In Her Own Words: Emily Hale’s Introduction to Eliot’s Letters

Edited by Frances Dickey and Sara Fitzgerald

Background

In November 1956, Emily Hale traveled to Princeton to complete her donation of Eliot’s letters to Princeton Library, staying with her friends Willard and Margaret Thorp. During her visit, perhaps at the Thorps’ urging, Hale drafted a narrative or outline of her relationship with Eliot from 1911 to the present. In January, she received the stunning news of Eliot’s marriage to Valerie Fletcher, which, along with her teaching duties and a crisis in her aunt Edith Perkins’s health, may have caused her to put aside the narrative. Seven months later, at the end of the spring term, she began organizing her belongings for another move; after working at Abbot Academy for almost ten years, she had reached the mandatory retirement age. On July 15, 1957, she wrote to William Dix, Princeton University Librarian:

Dear Mr. Dix, you will be greatly surprised to hear from me so unexpectedly— but today in beginning to clear my desk drawers, preparatory to leaving Andover in September, I came upon the sheets of an Introduction to the Eliot letters which I wrote while I was in Princeton so long ago, and which have been “lost” ever since! I must apologize for copying the original in pencil, but typing takes me a very long time, and there is no one here naturally to whom I care to dictate the material.1

The four double-sided manuscript pages that Hale sent to Dix include a reference to Eliot’s second marriage, indicating that she introduced new material as she was recopying the original. Indeed, when she wrote to

1 Emily Hale to William Dix, Narrative Written by Emily Hale; Emily Hale Letters from T.S. Eliot, C0686, Manuscripts Division, Department of Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
Willard Thorp a few days later, she told him that she had “made [the Introduction] even more personal and detailed than earlier.”

This draft, dated “Andover July 15, 1957,” is one of two accounts included in the “Emily Hale Letters from T. S. Eliot” collection at Princeton; the other, consisting of a corrected typescript and revised clean copy, dates from March through May 1965. Both can be seen as digital scans at the Princeton University Finding Aids website, but while the 1965 typescripts are quite legible, Hale’s 1957 pencil manuscript is challenging to read. [We have bracketed uncertain passages in our transcription.] Perhaps for this reason it has gone relatively unnoticed, especially in comparison with Eliot’s own posthumously released statement at Houghton Library. We decided to reproduce Hale’s text—which is believed to be in the public domain—to make it more available to readers and inscribe it into the record of the opening of the Eliot-Hale archive.

As Lyndall Gordon discussed in Eliot’s New Life, Hale made several further attempts to record the history of their secret relationship in greater detail, including an oral memoir that she taped and sent to the Thorps (181). Willard wrote on November 26, 1963, “With Margaret’s help, I have finished putting the transcript of the tape in order, trying not to change your meaning in any respect. As soon as it is typed up again, I’ll send along a copy for your comment.” Willard’s following queries about points in this transcription refer to “p. 24,” suggesting a much longer narrative than either of those found in the archive. After hearing of Eliot’s death in January 1965, Hale changed her mind and asked Willard to return this version to her. In an exchange of letters over the next few weeks, the Thorps urged her to reconsider. But Hale’s mind was made up. She wrote Willard, “This will disappoint M. [Margaret] and you, I know, but there are other elements in life which I think equally as important as the objective literary professional point of view you both have.” A week later, she wrote Margaret that she would wait a while and “try once again something to meet these objectively minded biographers and historically literary demands of a future when I trust no one too close to T. S. E. will be living.” She told her friend that “my wish to change my first copy is not only for Valerie’s sake (some 50 years from now) but from my own feeling for shielding the association with a man I loved, and who, I think, did not respond as he should have to my long trust, friendship and love.” Hale reported to Dix on March 1, 1965, that “a friend of many years who knew the story ‘long ago,’” had incinerated this version.

In its place, Hale wrote a third, “brief” narrative, which was typed and corrected according to her instructions and placed in the archive with Eliot’s letters. The two surviving narratives—the first one begun just before his surprise marriage in 1957, and the last completed after his death in 1965—thus reflect the beginning and end of a process. In both, we see Hale accepting the denouement of her five-decade friendship with Eliot with decorum and grace. The missing piece is Hale’s more revealing account of 1963, but perhaps her destruction of this memoir was also part of the process.

Introduction by Emily Hale

In giving the letters between T. S. Eliot and myself—to Princeton University I feel it will be of interest to future generations of students, and perhaps the general public, to know the background behind the correspondence—a back drop so to speak for the human drama in these letters.

In 1911-12, T. S. E. was working at Harvard University towards a doctorate in Philosophy. I met him during this period, or a little earlier in his undergraduate and master’s [working] days, at the home of his cousin, Miss Eleanor Hinkley, living in Cambridge with her mother, who was Eliot’s mother’s sister. I saw quite a little of him, taking part together once in modest theatricals at Mrs Hinkley’s, in an original dramatization by her daughter, of Jane Austen’s

---

2 Willard Thorp and Margaret Farrand Thorp Papers, C0292, Manuscripts Division, Department of Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
3 Maybe “come.”
4 Perhaps Dorothy Elsmith.
5 Emily Hale Letters from T. S. Eliot, C0686, Manuscripts Division, Department of Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
6 In a letter of 18 August 1932, Eliot reminisced to Hale that the date of their first meeting was in 1905. This would have been when he first came to the Boston area to study at Milton Academy and before Hale went to Miss Porter’s School in Connecticut. Eliot returned from Europe for the 1911-12 academic year at Harvard.
7 Eleanor Holmes Hinkley (1891-1971), Eliot’s first cousin, was the second daughter of Susan (Susie) Heywood Stearns (1860-1948), sister of his mother Charlotte. Eleanor and Emily attended the Berkeley Street School in Cambridge together as children. Eleanor’s three-act play on Jane Austen, Dear Jane, was produced in New York in 1932.
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Ann Marie Jakubowski
Washington University in St. Louis

For a year in which it’s fair to say we’re all in dire need of silver linings, the first-ever Zoom rendition of the Annual Meeting delivered a few. The coronavirus pandemic upended plans to convene at Harvard University and Gloucester, Massachusetts, but the shift online enabled record registration numbers and remarkable flexibility. This year, 130 registrants logged on, entering the ether from 17 time zones across the globe. Those numbers alone represent a significant silver lining, opening the digital door to connections with many far-flung Eliot scholars who wouldn’t have been able to make the trip to Boston if these were ordinary times.

And there is something to be said for attending a conference from the comfort of one’s own home. The chance to tune in without a commute, to discreetly tune out when needed, and to swap business casual for slippers offered a sense of ease that I certainly appreciated. It was convenient to be able to Google a reference in real time rather than losing it in a page of notes, or to catch a panel in the half-hour interval between other obligations. Zoom’s features—the chat window, the speaker spotlight view, screen sharing—adapt well to conference demands. The chat function offered both a lively sounding board for general greetings as well as a tool to manage Q&A sessions, and screen sharing capabilities for presenters proved easier than the finicky projectors of conventional venues. Beyond the practical benefits, the idiosyncrasies of Zoom were a pleasure too—children and pets making background cameos, the opportunity to envy other attendees’ bookshelves and houseplants, and the ragtime music playing in the breaks between sessions. Thanks to the heroic efforts of the tech team, masterfully led by Tony Cuda (including Ria Banerjee, David Chinitz, Julia Daniel, Frances Dickey, Patrick Query, Jayme Stayer, and John Whittier-Ferguson), and the wisdom of a digital dry run held a week ahead of time, the online experience was smooth and efficient.

The conference opened with a set of four peer seminars on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning. These included “Twenty-First Century Eliot: The Waste Land,” led by Nancy K. Gish; “Eliot and Racial Others,” led by Anita Patterson; “Eliot and the Avant-Garde,” led by Vincent Sherry; and “Eliot’s Later Poetry,” led by Aakanksha Virkar Yates. I was part of the conversation on Eliot and race, and in my experience, the seminar was an ideal way to kick off the conference weekend. The position papers circulated ahead of time and the smaller-scale format generated constructive discussions. Our conversation ranged widely, focusing on Eliot’s status as an important intertext for Ralph Ellison and other Black writers, the ways his work performs whiteness and reveals its fragility, and the understudied dynamics of race and colonialism in the plays. We talked about the historical and religious implications of his infamous anti-Semitic comments and considered pedagogical approaches to his work that could foreground the beauty of his poetry while still not minimizing those thornier elements of his legacy. Though Zoom can’t fully re-create the experience of in-person discussion, in this case it opened more possibilities than it curtailed, bringing together in one space papers and perspectives from Beijing, Kanagawa, Boston, Cleveland, and St. Louis. Overall, we left the seminar with the consensus that race is a generative and understudied point of entry.
into Eliot’s oeuvre and a crucial growing point for the future of Eliot scholarship. Participants in the other seminars had similarly positive things to say about the blend of rigor and friendly openness in the group conversations.

This year’s panels were condensed into two days instead of three, but they represented a wide range of interests. Papers covered everything from ecocritical readings of Eliot (LeeAnn Derdeyn, Rachel Murray) to his relationship to detective fiction (Deborah Leiter, Alex Davis). Others undertook analyses of marginalia in the Eliot archive (Amanda Golden), explored the religious potential of dramatic form (Sørina Higgins), and examined the illustrations of Eliot’s Ariel poems (Jack Quin). I was particularly interested in the first panel’s attention to Eliot’s networks of literary influence: Kevin Rulo took up the relationship between Eliot’s work and that of his Harvard roommate, the WWI veteran Alan Seeger, while Annarose Steinke outlined the adversarial relationship between Eliot and Basil Bunting. Yasna Bozhkova drew our attention to the convergences among long poems by Eliot, Hope Mirrlees, and Mina Loy, each addressing urban experience with an iteration of the “unreal city” trope. Each of these helped clarify Eliot’s place within the social-literary matrix of his time, and each modeled effective strategies for reading Eliot in conversation with his peers.

The Emily Hale Archive was a key point of interest for this year’s conference, and the two Friday afternoon roundtables chaired by Megan Quigley and Julia Daniel were a major highlight. The opening of the archive at Princeton University Library in January of this year now feels as though it occurred in a different lifetime, with all that’s happened to the world in the interim. The pandemic has curtailed access to the material for the foreseeable future, which made the panelists’ insights especially exciting to those of us who had been following the news but haven’t yet been able to visit ourselves. The first panel—John Whittier-Ferguson, Frances Dickey, Tony Cuda, and Katerina Stergiopoulou—discussed the question of what readers should make of the archive’s revelation that Hale is behind so much of Eliot’s mid- and late-career work, especially Four Quartets and The Family Reunion. There’s no easy answer to that question, but there was a fascinating conversation about Eliot’s disclosures to Hale of who the real-world analogs are to the “characters” in his poetry. Seeing these connections outlined in his own hand might prompt us to return to the poems with a new perspective, but the panelists agreed that they also reveal the profound intimacy Hale and Eliot shared, underscoring her status as the only reader of his work during their lifetimes who had access to these revelations.

The second roundtable, with Jayme Stayer, David Chinitz, Jewel Spears Brooker, and Sara Fitzgerald, reflected on how the letters offer new, clarifying context to some of the more fraught elements of Eliot’s life and legacy, including his understanding (or misunderstanding) of celibacy as a spiritual practice and his hyperattention to Jewish people and Jewishness generally. The archive adds valuable nuance to our understanding of Eliot’s life and work, but, as one of the panelists pointed out, “the greatest thing about these letters is that they make everything more complicated.” I was struck by the panelists’ generosity in sharing their perspectives on the archive and the questions it has opened up for them; it provided a much-needed boost of energy and excitement about the new trajectories opening up for future work in Eliot studies.

The two roundtables were followed by a third, with a more practical focus: law professors from US and UK universities weighed in on the complexities of fair use and copyright law, explaining the different regulations for the two countries and offering advice on how to navigate the process of securing rights. Assembled for this last roundtable on Friday were Robert Spoo—Chapman Distinguished Professor at The University of Tulsa College of Law; Peter Jaszi—Professor Emeritus at American University’s Washington College of Law, where he helped found the Glushko-Samuelson Intellectual Property Clinic and the Program on Information Justice and Intellectual Property; and Lionel Bentley—Herchel Smith Professor of Intellectual Property Law at the University of Cambridge, where he co-directs the Centre for Intellectual Property and Information Law and is a professorial fellow at Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Robert von Hallberg delivered the 41st Annual Memorial Lecture on Saturday afternoon, speaking on “Intellectual Eloquence: East Coker.” Von
Hallberg’s reading of the second section of Four Quartets highlighted its most strikingly discursive moments of general address, reassessing the effect of lines like “That was a way of putting it—not very satisfactory / A periphrastic study in a worn-out poetic fashion.” Though Eliot’s contemporary critics disparaged the poem’s discursivity and perceived its prosaic moments as lapses, von Hallberg proposed a different way of viewing them, positing that the rise of Nazi propaganda in the mid-1930s contributed to Eliot’s shift toward this milder mode of direct address. Eliot seems to have valued the hesitancy and tentativeness available in earnest, discursive prose, and especially its eschewal of superlatives and bombast in favor of constant qualification and nuance. Thus, von Hallberg made a compelling case that Eliot’s pivot away from the aggressively fragmented techniques of The Waste Land in moments like this can be considered as, in part, a reaction against the bold, extremist propaganda that characterized contemporary Third Reich journalism.

In his lecture, von Hallberg modeled a way of reading poetry that was, to me, new and refreshing. His approach allowed the stylistic elements of Eliot’s poetry to clarify his political commitments, while still refusing to reduce East Coker to a straightforward record of external politics. Drawing our attention to the dynamic interplay of lyric and discursive moments in the poem, von Hallberg’s reading demonstrated how East Coker emerges from and speaks back to a complex and unstable force field of political discourse, offering important new insight into Eliot’s particular mode of anti-fascist resistance, and how that resistance infuses the poetry itself. What stood out to me most in both this talk and his 2019 lecture at the Eliot Festival at Little Gidding is how von Hallberg generously walks his listeners through his own reading practices, zeroing in on the technical elements that create striking poetic effects and then using those moments as springboards to asking new and powerful questions about the poem as a whole. The talk was recorded and is available for wider access on the International T. S. Eliot Society YouTube Channel—yet another silver lining of this digital world (the channel is here; von Hallberg’s lecture is here).

For all the differences of this year, one happy point of consistency was the conclusion of the meeting on a celebratory note. This year’s Fathman Young Scholar awards went to Parker T. Gordon of the University of St. Andrews and Rachel Murray of the University of Sheffield for their papers, respectively titled “Eliot’s The Rock: No Longer ‘Reading Without Seeing’” and “Things that Cling: Marine Attachments in Eliot.” My seminar paper on “Never Anything Anywhere: Whiteness in Eliot’s Literary Imaginary” received the T. S. Eliot Studies Annual prize. To mark the occasion of the forthcoming print edition of the eight-volume Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot from Johns Hopkins UP, general editor Ron Schuchard gave a complete set of the volumes to a lucky attendee; Sarah Coogan won the drawing and will receive the set upon publication in March 2021.

After logging off from the final session, I took my dog for a walk. I’m based in St. Louis, and so the local memory of last year’s in-person conference remained vivid for me. We made our way east down Waterman Boulevard and went past First Unitarian Church, where the weekend meeting proceedings occurred last fall, in what feels now like a different world. At the risk of sounding sentimental, it was satisfying to remember the recent sight of all the familiar faces in their Zoom boxes, and to think that the cities that have served as magnets for past gatherings—St. Louis, Boston, London, Atlanta, etc.—are still there, waiting for this phase to pass so we can fill them once again. Until then, we’ll make do with the silver linings of the ether.

See conference photo spread on p. 10.
Interwar Modernism and the Liberal World Order: Offices, Institutions, and Aesthetics after 1919, by Gabriel Hankins


Reviewed by Matt Seybold
Elmira College

Gabriel Hankins’s Interwar Modernism & The Liberal World Order (2019) was recently nominated for the Modernist Studies Association First Book Prize. The prize committee noted that “the book changes what the political looks like and means for modernist studies.” It does so “by turning the axis of reference from familiar contests between left and right social formations, to the shifting, conflicted juggernaut of modern liberalism.” The committee speaks, indirectly, to the book’s presentist orientation, a somewhat controversial choice to treat what Hankins calls the “Interwar Liberal Order” as interwoven with crises of liberalism which followed World War II just as much as those which preceded it.

Michel Foucault’s analyses of the midcentury Keynesian synthesis, Philip Mirowski’s postmortem for the 2008 global financial meltdown, and very recent works by Lisa Adkins and Melinda Cooper unraveling the mutual dependencies of market liberalism and cultural conservatism right now prepare us as much for Hankins’s Interwar Modernism as does Keynes’s “Am I A Liberal?” (1925) or the classical liberal canon of Hobbes, Locke, Smith, and Mill. Hankins’s book is a reminder that there is no such thing as an anachronistic politics. The Treaty of Versailles can be better understood through present systems of oppression. Claude McKay’s poems and Virginia Woolf’s novels mobilize current and future activisms.

The virtues of presentism are never more apparent than in Hankins’s third chapter, “The Artist as Clerk: Debt, Paperwork, & Liberal Order in T. S. Eliot.” After all, it wasn’t until the last decade, following the 2008 crisis and groundbreaking works by David Graeber, Annie McClanahan, and others, that literary and cultural studies scholars comprehended the extent to which debt was the prevailing organizational structure of the Post45 world for both individuals and institutions.

Annotating Modernism: Marginalia and Pedagogy from Virginia Woolf to the Confessional Poets, by Amanda Golden


Reviewed by John K. Young
Marshall University

When Sylvia Plath was composing “Lady Lazarus,” she used the typescript sheets of The Bell Jar for the poem’s holograph drafts (89n193). When John Berryman taught selections from Ulysses at the University of Minnesota in the 1950s, he instructed his students to skip the opening three chapters, the “Telamachiad” centering on Stephen Dedalus, and begin instead with Leopold Bloom’s day (110). When Anne Sexton delivered a reading of her poems at Harvard in 1959, English department chair Harry Levin’s wife walked out of the auditorium after Sexton finished “Her Kind” (170-1n118). These are just a few of the many fascinating details Amanda Golden assembles in Annotating Modernism, a rich archival study of the reading and teaching practices of mid-century (mostly) American poets. Golden concentrates her three main chapters on Plath, Berryman, and Sexton as careful readers of works by “high” modernists, especially Eliot, Joyce, and Pound, and as teachers. The latter role is perhaps the more instructive because the less studied, though Golden’s rigorous tracing of the underlinings and marginalia in these poets’ copies of modernist works is equally illuminating. Plath’s heavily marked-up copy of The Waste Land, for instance, in her copy of Eliot’s Complete Poems and Plays, includes her observation that the poem’s transition to the “Unreal City” represents a shift in imagery, so that we have “‘no longer old meaning of community’” but now a “mixture of sordid, realistic, and the phantasmagoric” (60). While Plath’s and Sexton’s classroom careers were brief—a year at Smith College in Plath’s case, and a visiting position at Colgate University in Sexton’s, where she taught a workshop on her own work, titled “Anne on Anne”—Berryman spent much of his adult life as a faculty member, primarily at Princeton.
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Pinched in the end. Tweeted a wag (Death Cult for Boomie @CausticPop) on 3 Nov. 2020:

This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but with a WI/MI/PA

[Translation: the outcome of the US presidential election remained undetermined while three states—Wisconsin (postal abbreviation WI), Michigan (MI), and Pennsylvania (PA)—counted votes.]

Touchstone. Asked to recommend a novel outside the mainstream, author Helen DeWitt offers the post-apocalyptic story Riddley Walker, by Russell Hoban, which she first read in 1994. DeWitt notes that the book “had come out in 1980 to acclaim; I’d never heard of it. And yet this extraordinary book seemed to me to be the equal of The Waste Land; it was embarrassing to have to recommend it to people, as if one were to go about saying “I’ve just discovered this amazing poem by someone called T. S. Eliot.” (Cameron Laux, “The Most Overlooked Recent Novels,” bbc.com, 6 Mar. 2020)


An easy Toole. Reviewing the Off-Broadway play Mr. Toole—about the writer John Kennedy Toole—Laura Collins-Hughes explains that the narrator, Lisette, is a student in Toole’s undergraduate poetry class. “She has a raging crush on him, which might be why, after his memorial service, she goes to his parents’ house and tells a devastated Thelma [Toole’s mother] that she wants her paper on ‘The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock,’ by T. S. Eliot, back. Priorities, right?” Scenes of Toole lecturing on “Prufrock” are “meant to probe for signs of frustration and despair.” However, the reviewer complains, “the play is more banal biography than firsthand reminiscence. You could get much the same understanding from Wikipedia.” (“In Mr. Toole, Trying to Remember Teacher,” New York Times, 5 Mar. 2020.)

Shouldn’t they have quoted The Dry Salvages?

Man: “Remember T. S. Eliot?”
Woman: “Yeah, famous poet.”
Man: “He said, ‘And the end of all our exploring / Will be to arrive where we started / And know the place for the first time.’”

So begins a radio commercial, broadcast in both the United States and Canada, for the disposal service 1-800-GOT-JUNK. (20 Aug. 2020)

Practical viruses. In the midst of the Covid pandemic, the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses undertook to standardize the way viruses are named. A debate over the timing of this move ensued among virologists: was this the perfect moment to focus on viral taxonomy or was taxonomy an absurd distraction during a world crisis? In an article on the controversy, Jordan Fenster leads with Eliot, observing that “the naming of viruses is a difficult matter, it isn’t just one of your holiday games.” (“Virologists Arguing Over How to Name Viruses,” ctpost.com, 3 Aug. 2020)

We would see a sign! In a blog post dated 9 Sept. 2020, Alicia Lopez confesses that she finally watched “the cursed Cats 2019 film.” Her first thought, she writes, was “This is not what T. S. Eliot would have wanted.” On reflection, however, she concluded that the film was an omen: “The thought of millions of people watching this film and not warning the world to stock up on non-perishables and bad paperback novels to sit this year out was perhaps even more appalling than the film itself” (underthebutton.com). Lopez was not the first person to have this thought: see June 2020 internet meme below.

We would see a sign! 2020
In Her Own Words

continued from page 2

“Emma.”18 Eliot played Mr. Woodhouse very delightfully, while I was a “natural” for the part of Mrs. Elton. I was overawed by the quiet, reserved, very brilliant young man whose low voice made all he said very difficult to follow, apart from the content of his already individual thinking. I was given to understand by others that “I was the only girl he paid any attention to.”

In 1914 Eliot went to Germany to complete his doctorate study.9 Before leaving for Europe, he very much embarrassed me by telling me he loved me deeply; no mention of marriage was made, but I heard often from him; on certain anniversaries my favorite flower, sweet peas, always arrived.

The outbreak of war caused Eliot to change his plans and he transferred to Merton College, Oxford, in order to study under the great teacher of philosophy — [sic] Joachim.10

Between 1914 and the end of the war, Eliot decided to remain always in England, married an English girl whom he met at Oxford, and came suddenly and brilliantly into a literary lime-light thro’ the publication of The Waste Land.

In 1922 and on later visits, when I went to England for a summer’s holiday, we renewed acquaintance. The circumstances were difficult, he was very unhappy in his marriage, and he found himself once more in love with me. The correspondence of so many years began in 1930, when I was living with a friend in Boston, in an interval between teaching positions.11

1932-34 saw me at Scripps College, Claremont, California, teaching speech and dramatic production, as well as living in residence as a “house mother.” The year 193312 brought Eliot to America for the first time since 1914; he had become an English citizen, an Anglo-Catholic, and a coming literary figure of authority.13 He delivered the Charles Eliot Norton lectures at Harvard, then traveled to Scripps ostensibly as a poet in residence—tho’ that post had not been then designated for popular visitors—but in reality to visit with me and try to straighten out his emotional life, as he was then separated from his wife.14 While at Scripps, he occupied the house of a faculty admirer of his and friend of mine,15 met with small groups of the Seniors and delivered a public lecture on Edward Lear and his humor, the nonsense verses claiming his especial affection.16 A public reading was given at U.C.L.A. before hundreds of students—many there from curiosity rather than knowledge of the poet. This appearance was repeated later at Berkeley.

During the summers of [19]34-1939, relatives of mine, Mr. and Mrs. John Carroll Perkins,17 rented a charming 18th century house with beautiful gardens in the famous Cotswold town of Chipping Campden, Gloucestershire. Each summer of this period, Eliot joined us at Stamford House for longer or shorter stays during his holiday. The charm of the town, the country’s beauty, the comfort of living under Mrs. Perkins’ housekeeping, the easy social engagements among people who were all our friends, added to his

8 The “stunt show” in which they played parts in Eleanor Hinkley’s dramatization of Emma took place on February 17, 1913 (Lyndall Gordon, T. S. Eliot: An Imperfect Life, 78).
9 Eliot departed Boston at the beginning of July, posting a letter to Eleanor Hinkley from London on July 7, 1914.
10 Harold H. Joachim (1868-1938), British idealist philosopher and follower of F. H. Bradley, whose Appearance and Reality was the topic of Eliot’s dissertation.
11 Hale’s friend was Mary Lee Ware (1858-1937), daughter of Charles Eliot Ware, a leading Boston physician; she combined her interests in botany and philanthropy by donating the glass flower collection to Harvard’s Botanical Museum. Ware maintained an extensive farm in West Rindge, New Hampshire, and a home in Boston at 41 Brimmer Street. Hale often visited Ware in West Rindge in the summers and was staying with Ware in 1930 while trying to develop a career lecturing and giving poetry readings.
12 Eliot spent the academic year 1932-33 at Harvard, departing England on 17 September 1932.
13 Eliot briefly visited his family in the summer of 1915 after his marriage with Vivien, but Hale may not have known about this trip.
14 Eliot departed England in 1932 without indicating to Vivien that he did not intend to come back, but initiated the process of legal separation after his visit with Hale at New Year’s, 1933.
15 Mary B. Eyre (c.1876-1946), the first tenured psychology professor at Scripps and author of books on mental health aspects of nursing and illness.
16 Eliot lectured on “Edward Lear and Modern Poetry” on 5 January 1933 at Scripps College, repeating his talk on 9 January at the University of Southern California. See Proc. 3.828-833.
17 Edith Burnside Perkins (née Milliken, 1869-1958) was the sister of Hale’s mother, Emily Jose Hale (née Milliken); in 1892 Edith married John Carroll Perkins (1862-1950), who served as minister of King’s Chapel in Boston from 1927-33. Though often described as Hale’s guardians, they were her aunt and uncle; she was raised by her father, Edward Hale (1858-1918).
release from the bondage of his marriage (Mrs. Eliot was ill enough to be confined in a sanitarium) made these five summers the most truly happy, I believe, of his life—up to his second marriage. In the beautiful garden at the rear of the house, where he and I spent many hours, he proof-read “The Family Reunion,” and worked on a set of Shakespearean lectures. It was from Campden that we walked together to the ruined Georgian house, “Burnt Norton”—the inspiration of that visit producing the first of the “Four Quartets.”

I taught for the first years of the ’40’s at Smith College and Concord Academy, Concord, Mass. Eliot visited me in both situations. At Concord my last year (’46) he was persuaded to give the commencement address “The Meaning of Poetry.” The headmistress in appreciation printed it in the form known since to all collectors of Eliotiana.

Since 1948 I have taught at Abbot Academy for Girls—Andover, Mass., a very old and highly esteemed boarding school. Thro’ his friendship with me, Eliot came three or four times to the school to speak informally with small groups or to address the whole school. His wife’s death however did not bring fruition to our relationship, altho’ the correspondence and his intimacy with me continued till his second marriage in the winter of 1957. (Insert here references to Woods Hole and Vt.)

Among the reasons for my choice of Princeton University as the guardian of these letters, is my life long friendship with Professor & Mrs. Willard Thorp (Margaret Farrand Thorp) of the University, also friends of Eliot, and because Eliot was resident at the Institute for Advanced Studies where he received his Nobel Prize award—and enjoyed life in the town and among his contemporaries.

** (Other very personal visits to me were made at Woods Hole, Mass, and at Dorset Vt, where for two summers I acted with a summer theatre group.)

Recognizing increasingly in this year of our lord 1957 Vital Truth is a priceless heritage in the world of letters or mankind, to pass on to future generations, I bequeath this collection to a public perhaps yet unborn. The length of time before it is made available is [owing to Mr.] Eliot’s insistence. I have had much kindness and happiness of experience in this friendship—as well as inevitable pain. May the record speak all this in itself.

Signed
Emily Hale

[on a separate page, in pen, Hale has added the following:]

I should like to add a very important word of gratitude for the great kindness, courtesy and understanding of the current librarian Mr. William Dix, and his curator of Rare Manuscripts, together, with Professor Thorp, made this rather delicate business, as easy for me as possible.

Emily Hale

** (Insert earlier before the 1948 paragraph)

Andover—July 15, 1957

18 “The Development of Shakespeare’s Verse. Two Lectures” (Prose 5.531-561), delivered at Edinburgh University on 27-28 October 1937. The carbon typescripts of these lectures were given to Houghton Library by Emily Hale.


20 Eliot’s speech actually took place in 1947: “On Poetry: An Address by T. S. Eliot on the Occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of Concord Academy, Concord, Massachusetts, June 3, 1947” (Prose 7.11-18)


22 Hale and Margaret Farrand Thorp (1891-1970) became lifelong friends as children in East Orange, NJ; Margaret wrote literary criticism, biography, and journalism (e.g., America at the Movies, 1969) and taught at Smith College before marrying Willard Thorp (1899-1990), Princeton professor and scholar of American literature and Elizabethan and Restoration drama.
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Sara Fitzgerald
Interwar Modernism
continued from page 6

As Hankins demonstrates, it is only from within our present realization of weaponized debt, made visible by recent capitalist crises, that we can fully appreciate debt as a conceit in Eliot's poetry and criticism, and debt as a stark reality of Eliot's life as a banker, publisher, and breadwinner. The Eliot who composed The Waste Land was equally familiar with the roles of debtor and debt collector. Warren Buffet would not compare debt-backed securities to "weapons of mass destruction" until 2002, but what was the Ruhr Eliot visited on behalf of Lloyds Bank if not a ghost country, ravaged as much by reparations payments as by British munitions? Debt is the catalyst and conqueror of Cold War geopolitics, supplementing conventional military imperialism when it cannot fully replace it. Neither fear nor courage will save us from our debts.

There is much to commend about Hankins's work, but foremost is his debunking of one of the resilient myths of modernism, that is, that it was an aesthetic movement devoid of base politics, disconnected from the social turmoil of the interbellum period, and largely disinterested in the collision of ideologies—capitalism against communism, liberalism against authoritarianism, etc.—which occupied lesser minds like Walter Lippmann. Hankins belongs to a generation of scholars committed to dispelling this myth, both because it is complicit in the false impression created by the enshrining tendencies of midcentury critics that modernist literature was disproportionately written by white men educated in elite institutions, and because it wrongly suggests that authors and culture-makers were not integral participants in the "history-making" institutions.

This latter point is, I think, less familiar and even more prescient for readers in 2020. Interwar Modernism and the Liberal World Order shows us that a transatlantic community of modernist poets and prose-writers were not only "on the ground," making an impact in government agencies, political organizations, banks and other corporations, and many of the other ascendant bureaucracies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which shaped the political and economic paradigms of liberalism, but that their experiences in these institutions were not ancillary to their art. To the contrary, much of the modernist canon would not exist (or would look radically different) were it not for such direct involvement in the making (and sometimes resisting) of liberal world order.

Annotating Modernism
continued from page 6

Hankins's work is particularly timely because it reminds us that many of the authors treated as ivory tower elitists—T. S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf among them—were anything but, and that creative writing and cultural criticism was then and should again be urgently transportable between academic, activist, commercial, governmental, and public spheres.

and Minnesota. As Golden demonstrates in detail, these poets contributed to the mid-century shaping of the modernist canon within American literature departments, while their own close readings of their modernist forebears also helped to shape the American poetry that would follow that movement.

One of the great pleasures of Golden's study is its rich array of photographs, enabling readers to experience first-hand the marginal glosses and other material evidence from which her argument develops. These images include the bookshelf and reading chair in Plath's dormitory room at Smith; underlined pages from Plath's copies of Ulysses, Finnegans Wake, The Waste Land, and Edmund Wilson's Axel's Castle; Berryman's notes on Ezra Pound's XXX Cantos and Pisan Cantos (for a proposed New Directions introduction that Pound nixed, but which Berryman published instead in Partisan Review); the Humanities 54 syllabus for Berryman's course at Minnesota in the mid-1960s; and Sexton's exuberant "Yes! Yes!" in the margins of Philip Rahv's introduction to Franz Kafka's Selected Stories, when Rahv quoted Kafka's comment (which Sexton underlined for good measure) that "the books we read are of the kind that act upon us like a misfortune, that make us suffer like the death of someone we love more than ourselves" (145). Witnessing these writers as readers enables Golden's readers to see how those roles influenced each other, as for instance in Plath's note in her copy of Ulysses that Stephen Dedalus is "imprisoned by everything" (37). Similarly, her reading of "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock," as refracted through Elizabeth Drew's modernist literature course at Smith and Edmund Wilson's Axel's Castle, leads Plath to the insight that Prufrock and Henry James's John Marcher (from "The Beast in the Jungle") share the "fate to be men without experience: who never force moment to crisis: men to whom 'nothing happens'" (56). Berryman's lectures on Pound and Eliot at the University of Cincinnati...
Golden expertly assembles this material evidence in support of her local readings, and of her broader claim for the role of marginalia and other personal documents in her approach to modernism: “Modernism has the reputation of concerning itself with the autonomous, free-standing artwork. In fact, as we will see in the following chapters, the intimacy of texts and surrounding texts is integral to modernism, and margins and edges present a meeting ground” (15). *Annotating Modernism* offers persuasive cases for the inflection of modernist “classics” through these poets’ reading and teaching of those works. (And as Plath notes in a letter to her brother that Golden observes that Berryman’s notes for this lecture “had placed ‘original’ in scare quotes . . . suggesting that what makes Eliot’s work distinctive is in part due to the work of others” (108). Sexton, meanwhile, dissects her own response to the “impersonality” of the poet in Eliot’s “Tradition and the Individual Talent” in one of her “Anne on Anne” lectures, quoting from a critical essay on Lowell, Plath, and Sexton that emphasizes Sexton’s way of “coming to terms with painful and intensely personal experience” in contrast to Eliot’s distinction between “the man who suffers and the mind which creates” (151; Sexton’s underlinings).

Golden deploys *The Waste Land* and *Ulysses* as recurrent brief examples, returning to each of the three main objects of her study to show how each of their copies of these works constitutes “a different document” because of the specific inflections of their annotations, and the particular reading situations from which they developed. While Berryman advised his students at the University of Cincinnati “Don’t worry about them” in relation to Eliot’s notes in *The Waste Land* (qtd. on 108), Plath incorporated Eliot’s notes into her own research on his sources when teaching the poem at Smith, with the aim of “making accessible Eliot’s difficult, fragmentary poem, introducing her students to its antecedents” (62). Plath’s course with Drew, and Drew’s book *T. S. Eliot: The Design of His Poetry* (1949) were among the important sources in the young poet’s own working through of the poetic tradition Eliot represented, as Golden demonstrates, even as Plath ultimately turned away from following Drew’s path as a teacher, grounded in “the distinction she drew on her final day of teaching between living in the world and writing about it” (63).

*Annotating Modernism* will make an important contribution to the scholarship on modernism’s curricular enshrinement in the years after World War II, and to the growing body of work on modernism’s material texts (such as Jerome McGann’s *Black Riders*, George Bornstein’s *Material Modernism*, and Dirk Van Hulle’s *Modern Manuscripts*, among others). Golden’s subtitle is slightly misleading, as Virginia Woolf figures only occasionally in these pages, and the book’s rich array of archival documents might well have included more material evidence from these poets’ own notebooks, to show more precisely the ways in which their work as annotators and teachers left its traces on their habits of composition and revision. These quibbles aside, Golden’s study is sure to enrich our understandings of mid-century poetry, and of the coalescing modernist tradition from which it emerged.
ELIOT NEWS & SOCIETY NOTES

Benjamin G. Lockerd, Eliot scholar, past President of the Society (2004-2006), friend and colleague to us all, announces his retirement from Grand Valley State University, in Allendale, MI, at the end of 2019, after 35 years on the faculty. We are grateful for his service to this Society; we congratulate him on his retirement; and we stand in awe of his timing, stepping down just as Zoom was ramping up.

There is now an International T. S. Eliot Society YouTube channel. We are delighted to announce that the first posting on the channel is Bob von Hallberg’s Memorial Lecture from this year’s annual conference: an auspicious way to inaugurate the channel. Make sure you subscribe to your Society’s new media venture!

And while we’re on the subject of the Society making its mark in non-print media: in September, our President, Jayme Stayer, was interviewed for two different podcasts by a Scottish podcaster, Ash Caton, who does a show on books and literary topics called “Ear Read This.” There are walk-on appearances in these episodes by Jason Harding, John Haffenden, Frances Dickey, Ron Schuchard, David Chinitz, and Pat Stayer (Jayme’s mother). Jayme also thanks Julia Daniel, “who gave me some talking points before the interview, and made me seem more prepared than I actually was.” Follow the links to hear the Episode on Eliot’s Murder in the Cathedral and an Episode on the Eliot Society and Jayme’s own work on the Complete Prose; there’s a third episode planned for spring 2021, on “Prufrock.”

In more ordinary times, Nancy Gish announces, in the Fall issue of Time Present, a Call for Papers for the American Literature Association conference, which is (very) tentatively scheduled to take place in Boston, from May 27-30, 2021 (check that linked conference website as the event’s time approaches). The ALA has advised its panel organizers, as they choose the participants for 2021, that they give priority to those whose papers were accepted for the 2020 conference (which had to be cancelled). If you do have an interest in participating in the ALA 2021 event, and would like to check in with Nancy about that, you may reach her at nancy.gish@maine.edu.

Kevin Rulo is pleased to announce the publication of Satiric Modernism, forthcoming, in spring 2021, from Clemson University Press. In his book, Kevin reveals the crucial linkages between satire and modernism. He shows how satire enables modernist authors to evaluate modernity critically and to explore their ambivalence about the modern. Through provocative new readings of familiar texts and the introduction of largely unknown works, Satiric Modernism exposes a larger satiric mentality at work in well-known authors like T. S. Eliot, James Joyce, Wyndham Lewis, Ezra Pound, Virginia Woolf, and Ralph Ellison and in less studied figures like G. S. Street, the Sitwells, J. J. Adams, and Herbert Read, as well as in the literature of migration of Sam Selvon and John Agard, in the films of Paolo Sorrentino, and in the drama of Sarah Kane.

John Melillo would like to announce that his first book, The Poetics of Noise from Dada to Punk, was published this fall by Bloomsbury Academic on their Sound Studies list. The book traces how poets, lyricists, and performers from the First World War to the present figure noise in the sound of language. The case studies

Send news of Eliot-related events and professional milestones to tseliotsociety@gmail.com.
range from ear-witness poetry of the Western Front to punk performance and contemporary noise music. Society members may be particularly interested in the third chapter of the book—“The Persistence of ‘That Da-Da Strain’: The Modernist Travels of ‘Da’”—in which Eliot’s DA appears alongside Mamie Medina and Edgar Dowell’s “That Da-Da Strain” and Langston Hughes’s short poem, “Negro Dancers.”

Ghareeb Iskander announces the publication, with Bloomsbury, of *English Poetry and Modern Arabic Verse: Translation and Modernity*, which is the first study to examine the Arabic translations of a number of major modern poems in the English language, in particular T. S. Eliot’s *The Waste Land* and Walt Whitman’s Song of Myself. With case studies dedicated to the Arab translators who were themselves modernist poets, including Badr Shakir al-Sayyab and Saadi Yusuf, the author argues for a reading of the translations as literary works in their own right.

A panel on T. S. Eliot and Emily Hale, organized and chaired by Gabrielle McIntire, will be held at the MLA Annual Meeting in Toronto, January 7-10, 2021. Panelists will be Frances Dickey, Megan Quigley, John Whittier-Ferguson, and Tony Cuda. The session will take place on Saturday, 9 January 2021 from 10:15 AM - 11:30 AM.

Jewel Spears Brooker has recently placed an article in *The Glass* (published by the Christian Literary Studies Group at Oxford), titled “Good and Evil in Eliot’s Letters to Emily Hale”; she will also present a talk at the 2021 MLA convention, in a session on “Eliot, Emily Hale, and the Religious Imagination.” The session will take place on Friday, 8 January 2021 10:15 AM - 11:30 AM.

C. R. Mittal announces the publication, on the Google Books platform, of *Eliot’s Early Poetry in Perspective*.

Sally Waterman announces the recent production of two short films, parts of what she’s calling “The Wellow Project,” each informed by *Four Quartets*. *Wellow* dwells upon place, ancestry, mortality, and religion, triggered by the redevelopment of the artist’s late Grandfather’s Baptist chapel in a rural village on the Isle of Wight (Wellow is a village on that Isle). *From our Mothers’ Arms* centers on a telephone conversation between the artist and her mother made during the coronavirus pandemic lockdown. Ultimately, the entire project is about the end of an era and an imaged future: “In my beginning is my end.” Sally would welcome feedback from Society members on these films (email@sallywaterman.com).

Massimo Bacigalupo chaired the jury of the Genoa International Film Festival, which awarded special mention to Kyrgyzstan filmmaker Lilya Lifanova’s short feature film *Flight Over Wasteland*, which is, Massimo writes, “a brilliant reading performance of T. S. Eliot’s poem.” He also reminds us that this year’s Nobel Prize winner for literature, Louise Glück, is the author of a fine, admiring essay, “On T. S. Eliot” (in *Proofs and Theories*). Massimo is the translator of Glück’s only books of poetry available in Italian, *The Wild Iris* (2003) and *Averno* (2019).

The Society seeks nominations for two seats on the Board—those presently held by Cyrena Pondrom and Nancy Gish. These are three-year positions, running from July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2024.

Elected members are expected to attend the annual conference of the Society, at which the Board meeting is held, and to take on other tasks in service to the Society. Nominations and self-nominations should be sent to the Supervisor of Elections, Frances Dickey (dickeyf@missouri.edu) by January 31, 2021. Candidates with five or more nominations will appear on the ballot, announced in the spring issue of Time Present.

Members may also make nominations for honorary membership and for distinguished service awards. These nominations should be made to the President, Jayme Stayer, by August 1, 2021.
Rolled Trousers and Sand-Stained Dresses: Eliot’s Fashionable Voices

This paper interrogates the rhetorical use of fashion in T. S. Eliot’s works. A strong critical tradition within cultural studies has connected the art of fashion with a subject’s conception of language and identity. Indeed, Stuart Hall argues that fashion represents “some element to stand for or represent what we want to say, to express or communicate a thought, concept, idea or feeling” (4). Furthermore, for Susan Kaiser, fashion “becomes a metaphor for having a voice or a sense of agency through everyday looks or fashioning of the body” (5). The notions of “communication” and “agency”—or a lack thereof—appear particularly important to Eliot’s textual personae. Given the close connection of fashion and clothing choice to expression, I aim to investigate the multifaceted styles in which Eliot “dresses” his subjects: that is, the way he deploys images of clothing to demonstrate a space of social division that concurrently underscores a repelling of and pining for connection.

Fashion imagery is not necessarily central in Eliot’s works, but when articles of clothing do appear, they convey a sense of interaction that has often failed. Prufrock’s famously “rolled trousers” add to the image of an aging speaker attempting to appear more youthful in the eyes of the bracelet, bare-armed women, and in “Portrait of a Lady,” the speaker “take[s] [his] hat” while considering how to rebuff his female counterpart’s advances. By considering the relationship between the speakers and characters in Eliot’s works and their physical garments, I argue that clothing functions as a marker of expression that simultaneously self-sabotages and differentiates while conveying a longing for concord within the subject.

Elyssa Balavage
UNC Greensboro

Writing the Fragmented City: Eliot, Loy, and Mirrlees

This paper explores some common resonances between Eliot’s poetry and some poems by Mina Loy and Hope Mirrlees, focusing particularly on how the three poets write the city as a fragmented text and often also as a transcultural and transhistorical palimpsest. As several scholars have argued, Hope Mirrlees’s long poem Paris (1920) anticipates a number of the formal and thematic motifs developed by Eliot in The Waste Land. I dig deeper into these common resonances between Eliot’s canonical modernist masterpiece and the poems of his lesser-known female contemporaries, taking as my starting point the echoes between Mirrlees’s Paris and Loy’s earlier poem sequence “Three Moments in Paris” (1914), which suggest that Loy’s work may be seen as one of the possible intertexts of Mirrlees’s poem. These two poems share imagery and use disjointed, elliptical syntax, experimental typography, and collage techniques seeking to capture the complex simultaneity of modern urban experience, and an ironically detached poetic voice conveying what Loy called “the altered observation of modern eyes.” I then examine some points of contiguity between Mirrlees’s Paris, Eliot’s The Waste Land and Loy’s “Lunar Baedeker” (1923), which is, I argue, to some extent a response to Eliot’s poem. All three poets use fragmentation, urban wandering, and intertextuality to transform the cityscape into a disorienting palimpsest where modernity coexists with tradition. The Waste Land’s poetics of wandering around a modern “unreal city” strewn with the ruins of the past finds its equivalents in the poems of Mirrlees and Loy; while “Etruscan tombs” figure prominently in the opening sequence of Mirrlees’s poem, Loy’s “Lunar Baedeker” transforms the decadent ambience of Paris into a surreal, composite cityscape where “Delirious Avenues” are strewn with “Pharoah’s tombstones.” In Loy’s poem, a lunar necropolis cluttered with the debris of tradition is conflated with the modern metropolis.

Yasna Bozhkova
Sorbonne Nouvelle U Paris

T. S. Eliot on Ersatz Education

Born into a family boasting eminent educators—William Greenleaf Eliot, founder of Washington University in St. Louis, and Charles William Eliot, famous Harvard President—T. S. Eliot joined the debate about schools and universities early on, in the era of the great educational reform leading to the development of the system of elective courses. The
family influence might have emerged in the elusive form of a chemical metaphor T. S. Eliot deployed in his literary theory (a nod to Charles William’s scientific rigor) or as T. S. Eliot’s claim that education should involve emotions and mould character (the idea bequeathed to him by William Greenleaf). His own education being a product of the elective system (and he himself, as he complained, a “victim” of it), Eliot criticized the changes in the university education and lamented the resulting decline in Classics; but his concern with the problem of education was never purely theoretical. Prior to working at Lloyds Bank, and before his professional and financial investment in Faber and Faber, he taught in grammar schools and, from 1916, as an extension lecturer under the auspices of Oxford University, evening classes to adults. His interest in educational issues continued over many years, assuming diverse forms—from writing on education to lecturing and giving opening addresses at universities to recommending poetry books for pupils and asking practical questions about the accessibility of university accommodation for students from abroad. He was, however, criticized for being an anti-egalitarianist opposing the equality of educational opportunity. It is the aim of this paper to re-examine the ideas from Eliot’s Notes on the Definition of Culture and “The Aims of Education” in the context of his ephemeral prose writings and to reconsider the question of whether his views did indeed represent exclusivist elitism in education.

Anna Budziak
U Wrocław, Poland

““That corpse you planted last year in your garden”: Eliot and Golden Age Detective Fiction

This paper examines a selection of Eliot’s poetry and drama in the 1920s in the context of his contemporaneous reviews of and essays in detective and melodramatic fiction, many written for his magazine The Criterion. An enthusiastic admirer of a number of the most popular crime writers of this decade, including R. Austin Freeman and Freeman Wills Crofts, Eliot is exemplary of the close interaction between modernist authors and the burgeoning mystery fiction of the inter-war period. Eliot’s The Waste Land, Sweeney Agonistes and related texts have literary accomplices in the interbellum crime fiction of George Antheil, Ezra Pound and Olga Rudge, and Gertrude Stein, in which exploitation of middlebrow genre writing illustrates the extent to which the avant-garde drew upon the recreational culture of these years. As a case-study, this paper further briefly examines Eliot’s reading in Freeman, drawing attention to the crime writer’s possible subterranean presence in The Waste Land. Attention is also paid to Eliot’s critical appraisal of another well-received detective novelist of the twenties, J. J. Connington, considering parallels between aspects of two of the latter’s novels, Mystery at Lynden Sands and In Whose Dim Shadow, and Eliot’s essays on Wilkie Collins’s sensation fiction and the ‘mythical method’ outlined in his 1923 review of Ulysses. The two examples, it is hoped, throw into relief the ‘two-way traffic’ between literary modernism and a widely read form of genre-fiction in this period—a conjunction representative, it could be argued, of the fascination exerted by puzzles of all kinds in post-War Britain.

Alex Davis
University College Cork

Elyne Mitchell: Fangirl in the 40s: Australian Female Environmentalist, Author, Photographer, Original Scholar of the Green T. S. Eliot

Jeremy Diaper’s 2019 T. S. Eliot & Organicism has created a buzz in the Eliot world in the year since its publication. It also participates in the “greening” of Eliot. Through close reading and detailed connections, Diaper provides a reading of Eliot that definitively shows an Eliot actively engaged in the conversations about soil conservation that take place in the New English Weekly—not only in his prose but also in his poetry and drama. Diaper persuasively shows that a reader could perceive Eliot engaged in those conversations; yet he doesn’t provide evidence that readers were reading Eliot in this way.

Elyne Mitchell uncovers the “green” Eliot as early as 1945 in her Speak to The Earth with a reverie on
Burnt Norton’s kingfishers and a reading of Marina. Yet, at some point in 1945, Mitchell must have received all of the Quartets and is so struck with the environmental aspects of the poem in its entirety that she acquires a breadth and depth of Eliot’s prose and dramatic writings (she had for several years owned the Collected Poems 1909-1935). The forward to her 1946 Soil and Civilization acknowledges her “great debt to Mr. T. S. Eliot, from whose poetry I have taken many of the quotations in this book.” That great debt quickly becomes visible as the 140-page volume blooms with at least forty-two quotations from, references to, or paraphrases of Eliot.

However, it’s not simply her great debt to but her astute reading of Eliot as an environmental activist that should be acknowledged. She may in fact be the first literary scholar to so extensively engage the green Eliot. This presentation will draw on an early gesture to Mitchell’s reading of Eliot in Soil and Civilization (from an essay I have forthcoming in Modernism/modernity), but will expand that reading as well as explicate the earlier connections in Speak to The Earth alongside brief correspondence between Mitchell and Eliot. I show the extensive engagement that Mitchell had with the theological, geological, and biological connections to conservation and environmentalism in Eliot’s writings.

LeeAnn Derdeyn
Southern Methodist U

Marginalia and the T. S. Eliot Archive

2020 has proved to be a landmark year for the T. S. Eliot archive. Access to Eliot’s correspondence with Emily Hale has introduced readers to new facets of his life and work. Hale taught at Smith College from 1936 to 1942, four years before Elizabeth Drew arrived. A pioneering Eliot scholar, Drew came to write T. S. Eliot: The Design of His Poetry (1949) and instilled Eliot’s presence in the Smith curriculum. Among others, Drew taught the poet Sylvia Plath, and when Plath returned to teach first year English at Smith from 1957 to 1958, Eliot provided an anchor for her course. As she prepared to teach, Plath worked closely from Drew’s book, annotating Eliot’s poems anew, and reading critics whom Drew had noted.

The Waste Land presents a paradigmatic example for modernist considerations of annotation. The impact that Eliot’s sources had for the midcentury reading population is emblematic of the extent to which academic close reading strategies developed in response to modernist texts. As William Carlos Williams put it in 1951, The Waste Land “[gave] the poem back to the academics.” Rachel Sagner Buurma and Laura Heffernan have recently addressed the impact of Eliot’s The Sacred Wood on the literary canon, noting that the students whom he taught shaped the essays Eliot came to publish. This paper turns to Eliot’s poems, shifting from his notes to those that students and teachers composed in response to them. Such materials, this paper argues, are where Eliot’s institutional presence takes hold.

Amanda Golden
New York Institute of Technology

Religious Drama: Does It Work?

My dissertation examines thirteen playwrights working in the British Isles between 1890 and 1945 who were initiated members of occult secret societies, exploring how their magical rituals influenced their plays. Then my last chapter turns to plays from the English liturgical verse drama revival written for and performed in a Christian ecclesiastical setting, of which Eliot’s Murder in the Cathedral is probably the most well-known. In this paper, I draw from that chapter to explore questions about illocutionary force in Murder and The Rock, asking whether Eliot believed that a theatrical performance could function as a worship service. I inquire whether, according to Eliot’s dramaturgical theories of the 1930s, the boundary between a worship service and a stage play could be entirely dissolved. Drawing on the Complete Prose from the 1930s, which suggests a pragmatic dramaturgy, I explore Eliot’s ideas about the dearth of theater-going audiences, the necessity for new authors of ecclesiastical drama, the theater’s didactic purpose, and the need for a serious cause to motivate the composition of such new plays.

Sørina Higgins
Baylor U
Francis Bacon’s *The Eumenides*, Indebted to T. S. Eliot’s *The Family Reunion*

In 1944 the modernist artist Francis Bacon completed his *Three Studies for Figures at the Base of a Crucifixion*, also known as *The Eumenides*. It is a triptych depicting three grotesque, amorphous creatures, characteristic of Bacon’s disturbing representation of the body. He found inspiration in the Furies as they appear in T. S. Eliot’s *The Family Reunion* (1936), and especially—I argue—in their ambivalent role in the play.

_The Family Reunion_ was modelled on Aeschylus’s _The Furies_. Eliot’s modern Orestes, Harry, is pursued and tormented by the Furies for having supposedly killed his wife. As a truly traditional artist in the Eliotic sense, while working on _Three Studies_ Bacon drew on the work of his predecessors (Grünewald, Eisenstein), and was equally fascinated by _The Family Reunion_, which he saw staged several times.

Curiously, the definitive text of _The Family Reunion_ contains no indications as to the visual appearance of the Furies. Their representation—motionless and silent, a frozen image at the back of the stage—is the play’s central challenge, as Eliot himself acknowledged in “Poetry and Drama.” Details of productions of Eliot’s play may have inspired Bacon’s _Three Studies_. The triptych, however, is coherent with his expressionist style and his avowed indebtedness to Eliot’s imagery of devastation, more resonant in the post-war (and post-Shoah) context in which the painting was composed.

Yet there is room for hope in _The Family Reunion_: the terrifying Furies become salvific “bright angels” when Harry envisages a purgatorial way out of his private hell. Bacon’s combination of mythology (the Furies/Eumenides) and Christian iconography (the Virgin Mary, Mary Magdalene, and John the Evangelist are, conventionally, the three figures at the foot of the Cross) seems to parallel the Furies’ evolving, dual role in Eliot’s play.

_Dídac Llorens-Cubedo_  
Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia

“The Old Lady Shows Her Medals”: Eliot’s Sherlockian Allusions

The 2015 edition of _The Poems of T. S. Eliot_, edited by Christopher Ricks and Jim McCue, outlines important, previously uncollected material around Eliot’s allusions to Sherlock Holmes in both _East Coker_ and in “Macavity: The Mystery Cat.” The headnote to the section of notes on “Macavity” provides a rough overview of Eliot’s playful planting of his allusions in these works as well as in his play _Murder in the Cathedral_ in order to gain membership into the various scion societies of the Sherlock Holmes fan club Baker Street Irregulars. One key thing this account leaves out is that Eliot could have easily gained access to the invitation-only BSI through his friend and colleague Frank Morley, who created the crossword that Frank’s brother Christopher Morley used to start the BSI on a whim in 1934. In fact, as vol. 7 of the _Letters of T. S. Eliot_ cross-referenced with materials from the BSI proves, Eliot was Frank’s backup at Faber and Faber during the time he was off creating this crossword. The present paper is based in my archival research in the Eliot archives at King’s College, as well as the Christopher Morley archives at the University of Texas at Austin, the Vincent Starrett archives at the University of Minnesota, and the Baker Street Irregulars archives, as well as my interactions with members of the present-day BSI. It also references work from the _Complete Prose_ and the _Letters_. This paper outlines a fuller context around Eliot’s interactions with the BSI, his abiding interest in Sherlock Holmes, and how he came to collect at least a few of the dozen membership cards from various BSI scion societies. Understanding this context will unpack Eliot’s social context, fascination with Holmes, and the playful-serious nature of his Sherlockian allusions.

_Deborah Leiter_  
U Wisconsin-Platteville

Additional abstracts will appear in our Spring issue.
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