulting from the fact that one settles face-to-face with the other. In case of a poem, we move within this neighbourhood as the poet`s poem speaks to us (Heidegger 1971: 82). As Heidegger explains, this neighbourhood remains invisible, similar to the actual neighbourhood that we live in, but if asked to define what that neighbourhood consists of, we would be in difficulties (Heidegger 1971: 83). Constructing a space for the reader and poet to meet, transcending the different time zones and physical places, is exactly what Graham is very bluntly admitting doing in this poem. He is stating it out right, “I/construct this space”. This `space` is meant for two persons who have never met before (“here we are and never/Before have we two faced each other who face/Each other now”) and who are not near each other in either space or in time but could meet “across this abstract scene”. Next, an explanation is given on why this `space` has been created: “So that somehow something may move across/The caught habits of language to you and me”, so that the language could speak, and the speaker and the addressee could listen. There is a

space that needs to be crossed and an inner space within language. Language acts as a pipeline or conduit between the two spaces (Francis 2004: 11).

In the poem “The Beast in the Space” the speaker tells us directly that he “is not there, only the space” of the poem”:

This curious necessary space
(/.../)
I am not here, only the space
I sent the terrible beast across.

Although the poem begins by creating the abstract `necessary` space in which to send the Language-Beast across to the reader, in the last stanza the persona allows himself to get more personal by indicating at least some details of the place he is speaking from by stating:

[..] The whole house
Is sleeping and I remember
I am not here, only the space
I sent the terrible beast across.

Similar `personal notes` which help to create the nearness between the persona and reader can be seen in Graham`s later poem “What is The Language Using Us For?“, that actually consists of several poems. Here the speaker begins with abstract spaces and gradually adds more details as the poem develops, but still not enough of the details to refer to any particular geographical place that would be identifiable. The poem begins by the persona saying:

I am in a telephoneless,
Green crevasse and I can`t get out.
I pay well for my messages
Being hoisted up when you are about.

A space is created where the persona is stuck and tries to send the messages up from the crevasse. The image of a white abstract space is further emphasized by the persona referring to:

Reading the words that steam out

Against the ice?

(/.../)

Slowly over the white language.

The space from which the persona tries to speak is also compared to a jail:

(/.../) He fell

He falls (Tenses are everywhere)

Deep down into a glass jail.

In the second poem of “What is the Language Using Us For?” the persona is referring not to a space anymore but to a `real place` for language in his life as the persona later admits that the abstract space of art and the poetic language has its limits:

What I am making is
A place for language in my life
Which I want to be a real place

The space created by art does not seem to provide possibilities of the desired communication act as the persona continues by saying: “I could not speak/Or answer him easily in the white/Crystal of Art he set me in”. Art is seen as crystallizing the moment in time from which the meaning making is difficult, and the persona admits that his efforts to communicate are like a person throwing himself in icy water without anyone to hear his cries: “I slid/Into the walrus-barking water/To find. I did not find another/At the end of my cold cry”. In `the white/Crystal of Art` it is impossible to speak/or answer. Such moments give substance to the reading of Graham`s poetry that is closest to holding critical consensus: that poetic language leaves Graham in a world of virtuality, cut off from all physical proximity, and so his work increasingly becomes an attempt to restore the lost contact (Nowell Smith 2022: 4).

To achieve the contact within the abstract space of the poem we can see Graham giving directions to the reader to achieve nearness that would beat the calculated space-time distance. In “What is the Language Using Us For?” the persona creates togetherness and nearness of the addressee and the persona by making it clear that both of them are on the

journey together to discover the nature of the relationship between language and those who use it. In the first poem, the persona tells the reader that the character Malcolm Mooney they are observing is actually “going to be/Myself and for you slightly you/Wanting to be another”. The persona also gives the reader direct instructions in the first poem by saying “Anyhow draw/This folded message up between/The leaning prisms from me below”; and in the third poem addresses the reader directly and offers explanations “Who is the King of Whales? What is/ He like? Well you may ask. He is/A kind of old uncle of mine/And yours mushing across the blind/Ice-cap between us in his furs”. Graham draws on family relations to create the nearness between the persona and the reader and, to use the words of Lopez (1989: 132), “tackle metaphysical problems from reduced social circumstances while at the same time holding on to the possibility of tenderness between individuals”.

In “The Beast in the Space”, the persona can be seen to direct not only the Language-Beats to “Shut up. Shut up”, but also the reader to achieve the kind of `listening` of language by the reader that both Graham and Heidegger had in mind. The persona instructs the reader to `Watch` the Language-Beast and warns the reader to watch out because the Beast `bites` the meaning. The reader is also instructed to `listen` to the Beast and “to give him food”, meaning to give food by the thinking and meaning making from the reader`s side. Similarly, to the beginning of the poem, the reader is instructed to `shut up`, to `listen`, and to listen with love, which could be understood as making oneself as open as one can to language of the poem so that the nearness can be achieved.

2.2. Language as Mediator

Graham often referred to language as a `creature` that elicited both his affection and contempt. This creature is a friend, a suffering fellow-being (Sansom 2004: 17). In Sansom`s view (2004:17), critics and commentators have tended to emphasize Graham`s belief in the poem as a constructed space, as an inanimate object, yet as Sansom (2004: 19) argues, there

is a strong sense throughout his work that the poem is not merely a device, or an instrument, or a tool, but a kind of imaginary being. Graham theorized about the world governed by language, in which language becomes the decisive metaphor through which we conceive of the self (Sansom 2004: 19).

The nature of language is observed in “The Beast in the Space” by characterizing language as a Beast. In doing this, Graham is again on Heideggerian territory as Heidegger (1971: 125) asks “Do we run the risk of elevating language into a fantastic, self-sustained Being which cannot be encountered anywhere?” Graham refers to language in “The Beast in the Space” as “the great creature” which “thumps its tail/On silence on the other side”. The persona will slap the Beast to make it cry out so that the reader “on the other side of the words” could hear it: “If you do not even hear that/I’ll give the beast a quick skelp/ And through Art you’ll hear it yelp”. The image of the Beast thumping its tail on silence on the readers side again reflects Heidegger’s treatment of the role of silence in the communication act and the way language speaks to us. Language, which speaks by saying, is concerned that our speaking is also listening to the unspoken which corresponds to what is said, and in this – silence, as the source of speaking, is itself already a corresponding (Heidegger 1971: 131). What is unspoken is not merely something that lacks voice, it is what remains unsaid and is not yet shown (Heidegger 1971: 122). When we cannot find the right word for something, we are in a situation where language speaks itself as language - we leave unspoken what we have in mind and undergo moments in which language itself has touched us with its essential being (Heidegger 1971: 59).

However, Graham’s poems do not accept the optimistic view that if communication is the passing of things across the space, then language as a conduit is passive and harmless and its role in communication is just not to get in the way (Francis 2004: 11). For Graham, language is an environment but it is not harmless environment, it is a wilderness; instead of

an accessible container it is sometimes a prison [e.g. referred to as a `glass jail` in the poem “What is the Language Using Us For?”]; instead of a passive receptacle, it is an active agent, a meaning-devouring monster (Francis 2004: 12) as in “The Beast in the Space”.

As Carruthers (2019:53) has noted, in “The Beast in the Space” the poet, the reader and the subject are all in doubt and everything is taken apart. The complexity of language as mediator and its unreliable nature is evidenced by comparing language to a beast who bites off meaning from both sides of communication: part of the meaning is bitten off by the creature already before words are put on paper, and part of the meaning is bitten off from the receiving end before the message crosses to the reader: “The beast that lives on silence takes/Its bite of either side./ It pads and sniffs between us. Now/It comes and laps my meaning up”. For Graham, language is not only an environment which is shaped and reshaped by its users. Language for Graham is a living organism that actively participates in this reshaping process. The persona is sending the Language-Beast across the space by saying “get away to whoever it is will have you”. Unlike the creature in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* who was treated with contempt when revealing himself, the persona is sympathetic to the flawed Language-Beast although being aware of the Beast’s shortcomings, when he says:

I sent the terrible beast across.
Watch. He bites. Listen gently
To any song he snorts or growls
And give him food. He means neither
Well or ill towards you. Above
All, shut up. Give him your love.

The reader is called to `shut up`. This could mean both that the reader is called to `listen` but also that the reader is called to calm the Beast down, to listen to it carefully with gentleness and love without any preconceived notions of the message the Beast carries.

The fact that Graham took words as being loaded and “tainted” with environment, as he noted in the NOPOR, “with words my material and immediate environment”, is evident also in “The Constructed Space” as the persona claims that he has created the space, the poem, hoping that “somehow something may move across/The caught habits of language to you and me”. The caught habits of language carry baggage that from both sides of the poem, the speaker and the addressee, is threatening to blur and destroy the intended meaning.

“The Constructed Space” reflects major themes from Graham’s NOPOR. In this essay Graham had described the process by which the poet’s intention is replaced with a new intention emerging from the language itself: the poet must show `courage` and `responsibility` to trace this intention and leave behind their own. This is evidenced in “The Constructed Space”.

Very often at the beginning till we are met
By some intention risen up out of nothing.
(/.../)
Or maybe, surely, of course we never know
What we have said, what lonely meanings are read
Into the space we make.

Both the essay and the poem emphasize that although there is the intention to send the message to the reader, it will never be known what meanings the reader will be able to decipher from the print page. The persona is expressing that he will not be able to predict with any certainty the meanings which the reader will have. From the words “maybe (/.../) we never know” the poet moves to “surely (/.../) we never know” to finally stating “of course we never know (/.../) what lonely meanings are read”. However, with the same doubtfulness on what the reader will make of the poem, the persona approaches his own ability to send the message as the same gradual insecurity of the persona’s handling of the language as a medium can be read to the lines “Or maybe, surely, of course we never know/What we have said”. Already the initial meaning by the persona might be, and probably is, unclear, and

being carried by different intent than that of the reader. Poetic language as a mediator is not a static, fixed, frozen-in-time telegram message. The `poetic letter` is open-ended and fluid, subject to intersubjective interpretations.

In “What Is the Language Using us For?”, language just seems to be something that is unfit to capture all human experiences and when it is unable to perform this function then it is also unfit to explain and transpose these experiences in any meaningful way to another person. The persona notes: “Certain experiences seem to not/Want to go in to language”. The poem consists of three parts titled `First poem`, `Second poem`, and `Third poem`, with the second part consisting of two separate sections and the third part consisting of three separate sections. The poem is not only titled “What Is the Language Using Us For?” but throughout its sections the same question is repeatedly asked with each section starting with the question “What is the language using us for?”.

The poem starts with the question being asked by the character Malcolm Mooney who is sent by the poet on a voyage with the question not about what we are using language for but “What is the language using us for?”. This reverses the power relation of the user of language and the language itself. We are not in control of the language, but the language is controlling us. Malcolm Mooney goes on the voyage to try and find an answer to this question without even knowing to which unknown terrain he is going: “moving away/Slowly over the white language / Where am I going said Malcolm Mooney”. The poet sends Malcolm “through suburbs and drive/ Out further just for fun to see/ What he will do”. As the poem reveals, Malcolm is actually both, the poet and the reader at the same time, who are both on this journey to discover what the language will do with them and where it will take them: “Reader, it does/ Not matter/He is only going to be/ Myself and for you slightly you/ Wanting to be another”. For each of us the terms to capture our inner states differ, as the persona says: “The sailing men had sailing terms/ Which rigged their inner-sailing

thoughts”. Even when we try to describe ourselves or our feelings, what comes out might not at all reflect our true being: “Have the words ever/ Made anything of you, near a kind/ Of truth you thought you were? Me/ Neither. The words like albatrosses/Are only a doubtful touch”.

Poetic language for Graham transcends physical intimacy in some respects and falls short of it in others. What is clear is that for Graham both language and art stand or fall by their ability or inability to express caring and love as pleasure alone is not enough for him (Francis 2004: 29). As he puts it in “What is the Language Using Us For?”: “What is the language using us for?/ What shape of words shall put its arms/Round us for more than pleasure?”, admitting thus the limits of nearness the poetic language is able to create.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the thesis was to provide an analysis of the representation of obsession with language and the act of communication in W.S. Graham`s poetry. Based on a literature review and close reading of three poems by Graham, it can be concluded that Graham`s views on language have indeed been influenced both by Heideggerian concepts of language and the abstract post-war Modernist art as suggested by critics, especially as concerns the construction of space by poetic language where the encounter between the reader and the poet could take place.

Graham`s critical essay NOPOR (1946) is anticipatory of Heidegger`s post-war years lectures “The Nature of Language and The Way to Language” published in 1959. The same concerns are also addressed in Graham`s poems analysed in the thesis. Both for Heidegger and for Graham, language is an environment. It is from this environment we first must take things up to be able to speak about them. To be able to speak, we must first listen to the language and let language reveal its nature to us. For Heidegger, a space is something that throws open locality and places, vacates them and at the same time gives them free for all

things. For Graham, a poem is s a space in which revelations about language can take place. Graham creates this environment, this space, in his poems and at least in one of his poems, “The Constructed Space”, even tells outright that he is creating the `constructed space` so that the meaning from `the caught habits of language` might move across. In this space a nearness can be achieved between the reader and the poet which transcends geographical places and time. The nearness achieved in the space of the poem is thus independent of physical place and time.

From both the literature review and my close reading of Graham`s poems it is evident that Graham wanted the space created in the poem to be as abstract as he could make it – even unvisual. In this, the spaces created by Graham in his poems resemble abstract paintings, and sometimes Graham even directly refers to his spaces as `abstract scene/stretching between us` as in his poem “The Constructed Space” where the poet admits he has constructed the space where in the end he himself will become an `abstract act`. Graham carves away the particulars to create a timeless space from which he will speak to his reader. As evidenced by the literature review, in his approach to abstraction in poetry, Graham was influenced by post-war Modernist art, specifically by the works of British abstract painters residing in St Ives where Graham spent most of his later years.

Both for Graham and Heidegger language predetermines our perception as much as our expression. When we speak, we express what we have obtained by listening to the language and by doing so we say again the saying we have previously heard. As both the reader and the poet carry the baggage of their previous encounters, language for Graham is not a passive mediator of communication but an active Being. In the poem “The Beast in the Space“ it is depicted as a meaning-eating monster which is able to bite off and blur the meaning from both sides of the communication act. The active nature of language is also evident in his poem “What is the Language Using Us For?” where already the title refers to

the reversed power relationship between the language and its users. For Graham it is not that we are using the language, but due to the predetermined and inherited past of the language it is an unpredictable creature which has a mind of its own. So, for Graham the thinking that we are in total control of language and thus meaning making, is illusionary.

REFERENCES

Primary sources:

Graham, William Sydney. "The Constructed Space" (1958) in W.S. Graham: *New Collected Poems* (2004), ed. by Matthew Frances. London: Faber and Faber.

Graham, William Sydney. "The Beast in the Space" (1970) in W.S. Graham: *New Collected Poems* (2004), ed. by Matthew Frances. London: Faber and Faber.

Graham, William Sydney. "What is the Language using Us For" (1974) in W.S. Graham: *New Collected Poems* (2004), ed. by Matthew Frances. London: Faber and Faber.

Graham, William Sydney. 1946. "Notes on A Poetry of Release" in *The Nightfisherman: Selected Letters of W.S. Graham* (1999), ed. by Michael Snow and Margaret Snow. Manchester: Carcanet Press.

Secondary sources:

Bennett-Hunter, Guy. 2007. Heidegger on Philosophy and Language. *Philosophical Writings* 35 (2): 5-16.

Carruthers, Gerard. 2019. W. S. Graham: 'Born in a diamond screeched from a mountain pap'. *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 45:1, 39-55. Available: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2219&context=ssl>

Corbett, John. 2009. Language, Hugh MacDiarmid and W. S. Graham. In Ian Brown, Alan Riach (eds.) *Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth-Century Scottish Literature*, 112-122. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Corcoran, Neil. 1993. *English Poetry since 1940*. Longman Literature in English Series. London, New York: Longman.

Drexel, John. 2007. What is the Language Using Us For? Available at: <https://www.cprw.com/Drexel/graham.htm>, accessed April 12, 2024.

Francis, Matthew. 2004. *Where the People Are: Language and Community in the Poetry of W. S. Graham*. Cambridge: Salt Publishing.

Heidegger, Martin. 1971. *On the Way to Language*. Trans. by Peter D. Hertz. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers (Original work published in 1959).

Lopez, Tony. 1989. *The Poetry of W. S. Graham*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lopez, Tony. 2004. Graham and the 1940s. In Ralph Pite, Hester Jones (eds.) *W. S. Graham: Speaking Towards You*, 26-42. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Meservy, Joel. 2014. Heidegger, metaphor, and the essence of language. Louisiana State University, Master's Theses. Available at: https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/277/, accessed April 12, 2024.

Motion, Andrew. 2004. Over the world's thorns. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2004/mar/13/featuresreviews.guardianreview9>, accessed April 12, 2024.

Nowell Smith, David. 2003. An Interview with David Nowell Smith. University of East Anglia. Available at: <https://www.uea.ac.uk/about/news/article/an-interview-with-david-nowell-smith>, accessed April 12, 2024.

Nowell Smith, David. 2018. Poetry's Plastic Medium: The Example of W. S. Graham. Johns Hopkins University Press. *Modernism/Modernity Print Plus*, 3:2. Available at: <https://modernismmodernity.org/articles/poetrys-plastic-medium>, accessed April 12, 2024.

Nowell Smith, David. 2022. *W. S. Graham: The Poem as Art Object*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pite, Ralph, Jones, Hester. 2004. Introduction: Contacting Graham. In Ralph Pite, Hester Jones (eds.) In *W.S. Graham: Speaking Towards You*, 1-7. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Piette, Adam. 2004. `Roaring between the lines`: W. S. Graham and the White Threshold of Line-Breaks. In Ralph Pite, Hester Jones (eds.) *W. S. Graham: Speaking Towards You*, 44-62. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Riach, Alan. 2016. Scottish Poetry, 1945-2010. In Edward Larrissy (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to British Poetry, 1945-2010*, 148-162. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, Peter. 2004. Dependence in the Poetry of W. S. Graham. In Ralph Pite, Hester Jones (eds.) *W.S. Graham: Speaking Towards You*, 108-129. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Sansom, Ian. 2004. `Listen`: W.S. Graham. In Ralph Pite, Hester Jones (eds.) *W.S. Graham: Speaking Towards You*, 11-23, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Snow, Michael, Snow Margaret. 1999. *The Nightfisherman: Selected Letters of W.S. Graham*. Manchester: Carcanet Press.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL

ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Annemari Õunpuu

Obsession with language and act of communication in William Sydney Graham`s Poetry

Keel ja kommunikatsiooniakt kui kinnisideed W.S. Graham luules

Bakalaureusetöö

2024

Lehekülgede arv: 39

Annotatsioon:

Bakalaureusetöö eesmärgiks on uurida keele kasutamist kui kommunikatsiooniakti vahendajat šoti luuletaja William Sidney Graham`i valitud teostes.

Bakalaureusetöö jaotub neljaks osaks: sissejuhatuseks, kirjandusülevaateks, empiiriliseks osaks ning kokkuvõtteks. Sissejuhatuses antakse ülevaade W.S.Graham`i elust ja loomingust ning esitatakse töö eesmärk.

Kirjandusülevaate eesmärk on anda ülevaade W.S. Graham`i loomingu osas varasemalt tehtud uurimistöödest ning tuua tööga seonduvate teemade osas välja kirjanduskriitikute seisukohad. Kirjanduse ülevaade koosneb kahest alapeatükist, millest esimeses antakse üldine ülevaade seni W.S. Graham`i luule osas avaldatud kirjanduskriitikast. Teises alapeatükis vaadeldakse Heidegger`i keelefilosoofia ja 20.sajandi modernse maalikunsti mõjusid W.S. Graham`i luulele.

Töö empiiriline osa on jaotatud kaheks alapeatükiks. Empiirilise osa esimene alapeatükk keskendub kommunikatsiooniakti toimumiseks vajaliku koha loomisele valitud teostes. Teine alapeatükk keskendub keele kui kommunikatsiooniakti võimaldava ja takistava vahendi kujutamisele valitud teostes.

Märksõnad: W. S. Graham, šoti luule, keelefilosoofia, modernism

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Annemari Õunpuu,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose

Obsession with language and act of communication in William Sydney Graham`s Poetry,

mille juhendaja on Ene-Reet Soovik,

reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada digitaalarhiivi DSpace kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

2. Annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace kaudu Creative Commonsi litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 4.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

3. Olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

4. Kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Annemari Õunpuu

Tartus, 21.05.2024

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva bakalaureusetöö ise ning toonud korrekselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride instituudi anglistika osakonna bakalaureusetöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

/allkirjastatud digitaalselt/

Annemari Õunpuu

Tartus, 21.05.2024

Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.

Ene-Reet Soovik

Tartus, 21.05.2024