

The Generation of Dynamic Subjectivity: Frank O'Hara's Interartistic Dialogue with Jackson Pollock's Action Painting

Shunying Shi¹ and Yanni Lei²

1. Postgraduate for MA degree, School of Foreign Languages, Sun Yat-sen University

2. Department of English, School of Foreign Languages, Sun Yat-sen University

Author Note

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yanni Lei, Department of English, School of Foreign Languages, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China.

Email: leiyanni@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Abstract

This essay examines how Frank O'Hara's poetry constructs a decentralised, dynamic subjectivity through interartistic dialogue with Jackson Pollock's avant-garde painting philosophy. The analysis is structured around two key dimensions: the deconstruction of the author's supreme authority and the emphasis on embodied presence. Both Jackson Pollock and Frank O'Hara deconstructed artistic authority by surrendering control. Pollock relinquished control by making gravity, painting materials, and viewers as co-creators of the painting. Similarly, O'Hara destabilised poetic authority by transferring interpretive power to readers while unleashing the autonomous potential of language. This decentralised aesthetic led to the construction of dynamic subjectivity, emphasising the embodied presence. For Pollock, subjectivity emerged through the body's dynamic negotiation with canvas. O'Hara's embodied presence was manifested in the improvisational immediacy and sensory description, thus forming a dynamic subjectivity. Through his poetic transformation of painterly concepts, O'Hara reconstructed Pollock's action painting aesthetics, establishing a deliberate interartistic dialogue that not only responded to postwar anxieties of subjectivity but ultimately formulated a dynamic paradigm of subjective expression.

Keywords: Frank O'Hara, Jackson Pollock, subjectivity, interarts

1. Introduction

During the mid-20th century, New York experienced an avant-garde art revolution, with the New York School emerging as a pivotal artistic and literary movement between the 1950s and 1960s. At the time, painting became the most rapidly developing art form in the American

art scene. The movement was spearheaded by the Abstract Expressionists, also known as the action painters—a group of groundbreaking American artists represented by Jackson Pollock, Willem de Kooning, and Robert Motherwell. These painters referred to themselves as the New York School. Inspired by their close ties with these painters of the New York School, poets such as Frank O’Hara and John Ashbery came to be known as the poets of the New York School. O’Hara, a leading figure in this poetic circle, maintained deep connections with many artists, whose work significantly influenced his poetic creations. In his memoir dedicated to Larry Rivers, O’Hara mentioned the collaborative atmosphere of the time: “John Ashbery, Barbara Guest, Kenneth Koch and I, being poets, divided our time between the literary bar, the San Remo, and the artists’ bar, the Cedar Tavern. In the San Remo we argued and gossiped: in the Cedar we often wrote poems while listening to the painters argue and gossip” (O’Hara, 1995, p. 512). Among his circle of friends, Jackson Pollock exerted a particularly profound influence on Frank O’Hara’s poetic philosophy. O’Hara even authored a book titled *Jackson Pollock*. Pollock’s innovative techniques, characterized by the spontaneous drip and pour of paint onto the canvas, not only transformed the visual landscape of painting but also opened new pathways for understanding subjectivity. O’Hara embraced Pollock’s artistic philosophy to explore new expressions of subjectivity as a response to the existential anxieties of postwar America. This interarts interplay resulted in a subtle aesthetic resonance between O’Hara’s poetic writing and Pollock’s action painting.

The New York School was dedicated to exploring interart exchanges among various art forms. This era was characterized by the belief that the New York School “was a moment for making analogies among the arts—jazz was like painting was like dance was like poetry—and

for collaborations, many important, some absurd” (Chiasson, 2008). Frank O’Hara’s engagement with diverse art forms, including painting, music, and film, significantly influenced his poetic inspiration. Just as Ou (2020) claimed, “From its very inception, poetry has been inextricably intertwined with other arts. One might even assert that the essence of poetry is inherently interartistic, as is the essence of poetics itself. To approach poetry through an interartistic lens is thus fundamental to the study of poetics” (p. 126).¹ Wang (2024) also mentioned, “The early twentieth century ushered in an unprecedented era of intermedial convergence, where different art forms such as *poesis* and *pictura* began to confabulate with each other rather than competing in historically paragonal debates” (p. 2). Consequently, many scholars have conducted interartistic studies of O’Hara’s poetry, particularly emphasizing the connections between painting and his work. Wyman (2009) explored how Paul Klee, the Swiss painter, and Frank O’Hara utilised painted images and written words to express dynamic human experiences. Wyman posited both artists utilized structural tensions to represent the flow of physical and mental experiences, as well as the complexity of human perception and emotion. Some scholars have particularly focused on the influence of action painting on O’Hara’s poetic creation considering the exploration of this artistic movement by poets within the New York School. For example, Wang (2017) argued that by absorbing Pollock’s treatment of space, O’Hara transformed the urban space of New York into a poetic action field. In this context, O’Hara expanded the ideographic space of poetic language, effectively creating what can be termed the “action poem”. Sullivan (2020) explored O’Hara’s theory of Personism from the perspective of abstraction, positing that the abstraction found in painting, particularly in

¹ This citation is translated from the original Chinese source by the authors Lei Yanni and Shi Shunying.

Pollock's work, correlated with Personism's notion of "true abstraction," which served as a counter to poetic abstraction that striped away the poet's identity. Ladkin (2016) argued that both O'Hara and Pollock introduced "figura serpentina" into artistic creation. O'Hara represented the serpent in the form of poetry, while Pollock played the serpent, leaving traces on the canvas. While existing scholarship has extensively documented the affinities between Frank O'Hara's poetic practice and Jackson Pollock's action painting, it has largely overlooked the poet's critical reconfiguration of subjectivity through his assimilation of Pollock's artistic philosophy. This article argues that O'Hara's conception of subjectivity embodied in his poetry is greatly influenced by Pollock's action painting philosophy in two dimensions: deconstructing the author's supreme authority and emphasizing embodied presence in the creation process. Through a self-conscious and dialectical dialogue with Pollock's painting aesthetics, O'Hara constructs a decentralized and dynamic subjectivity, which responds to the existential anxieties of subjectivity in the postwar era.

2. Decentralized Subjectivity: Deconstructing Author's Supreme Authority

"It was founded by me after lunch with LeiRoi Jones on August 27, 1959, a day in which I was in love with someone (not Roi, by the way, a blonde). I went back to work and wrote a poem for this person. While I was writing it I was realizing that if I wanted to I could use the telephone instead of writing the poem, and so Personism was born. It's a very exciting movement which will undoubtedly have lots of adherents. It puts the poem squarely between the poet and the person. Lucky Pierre style, and the poem is correspondingly gratified. The poem is at last between two persons instead of two pages" (O'Hara, 1973, pp. 354-355). This is how Frank O'Hara puts forward his famous theory of Personism. Personism reflects a

profound dialogic quality, emphasizing the relationship between the poet and the reader. In his own words, O'Hara describes how a poem is not merely a static work confined to the pages, but rather a dynamic interaction between the poet and a specific person (real or imagined), O'Hara invites the reader into active collaboration and grants them an equal status alongside the author. Through this lens, the poem becomes a space for conversation, evolving from an unfinished draft into a completed work through the collaboration of both parties. Indeed, the very characteristic that artistic creation ceases to be a solitary performance of the author and instead emerges as a collaborative endeavor is already observable in Pollock's paintings.

The emergence of action painting is inspired by many artists and schools of art, with Jackson Pollock playing a pivotal role through his bold innovations. Putting the canvas flat on the ground, Pollock pours, splashes, and drips color on the horizontal canvas. His painting technique is characterized by the movement of his body, the viscous flow of paint, and the participation of gravity. However, Pollock does not exert complete control over all elements occurring on the canvas due to his distinctive drip-and-pour painting techniques. "Art as action rests on the enormous assumption that the artist accepts as real only that which he is in the process of creating...The artist works in a condition of open possibility" (Rosenberg, 1970, p. 42). Gravity serves as an intriguing and uncontrollable factor in Pollock's creative process. Arnheim (1974) explains that "the force of gravity dominating our world makes us live in anisotropic space, that is, space in which dynamics varies with direction" (p. 30). Paint is drawn downward by gravity to produce organic, flowing patterns that are impossible to accomplish with conventional brushwork. Even though Pollock can control the initial gestures such as the angle and force of his application, the outcome is shaped by the pull of gravity, the viscosity of

the paint, and the texture of the canvas. In this process, the artist becomes one of several agents that contribute to the final work. Gravity acts as a co-creator, transforming the artwork into a collaborative event. While gravity introduces an element of chance and unpredictability into Pollock's works, the materials retain their autonomy in Pollock's painting process. In O'Hara's monograph *Jackson Pollock*, he mentions: "Very few things, it seems, were assimilated or absorbed by Pollock. They were left intact and given back. Paint is paint, shells and wire are shells and wire, glass is glass, canvas is canvas. You do not find, in his work, a typewriter becoming a stomach, a sponge becoming a brain" (O'Hara, 1959, pp. 16-17). Pollock refuses to transform materials like shells and glass into symbolic representations on the canvas; instead, he emphasizes their material authenticity, thereby undermining the artist's authority to ascribe meaning to objects. In Pollock's creative process, the artist's role transforms from being an "authoritative creator" to an "active participant." Jackson Pollock's revolutionary painting technique fundamentally transforms the viewer's engagement with art. By abandoning traditional focal points in his all-over compositions, Pollock creates dynamic visual fields where layers of dripped, poured, and splattered paint intertwine across the entire canvas. This radical approach invites active viewer participation. Without predetermined points of emphasis, each observer must navigate the work's intricate web of lines, colors, and textures, discovering unique rhythms and patterns based on their perspective and movement around the painting. The artwork thus becomes an immersive experience rather than a static image, with meaning emerging through the viewer's exploration of Pollock's kinetic traces. This approach democratizes interpretation—there's no "correct" way to view the work. "As a result, we tend instinctively to re-create the very act of painting in our imagination and experience sensations

of kinetic energy akin to watching a dancer in motion or a conductor leading an orchestra” (Cernuschi & Herczynski, 2008, p. 618). The act of viewing art becomes dynamic and immersive, making the audience feel as though they are having a conversation with the painter and the canvas. By surrendering control to gravity, preserving the authenticity of materials, and encouraging active audience engagement, Pollock redefines his creative agency and dismantles the myth of the omnipotent artist-author, thus constituting a radical decentralization of artistic subjectivity—not as its erasure, but as its redistribution across the creative continuum.

Pollock’s ideas provide O’Hara with methodological insights into what kind of subjectivity he aims to construct in his poems. O’Hara (1973) states, “Nobody should experience anything they don’t need to, if they don’t need poetry bully for them, I like the movies too. And after all, only Whitman and Crane and Williams, of the American poets, are better than the movies, as of measure and other technical apparatus, that’s just common sense: if you’re going to buy a chair of pants you want them to be tight enough so everyone will want to go to bed with you. There’s nothing metaphysical about it. Unless, of course, you flatter yourself into thinking that what you’re experiencing is ‘yearning’”(p. 354). O’Hara believes that poetry holds no inherent superiority over other forms of popular culture and should not be used to “flatter yourself.” Genuine experience is more important than fabricated profundity. Therefore, O’Hara’s poetry no longer serves as a platform for the poet to proclaim lofty ideals and thoughts. In this context, the poet rejects the supreme authority by transferring the power to the readers and the words. *The Day Lady Died* is an unconventional elegy written for the jazz singer Billie Holiday on July 17, 1959, the day of her death. In this poem, O’Hara (1995) writes:

I walk up the muggy street beginning to sun
and have a hamburger and a malted and buy
an ugly NEW WORLD WRITING to see what the poets
in Ghana are doing these days
I go on to the bank
and Miss Stillwagon (first name Linda I once heard)
doesn't even look up my balance for once in her life
and in the GOLDEN GRTFFTN I get a little Verlaine
for Patsy with drawings by Bonnard although I do
think of Hesiod, trans. Richmond Lattimore or
Brendan Behan's new play or *Le Balcon* or *Les Nègres*
of Genet, but I don't, I stick with Verlaine
after practically going to sleep with quandariness (p. 325)¹

In this poem, O'Hara describes various mundane details of everyday life—walking up the street, having a hamburger, buying a magazine, visiting the bank and choosing gifts for a friend in a bookstore. He meticulously documents his indecision at the bookstore, weighing options between Verlaine's poems illustrated by Bonnard, Hesiod's works in translation, or plays by Behan and Genet, before settling on Verlaine. By recording these mundane choices alongside his wandering thoughts, O'Hara transforms daily routines into a plain chronicle of urban existence, prioritizing raw experience over abstract ideals. The poem unfolds as a casual mental itinerary, mirroring the spontaneous rhythm of city life itself.

¹ Unless otherwise noted, the quoted passages represent selected sections of the poem, not the full text.

and for Mike I just stroll into the PARK LANE
Liquor Store and ask for a bottle of Strega and
then I go back where I came from to 6th Avenue
and the tobacconist in the Ziegfeld Theatre and
casually ask for a carton of Gauloises and a carton
of Picayunes, and a NEW YORK POST with her face on it

and I am sweating a lot by now and thinking of
leaning on the john door in the 5 SPOT
while she whispered a song along the keyboard
to Mal Waldron and everyone and I stopped breathing (p. 325)

In the end, O'Hara reveals that the poem is an elegy in honor of jazz singer Billie Holiday following her death. O'Hara presented in the poem does not possess a perspective that transcends readers' perspective; rather, he learns of Billie Holiday's death only upon seeing "a New York Post with her face on it" (p. 325). Following this revelation, O'Hara writes that he "stopped breathing" (p. 325), capturing the immediate pain and shock he feels upon receiving the news. In this context, both O'Hara and the readers are situated in the same moment, confronting the same reality. O'Hara rejects the traditional notion of the writer as a supreme authority, no longer manipulating the readers' emotions or assigning meaning to events. Instead, he positions himself as a participant who is experiencing and feeling like a reader, rather than as an omniscient narrator. In *Chez Jane*, O'Hara (1995) writes:

The white chocolate jar full of petals

swills odds and ends around in a dizzying eye
of four o'clocks now and to come. The tiger,
marvellously striped and irritable, leaps
on the table and without disturbing a hair
of the flowers' breathless attention, pisses
into the pot, right down its delicate spout (p. 102).

In this poem, O'Hara dismantles the poet's role as a meaning-giver and the text's traditional obligation to coherence. The vibrant imagery in this poem, such as the "white chocolate jar," "petals," and "tiger," juxtaposes elements in a way that defies rational control, producing a surreal and dream-like scene. The collage of these images resembles Pollock's splashing of paint on the canvas, presenting an absurd scene. O'Hara rejects the traditional poet's approach of taming imagery, instead allowing those beautiful yet bizarre images to collide and interact freely, forming absurd yet strangely compelling scenes. The rapid transitions between images generate a tension that transcends the author's control, as these images establish new relationships seemingly guided by a logic independent of the poet. The author's control is ceded to the vitality and tension expressed by the text itself. The most subversive moment comes with the tiger's appearance. The tiger "leaps on the table" and "pisses into the pot". O'Hara refrains from explaining the imagery or assigning clear symbolic meanings; instead, he allows the images or words to present themselves. This intentional ambiguity creates an open field where readers exercise their interpretive agency, free from authoritative constraints. In this way, O'Hara redistributes the production of meaning, foregrounding a decentralized model of subjectivity that thrives on collaborative engagement

rather than authorial dictate. Words' autonomy can also be observed in the poem *Why I Am Not a Painter*.

But me? One day I am thinking of
a color: orange. I write a line
about orange. Pretty soon it is a
whole page of words, nor lines.
Then another page. There should be
so much more, not of orange, of
words, of how terrible orange is
and life. Days go by. It is even in
prose, I am a real poet. My poem
is finished and I haven't mentioned
orange yet. It's twelve poems, I call
it ORANGES. And one day in a gallery
I see Mike's painting, called SARDINES (O'Hara, 1995, p. 262).

In this poem, the word "orange" functions as a trigger, setting off an unstoppable chain reaction. Words breed words, lines dissolve into pages, and the poem evolves organically, bypassing traditional structures of meter or narrative. Crucially, O'Hara emphasizes that the final work, ORANGES, contains no direct mention of the "orange" itself. In this context, the poet's authority surrenders to the associative logic of language. Words become autonomous agents, their collisions and alliances generating meaning independently of authorial design just like the paints used by painters of action painting. Through the poetic practice itself, O'Hara

ultimately answers his question “Why I am not a painter”. As Bruhn (2001) observes, “poets may respond to a work of visual art with a creative act in their own medium, transporting the style and structure, the message and metaphors from the visual to the verbal” (p. 551). In this light, O’Hara can be regarded as a painter, one who employs language to replicate the visual dynamism of action painting while reconstructing its generative logic through words.

Both O’Hara and Pollock reject the notion that the creator holds sole authority over a work’s meaning. Instead, they open their art to interpretation, allowing viewers and creative materials to actively participate in shaping its significance. This collaborative meaning-making process fundamentally decentralizes the author’s subjectivity. For O’Hara, decentralization manifests not only as interpretive openness but also as a dialogue and perpetual negotiation among the poet, the reader, and the text or words.

3. Dynamic Subjectivity: Emphasizing Embodied Presence

O’Hara not only dissolves the authority and central stance of the artist but also emphasizes expressing subjectivity through improvisational writing and sensory perceptions, which further pushes the decentralized subjectivity to a dynamic expression. This embodied approach to decentralized subjectivity finds its precursor in Pollock’s radical practice. In his monograph *Jackson Pollock*, O’Hara (1959) explains his admiration for Pollock’s painting process: “In the past, an artist by means of scale could create a vast panorama on a few feet of canvas or wall, relating this scale to the visual reality of known images (the size of a man’s body) and to the setting (the building it would enhance)” (p. 28). However, Pollock is different and revolutionary. “The scale of the painting became that of the painter’s body, not the image of a body, and the setting for the scale, which would include all the referents, would be the

canvas surface itself” (O’Hara, 1959, p. 28). As Pollock himself notes, “On the floor I am more at ease. I feel nearer, more part of the painting, since this way I can walk around it, work from the four sides and literally be in the painting” (O’Hara, 1959, pp. 31-32). Through his body’s presence during the painting process, Pollock feels more physically engaged with his art. By treating the canvas as a dynamic field rather than a representational window, Pollock transforms the canvas into what Harold Rosenberg terms as “an arena in which to act” where “what was to go on the canvas was not a picture but an event” (Rosenberg, 1970, p. 36). This characterization as an “event” highlights that the most important thing is not the final marks left on the canvas, but the immediate record of the artist’s interaction with the material and the environment during the creation process. Therefore, the act of painting transforms into a performance of the artist’s physical energy. The painting is no longer a mere representation of external objects, but rather a reflection of the artist’s presence. With Pollock’s unique drip and pour techniques, his body movements become a three-dimensional extension of the artwork. The subjectivity of the painter is no longer a closed self, but an open, fluid, and situational process shaped by the contingencies of time, space, and bodily action.

While Pollock’s bodily motions produce a dynamic expression of subjectivity, O’Hara’s embodied presence is manifested in the improvisational writing style of his works and the extensive depiction of sensory experiences in his poems. This poetic practice is like a simultaneous translation of his life experiences (Wyman, 2009, p.42). O’Hara’s poetry is not the product of deliberation, but the immediate record of a moment in life, capturing the fluctuations and emotions of that moment and experience. This approach “eliminated the mystique of knowledge and deconstructed the structures of power discourse” (Tang, 2007, p.

196). In this context, O’Hara’s subjectivity is not abstracted from personal experience and emotion, nor is it presented as intense “poetic conflict” or “emotional catharsis”; rather, it is woven into every moment of life. For O’Hara, poems serve as a means to capture the dynamics of life rather than the ultimate expression of subjectivity. In *A Step Away from Them*, O’Hara (1995) writes:

The sun is hot, but the
cabs stir up the air. I look
at bargains in wristwatches. There
are cats playing in sawdust (p. 257).

The poet utilizes various senses, including touch, hearing, and sight, immersing readers in the physical environment and emphasizing his embodied presence in the moment. O’Hara’s observations—such as noticing “bargains in wristwatches” and “cats playing in sawdust”—reflect spontaneous thoughts that arise from his interactions with the world around him. The combination of sensory details and personal reflection demonstrates how the poet’s subjectivity is dynamically created in real time, influenced by his body, surroundings, and immediate impressions. Through this method, O’Hara captures the essence of lived experience and invites readers to engage with the fluidity and immediacy of his poetic expression, which is also evident in the poem *Today*:

Oh! kangaroos, sequins, chocolate sodas!
You really are beautiful! Pearls,
harmonicas, jujubes, aspirins! all
the stuff they’ve always talked about

still makes a poem a surprise! (O’Hara, 1995, p. 15)

In this poem, O’Hara creates a fluid and evolving sense of self. The playful exclamations—“Oh! kangaroos, sequins, chocolate sodas!”—immediately draw readers into a world of sensory delight, where ordinary objects become sources of beauty and surprise. The quick jumps among these images reflect the spontaneity of thought and perception, allowing the poet’s subjectivity to emerge in response to the chaotic flow of his surroundings. This technique underscores the idea that subjectivity is not a fixed entity but rather a collection of moments shaped by the poet’s interaction with the everyday world. Similarly, in *The Day Lady Died*, O’Hara (1995) traces his actions through the poem, creating a narrative that is both personal and immediate. The lines reflect his experiences as he moves through the city, capturing the emotional resonance of a significant event while engaging with the vibrant life around him. This approach transforms poetry into a form of performance art, as Wang (2017) notes, “O’Hara creatively appropriates Pollock’s artistic philosophy, transforming poetry into performance art and using New York, this international metropolis, as his expansive canvas, recording moments of inspiration while walking” (p.171).¹ In *Meditations in an Emergency*, O’Hara (1995) asserts:

However, I have never clogged myself with the praises of pastoral life, nor
with nostalgia for an innocent past of perverted acts in Pastures. No. One need
never leave the confines of New York to get all the greenery one wishes—I
can’t even enjoy a blade of grass unless I know there’s a subway handy, or a
record store or some other sign that people do not totally regret life (p. 197).

¹ This citation is translated from the original Chinese source by the authors Lei Yanni and Shi Shunying.

O’Hara demonstrates a strong dependence on New York City, distinguishing himself from other members of the New York School. He challenges the notion that urban life can alienate individuals from nature, leading to feelings of frustration or disconnect. In this poem, O’Hara rejects the “praises of pastoral life”. On the contrary, he advocates the greenery that can be found within the confines of New York, thus highlighting the possibility of appreciating nature in an urban setting where a subway is “handy”. The convenience of city life, with its accessibility to green spaces, allows modern individuals to experience nature in a way that is integrated with their daily lives. This perspective advocates for a harmonious coexistence with both the urban landscape and the natural world, presenting a new way for modern people to engage with their surroundings. It showcases a fluid and evolving subjectivity that is responsive to the complexities of contemporary life rather than confined to romanticized ideals like pastures. As John Ashbery observes, O’Hara’s poems resonate with “the reader who turns to poetry as a last resort in trying to juggle the contradictory components of modern life into something like a livable space” (O’Hara, 1995, p. x). In fact, the title *Meditations in an Emergency* implies O’Hara’s dynamic subjectivity. “Meditation” typically suggests an action conducted in a calm, quiet atmosphere; however, O’Hara advocates meditation in a state of urgency and impatience. This title captures the essence of living in a bustling city like New York, where moments of crisis or urgency often interrupt daily life. O’Hara embraces these moments and finds inspiration within the dynamic environment of urban existence. The poet is not an isolated individual who travels through the urban space of New York City; instead, he actively engages with it. Through this embodied engagement, O’Hara captures sensory experiences from everyday life and engages in improvisational writing, shaping subjectivity

into an organic entity that dialogues with the surrounding environment.

In *Personism: A Manifesto*, O'Hara (1973) writes, "I don't even like rhythm, assonance, all that stuff. You just go on your nerve. If someone's chasing you down the street with a knife you just run, you don't turn around and shout, 'Give it up! I was a track star for Mineola Prep'"(p. 353). This reflects O'Hara's emphasis that creation should rely on the immediate feedback of the body and senses, leading to a form of improvisational writing rather than rational design. The creative subject flows continuously under the impetus of various instincts, rejecting fixed postures. Therefore, O'Hara effectively illustrates a "subjectivity in motion". This perspective invites readers to experience the poem as a living, breathing expression of the poet's evolving self and readers can find a sense of authentic and dynamic existence amidst the fast-paced life of the modern world.

4. Conclusion

By focusing on the two parts including deconstructing the author's supreme authority and emphasizing embodied presence in the creation process, this paper revealed how O'Hara propelled the construction of a decentralized and dynamic subjectivity through his interartistic dialogue with Pollock. Both Jackson Pollock and Frank O'Hara deconstructed artistic authority through radical acts of creative surrender. Pollock relinquished control by making gravity, painting materials, and viewers as co-creators. Similarly, O'Hara destabilized poetic authority by transferring interpretive power to readers while unleashing language's autonomous potential. This decentralized aesthetic led to the construction of dynamic subjectivity with an emphasis on embodied presence. For Pollock, subjectivity emerged through the body's dynamic negotiation with canvas. O'Hara's embodied presence was manifested in the improvisational immediacy and sensory description, thus forming a dynamic subjectivity. Frank O'Hara's poetic revolution marked a decisive break from the modernist legacy of Pound and Eliot. While

their works interrogated the fragmented modern subject, challenged existing self-concepts, and explored the difficult conditions of individuals in a complex society, they often failed to provide clear answers regarding the construction of subjectivity. Frank O'Hara's artistic engagement with Jackson Pollock exemplified the intellectual resonance between the New York School poets and Abstract Expressionist painters and gave a new possibility to construct subjectivity. Through his poetic transformation of painterly concepts, O'Hara reconstructed Pollock's action painting aesthetics, establishing a deliberate interartistic dialogue that not only responded to postwar anxieties of subjectivity but ultimately formulated a dynamic paradigm of subjective expression.

References

- Arnheim, R. (1974). *Art and visual perception: A psychology of the creative eye*. University of California Press.
- Bruhn, S. (2001). A concert of paintings: "Musical Ekphrasis" in the twentieth century. *Poetics Today*, 22 (3), 551-605.
- Cernuschi, C., & Herczynski, (2008). A. The subversion of gravity in Jackson Pollock's abstractions. *The Art Bulletin*, 90 (4), 616-639.
- Chiasson, D. (2008, March 31). The world of Frank O'Hara. *The New Yorker*.
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/04/07/fast-company>
- Ladkin, S. (2016). "And now it is the serpent's turn": the rhetoric of the figura serpentinata in Frank O'Hara's "In Memory of My Feelings". *World & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry*, 32 (1), 21-44.
- O'Hara, F. (1959). *Jackson Pollock*. George Braziller, Inc.
- O'Hara, F. (1973). Personism: A Manifesto. In Allen, D. & Tallman, W. (Eds.), *The Poetics of the New American Poetry* (pp.353-355). Grove Press.
- O'Hara, F. (1995). *The Collected Poems of Frank O'Hara*. University of California Press.
- Ou, R. (2020). 语词博物馆:当代欧美跨艺术诗学概述[Museum of words: A survey of contemporary European and American Interart poetics]. 上海交通大学学报(哲学社会科学版)[*Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*],

28 (04), 126-137.

Rosenberg, H. (1970). *The Tradition of the New*. Paladin.

Sullivan, R. D. (2020). Not you: Frank O’Hara and the poetics of “Personism”. *Textual Practice*, 34 (3), 419-436.

Shi, H. (2017). 英国新古典主义诗歌的主体性思辨[The subjectivity discourse in British Neoclassical poetry]. *文艺争鸣*[*Contention in Literature and Art*], (08), 165-169.

Tang, Genjin. (2007). 20 世纪美国诗歌大观[*American Poetry in the 20th Century*]. 上海大学出版社[Shanghai University Press].

Wang, B. (2024). Intermedialising Modernities: The Polyphonism of Modernist *Ut pictura poesis*. *Journal of Literary Studies*, 40, 1-20.

Wang, X. (2017). “空间感”:从绘画到诗歌——弗兰克·奥哈拉对波洛克的艺术借鉴 [“Sense of Space”: From painting to poetry—Frank O’Hara’s artistic Borrowing from Pollock]. *文艺争鸣*[*Contention in Literature and Art*], (12), 168-172.

Wyman, S. (2009). How Paul Klee and Frank O’Hara used painted image and printed word to signify worlds in motion. *Word & Image: A Journal of Verbal/Visual Enquiry*, 26 (1), 40-51.