GEOFFREY HILL TO GIVE
2001 MEMORIAL LECTURE

The distinguished poet and critic Geoffrey Hill will be the Society's 22nd Memorial Lecturer. Regarded by many, including Harold Bloom and John Hollander, as the most powerful living English poet, Hill is the author of such celebrated books of poems as Mercian Hymns (1971), Tenebrae (1978) and more recently, Canaan (1997), The Triumph of Love (1998) and Speech! Speech! (2000). Hill’s critical prose includes the following books: The Lords of Limit (1984), The Enemy's Country (1991), and Illuminating Shadows (1992). Geoffrey Hill is University Professor and Professor of Religion and Literature at Boston University.

The Society has a small fund to help defray expenses of graduate students and new PhDs whose papers are selected for presentation.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Members are invited to nominate individuals for the following positions and awards:

Honorary Membership: The Board of Directors may confer Honorary (non-dues-paying, lifetime) Membership on friends and students of T.S. Eliot, distinguished for service in perpetuating the memory of the poet and knowledge of his work (total not to exceed ten). Society members may nominate individuals by submitting their names to the President of the Society by July 28, 2001. Board Members may not be nominated during their terms of office. Currently, the Honorary Members are:

Mrs. T.S. Eliot
Rober Giroux
A.D. Moody
Andre Osze
Leonard Unger

Distinguished Service Award: The Board of Directors may confer Distinguished Service Awards on members who have rendered the Society notable service of long duration or distinction. Society members may nominate recipients by submitting their names to the President of the Society by July 28, 2001. This year, multiple awards may be conferred; subsequently, up to two awards may be conferred annually.
T.S. Eliot's "What Dante Means to Me" and a Four-Piece Suit: A Reminiscence and Some Thoughts

Christopher S. Durer

We strolled up Shaftesbury Avenue dazzled by theatre lights and the smartly dressed women, and a tall figure loomed ahead. One of us said: "Surely it's Eliot." We watched him disappear through a stage door, come out almost immediately, and we left him on the pavement engrossed in a conversation with stout, overdressed men who looked like theatre producers—we four undergraduates rambling through London's West End on a brisk spring day of 1950.

The next time I saw Eliot was several months later, on July 4, when he gave the talk "What Dante Means To Me" at the Instituto Italiano di Cultura in Belgrave Square. Dressed in what were for him the obligatory black coat and striped trousers, and looking more like a head of state than a poet, Eliot was introduced by the Italian Ambassador, who compared him to Dante Alighieri, and spoke glowingly of "questi due fratelli" Eliot and Dante. A sense of the occasion and solemnity were truly in the air! But when Eliot turning towards the Ambassador said with disarming candor that he never even dreamt of calling Dante a "fratello" the ice was broken at once. Eliot began with the address "Your Excellency, Your Graces, Your Worships, My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen," appropriate words for special occasions but, with the exception of "Your Excellency" for the Ambassador, sounding hollow, if not downright anachronistic, in the England of 1950 when English society was already being reshaped and the Labour Government was doing away with the social injustices of centuries. I don't know if there were any archbishops, dukes, duchesses, high officials or lords in the audience, but the speaker apparently felt that they deserved recognition whether they were present or not. However, what followed was very different. Leaning forward from behind the lectern, looking frail and smiling often, Eliot spoke in a familiar and confessional tone which endeared him to the audience. Once again the ice was broken.

This ambivalence in Eliot the public figure between the love of ceremony and genuine emotion, and the ambivalence in Eliot the dramatist of contemporary England between a traditional pattern around which a play is built, and the invention and spontaneity which change and deformalize it, helps us to understand him better as a man and playwright. Eliot set his last four plays in the English upper-class world, but in the last two he went far beyond the aristocratic stereotypes. To return to the man: for Eliot England was always a never-never land, something like Agatha Christie's St. Mary Meade but considerably less real. He accepted its social order and the class structure, invariably identifying himself with the English upper classes, and seeing more substance in their rites and conventions than most upper-class Englishmen. Hence Virginia Woolf's words uttered at the end of the First World War and echoed by various members of the Bloomsbury Group, that Tom was really very nice despite his "four-piece suit," held good for the rest of his life. And successive generations of poets and intellectuals found Tom, or Mr. Eliot as he became to many of them, also very nice despite his "four-piece suit." All his life T.S. Eliot wore his "four-piece suit" with relish, both literally and metaphorically, but this did not prevent him from showing to the world his more human side. It is, therefore, hardly unexpected that "What Dante Means To Me," one of Eliot's most personal and intimate pronouncements on poetry and necessary reading for anyone examining his poetic education, should have been delivered among pomp and circumstance rivaling a royal occasion. This prompts me to turn to Eliot's drama because in it, more than in his poetry or critical writings, "a four-piece suit" holds center stage.

Much has been written about the classical influences on Eliot's last four plays, about martyrdom and saintliness in the first two, about the shedding of illusions, and self-discovery and auto-biographical elements in all of them, and about the progressive development in their verse and characterization. Still, I would like to add a thought or two about the last two plays, always bearing in mind Eliot's relation to the upper-class world. In The Confidential Clerk (1953) Eliot not only moves to a more inventive and more sympathetic characterization than was found in his earlier two plays, but he also moves from upper-class stereotypes to English eccentrics. Thus Lady Elizabeth, an earl's daughter and one of Eliot's true aristos, is a great comic creation with a pedigree of the comedy of manners and sentimental comedy, and she stands alongside the su-
superb dramatic heroines of the English stage like Millamant, Lady Teazle, and Lady Bracknell, having at the same time much in common with Mrs. Sealand of The Conscious Lovers, and Deborah Primrose of The Vicar of Wakefield. Significantly, Elizabeth is developed not through upper-class trappings which define numerous characters in The Family Reunion (1939) and The Cocktail Party (1949) but through personality traits which are often contradictory, being simultaneously kind-hearted and domineering, absent-minded and practical, scheming and altruistic. As a result, she is a human being first, her aristocratic standing serving for the most part as a leavening agent intensifying her various attributes. Elizabeth's first appearance, which demonstrates the author's keen sense of the comedy of situation, introduces her as an unpredictable eccentric who orders that her medicine bottle be given to the cabman because “He tells me that he suffers from chronic catarrh, ” and whose subsequent performance is not only delightful in its own right but strengthens the Comic structure of the play which she dominates and ultimately shapes.

Moreover, the ethos of The Confidential Clerk is that of benevolence. Eggerson (a Dickensian character and another of Eliot's highly successful dramatic creations) describes B. Kaghan as “one of the most promising young men in the City/And he has a heart of gold.” Not he alone! All the other characters, including the redoubtable Mrs. Guzzard, also have hearts of gold and they treat one another, as they advance through a minefield of explosive issues, with kindness and consideration. Sir Claude and Lady Elizabeth readily forgive each other's foibles, Colby and Lucasta forge a new friendship, and Colby is loved by everybody. The similarity between Eliot's comedy and Ion of Euripides and the various Roman comedies is obvious. But what is even more important is the kinship binding this play to the rich vein of English sentimental comedy and to the English novels tradition from Richardson to Galsworthy where sentiment plays a crucial role. As for the foundlings and cases of mistaken identity, they recur not only in Ancient Comedy but, what is closer to home, in the English eighteenth-century novel and drama with the result that The Confidential Clerk becomes an organic part of the sentimental tradition in English literature, being as well an integral part of that of the comedy of manners.

In like fashion, The Elder Statesman (1958), which is autobiographical in part and resembles Oedipus at Colonus, is a morality play and occupies its rightful place in the long tradition of this genre in English literature and among the distinguished twentieth-century morality plays such as MacLeish's J.B. and Dürrenmatt's The Visit. It is the commonly encountered offenses of which Lord Claverton is guilty, fleeing the scene of an accident, corrupting those who put their trust in him, and reneging on a promise of marriage; these offences, which stand symbolically for three broad areas of wrongdoing, thoughtless or cowardly physical act, betrayal by the mind, and sexually caused transgression of the moral law, cast him in the role of Everyman: Thus a democratizing and universalizing process takes place, as the struggle for the soul of Everyman-Claverton goes on, and he is flanked by Vice, the seductive Gomez and Mrs. Carghill, and Virtue, his loving daughter Monica. As in many a morality play so here too Everyman is saved, but his salvation is “internal” and comes about through his recognition of his own true identity. As Monica says of her father at the end of the play “In becoming no one, he has become himself.” Both plays are set in the upper-class world to which Eliot felt a special affinity, and which he considered his own, but the central characters in this world are portrayed with much subtlety and understanding. Now, in the final years of his life, Eliot's treatment of the well-born and the mighty has become varied, psychologically probing, and discriminating.

In closing I should like to go back to Eliot's “Tradition and the Individual Talent” (1919) where he says “No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists.” The Confidential Clerk and The Elder Statesman are integral parts of diverse literary traditions, those of melodrama, serious comedy, and post-Ibsenite realists being the ones which ought to be added to those named already. Like his poetry, Eliot's theatre both absorbs the past and simultaneously recreates it, and in so doing recreates the present. And we could do worse than to judge it according to Eliot's own principles, remaining at the same time as alert as we can be to what we hear and overhear in it.
Notes

1 Several faculty members at Queen’s University, Belfast, had met Eliot while I was a student there, and to the best of my recollection they were touched by his kindness.

2 I well remember Robert Speaight saying after one of the monthly poetry readings at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London in the early 1950s how very pleased Eliot was when friends told him that verse in his plays was sounding progressively more and more like prose. According to Speaight, Eliot would hoist himself up in his armchair, draw in, tuck his feet under him, perform other bodily feats, and beam with delight.

Christopher S. Durer is Professor Emeritus of English at the University of Wyoming. He now lives in Boulder, Colorado.

BOOK REVIEWS


Exploring the impact of the concept of evolution on Eliot’s life and work is a vast undertaking that Lois Cuddy handles with dexterity and grace. Integrating biographical information on Eliot and analysis of his poems and plays with discussions of classical literature, evolution theory, and the history of science, T. S. Eliot and the Poetics of Evolution establishes that the principles of evolution had a profound and long-lasting influence on the poet. By looking at Eliot through the lens of evolution, Cuddy tells a fascinating story about the man and his writing. Her story situates the poet within the thinking of his time, explains some of the choices he made in his life, and leads to a greater understanding of and appreciation for his work.

Taking as its point of departure the implications evolution had for all fields of inquiry, T. S. Eliot and the Poetics of Evolution scrupulously documents the theory’s influence on Eliot’s early life and on his studies at Harvard. Even as a child, through his mother’s Wednesday Club, which for many years designed its lecture series on the concept of evolution, Eliot was surrounded by the assumption of progress as a principle of life. In college, the courses he took reinforced the assumptions that there is an underlying unity within a field of study and that the history of a discipline consists of progress or development. His graduate study of Sanskrit and his extensive undergraduate studies of Greek, Latin, French, and German may have been motivated by an interest in examining the origins and developments in language, an application of evolution to linguistics. The evidence Cuddy offers, including his marginalia and underlinings in his books, persuasively presents Eliot, with his fascination with the principles of evolution, as a man of his time.

Though the poet accepted evolution as a scientific principle explaining the origin of life, he rejected its applications to human history and to individual human life. Cuddy links Eliot’s concept of Tradition with Darwin’s emphasis on a common descent or origin. But whereas Darwin understood “descent” as a narrative of man’s origins that reveals the progress of man, the poet saw cultural evolution from the ancients as degeneration. For him, as for many of the artists and intellectuals of his generation, the ancient Greeks were responsible for the greatest achievements of human civilization; despite scientific and material advances since the time of the ancients, human history has witnessed no improvement in happiness, morality, or human community. Human progress, according to Eliot, is an illusion.

Eliot’s critique of the illusion of human progress can best be seen in the figure of Ulysses, whom Cuddy calls an “objective correlative” for Eliot’s own journey and the journey of human history. From the early poetry, in which Homeric images and themes suggest life as a journey of initiation and return, the figure of Ulysses becomes in Eliot’s poetic oeuvre an evolving figure, one that reflects the changes in the poet’s life and world view. The leap made in T. S. Eliot and the Poetics of Evolution from historical and scientific inquiry to the imaginative realm of the Ulysses motif demands of the reader a corresponding leap of faith, but it’s worth it; Cuddy’s readings of and connections between the poems give them new life. Reading “Portrait of a Lady” as a modern version of The Odyssey, for example, sensitizes the reader to the woman’s perspective in the poem, since she, like dignified Penelope,
has endured and will soon again endure the pain of abandonment. The epigraph from Dante's *Inferno* in "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" suggests Prufrock as the modern reincarnation of Ulysses, but passive and ineffectual Prufrock can never live up to the bold and impassioned leadership of his mythical ancestor Ulysses. Even though Pound's editing of *The Waste Land*, according to Cuddy, left much of the Odyssean motif on the cutting room floor, the heroic tradition underlying the poem's allusions remains intact.

Eliot's dramas tell a somewhat different story. On one hand, the emotional abandonment of women in his plays preserves the pattern of wives' and daughters' neglect and abandonment in the ancient Greek tradition. On the other hand, Eliot's later plays show characters who are capable of loving, a progress which Cuddy attributes to the poet's second wife and the greater personal happiness he found with her. The fathers and sons in the poet's later plays, however, never overcome their alienation, suggesting a degeneration from the ancient heroes in which sons and fathers have an idealized relationship of mutual support and protection.

Cuddy's story of Eliot's relationship with evolution culminates in her last, most interesting chapter. Here she discusses "Social Darwinism" as one of the "dark places" where the imagination is polluted by destructive social constructs. Applying feminist and postcolonial theory to Eliot's ideas on evolution, Cuddy links the poet's status as an "intellectually gifted, privileged, middle class white male" to his family's placement atop the evolutionary ladder. The poet believed in his "inherited superiority" and, like many of his contemporaries, relegated the rest of humanity to the realm of Other. He did not necessarily hate women or Jews or Africans or the working classes, Cuddy contends, but rather he considered them to be lower on the developmental ladder of evolution. Without justifying Eliot's racism, she explains it as an unfortunate concurrence of personal insecurity and cultural conditioning. Yet his attitudes towards racial and religious others set the stage for the eugenics movement, a movement that held that "fit" members of society should procreate while "deficient" members should not, which ultimately provided justification for the Nazi notion of a "Master Race." Cuddy doesn't let Eliot off the hook: "His position and stature in the field of letters... gave him the voice to demand justice for all human beings as part of individual and social development. Instead, like so many other Modernist artists and intellectuals, he spent his life creating unique and wondrous works of art to validate his own class and his place at the pinnacle of evolutionary hierarchy" (234).

Nevertheless, by examining Eliot's prejudice in terms of evolution theory, Cuddy brings her readers to a point of understanding rather than judgment of Eliot's blind spot. Most remarkable of all, she helps us understand Eliot's racist ideology as a tragic mistake that prevented him from fulfilling his true poetic potential. Cuddy leaves us with an Eliot who was both "liberated by the transformative possibilities of the imagination" and "trapped in a culture defined by tradition and an evolutionary ideology which became the prescription for the failures of his age" (236).

*T. S. Eliot and the Poetics of Evolution* is a distinguished contribution to Eliot scholarship. It offers an original, broad, and rigorous approach to Eliot's life and work. Its advancement of the notion of Eliot as a man of his times furthers our understanding of the man, his writing, and his time.

*Nancy Goldfarb
Western Kentucky University


Fresh from the heyday of postmodern theory, the Longman *T. S. Eliot* might properly be sold alongside compilations like "The Best of the 80s" (Flock of Seagulls, Thomas Dolby, Duran Duran) on the late-night cable channels. It is a handsome package. There are ten essays—journal articles and excerpts from books—as well as the editor's introduction, where Harriet Davidson clears a space for Eliot "in a postmodern world." She really shouldn't have bothered. Postmodernism has the social value of an old "hair band," and there is nothing more precarious than a doubtful fashion that flaunts its hoary head.

John Ellis' recent verdict in *TLS* met with zero resistance: "Under the guise of being urged to 'do theory'—which sounds both intellectually high-powered and independent—students are in fact being
coerced into a closed, blinkered, obsolete belief system. It is high time this fraud was exposed.” Yet Davidson sees fit to speak for “students today.” I wonder what they will think of her selection from Terry Eagleton’s *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (1976; 1978)—a work as important now as the trousers worn by John Travolta in Saturday Night Fever.

If students can’t groove to the Marxist beat, they can ride the New Wave of Derrida and Gasché, courtesy of Michael Beehler: “Since alterity constitutes a radical logic of general otherness, what Gasché calls ‘an endless process of reference to Other,’ it unsettles from within the metaphysical or philosophical logic that strives to manage difference into systematically organized oppositions...oppositions in which two sides, each pictured as simply itself and not essentially self-other, can be seen as contesting with one another.” “Endless” indeed! And thanks to Maud Ellmann’s “reading” of *The Waste Land*, younger fans of Lacan and Kristeva can relive the excitement of breaking free from sense entirely.

Davidson gets a few things right. She wisely begins her collection with a long excerpt from Richard Shusterman’s *T. S. Eliot and the Philosophy of Criticism*. Shusterman views Eliot as a Harvard pragmatist. He compares Eliot’s “tradition” to Gadamer’s “linguistic community,” and he draws numerous suggestive parallels between Peirce and Royce, on the one hand, and Gadamer, on the other. It is my opinion that Shusterman flattens out Eliot a bit, that he loses touch with Eliot at the non-liberal extremes of radical individualism and religious community. But his book makes a lasting contribution to Eliot studies.

Likewise, I can only welcome a chance to reread the work of Jeffrey Perl. Davidson reprints a 1985 *Southern Review* piece by Perl with a long title: “The Language of Theory and the Language of Poetry: The significance of T. S. Eliot’s Philosophical Notebooks, Part Two.” Perl’s research into Eliot’s Harvard era writings is superb, and he combines this research with thoughtful analysis of Eliot as a “metaphilosopher,” a linguistic philosopher pulling the plug on metaphysical systems. What separates the good from the bad? Shusterman and Perl are philosophically knowledgeable. Comfortable with the political nature of human kind, they are neither obsessive about politics nor embarrassed by politics. They spare us the spectacle of watching well-heeled professionals profit from pseudo-radicalism.

The rest of the book might be read in a spirit of inquiry: how did theory contribute to the decline of higher education and nearly destroy the discipline of English? Sandra Gilbert’s feminist triumphalism shows much the same devotion to rigor, to nuance and open-mindedness, that distinguishes the anti-Modernist oath of Pius X: “Their obsessive use of sex-connected costumes suggests that for most male modernists the hierarchical order of society is and should be a pattern based upon gender distinctions, since the ultimate reality is in their view the truth of gender, a truth embodied or clothed in cultural paradigms which all these writers see as absolute and Platonically ideal and which the most prominent among them—Joyce, Lawrence, Yeats, Eliot—continually seek to revive.” A Platonic closet in the sky with “sex-connected” costumes hanging on the rack. And, wait a moment—yes, there are John Travolta’s beautifully pressed trousers!

In an excerpt from *T. S. Eliot and the Politics of Voice*, John Xiros Cooper relaxes his ideological vise-grip to write several pages of very fine intellectual history about the petite bourgeoisie. The famous article by Michael North, “The Dialect in/of Modernism: Pound and Eliot’s Racial Masquerade,” is, from 1992, the most recent work here. North interprets *Sweeney Agonistes: Fragments of an Aristophanic Melodrama* as in effect a language game where Eliot plays black dialect to win against standard English; according to North, Eliot plays this game duplicitously, in order to assert his American mastery of English while keeping blacks in their place. Sounds right to me! North seems unaware of the actual plays of Aristophanes, who wrote numerous parts for comic slaves, though without our racial anxieties (for anyone in his society could become a slave). Aristophanes’ slaves suffer no more indignity than anyone else; his comic arrows are aimed at fops, mountebanks, and pseudo-reformers.

It seems best to give the last word to Dickens’ Mr. Omer: “But fashions are like human beings. They come in, nobody knows when, why, or how; and they go out, nobody knows when, why, or how. Everything is like life, in my opinion, if you look at it in that point of view.”

*Lee Oser*

*College of the Holy Cross*
MODERNIST STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Third Annual Conference

The Modernist Studies Association (to which many Eliot Society members also belong, and whose current president, Michael Coyle, is on the Society's board of directors) will hold its third annual conference October 12-15, 2001, at Rice University in Houston, Texas. The deadline for submitting panel proposals is May 30. For further information, go to www.press.jhu.edu/associations/msa.

SOCIETY PEOPLE

Professor Nancy Hargrove was named 2000 CASE Mississippi Professor of the Year. This award is sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). Each year, one professor is chosen from each state to receive this prestigious teaching award. No one who has heard Prof. Hargrove give presentations at Society meetings will be too surprised at her receiving the award, for she is a dynamic and charismatic speaker.

Rev. Earl K. Holt has accepted a post at one of the oldest Unitarian churches in the country and will be leaving St. Louis for Massachusetts. We imagine that as Rev. Holt travels east he will be thinking about the fact that he is following TSE's course. We thank him for all he has done for the Society during his tenure at the church founded originally by William Greenleaf Eliot and express our hope that he will continue to be actively involved in the Society. Not fare well, / But fare forward.

Apologies to Marcia Karp, who was given a different surname when the abstract of her paper was published in the last newsletter.

GALLUP BIBLIOGRAPHY REVISION

Call for Information

Before his death, Donald Gallup gave the materials he had assembled for revising his Eliot bibliography to Dr. Archie Henderson, who is now working on the revised and updated edition. The new edition will attempt to include all items overlooked by Dr. Gallup for the previous (1969) edition of his bibliography as well as all items published since 1968. If any Society members are aware of items for inclusion in any section of the bibliography that might not have come to the attention of Dr. Henderson—such as translations, which are particularly elusive—it would be helpful if they would inform him at one of the following addresses:

Postal: Dr. Archie Henderson
8003 Highmeadow Dr.
Houston, TX 77063-4719

E-mail: archie@firstnethou.com

Dr. Henderson is also interested in learning about any lesser-known archives with Eliot correspondence or collections of newspaper clippings which might contain articles relating to Eliot. In addition, he would welcome suggestions for new sections to be added to the bibliography. He is considering sections on films, interviews, letters with multiple authorship, blurbs, and even the Internet. If anyone has possible additions to these sections or proposals for other new sections, please let him know.

Any assistance will be acknowledged when the revised edition of the bibliography is published.

T.S. Eliot Society Newsletter
The Eliot Society is sponsoring two panels at the American Literature Association Conference, which will be held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 24-27, 2001.

PANEL I: Chair: Professor Benjamin Lockerd Jr., Grand Valley State University
“Sex, Gender and The Waste Land, or T.S. Eliot and the Performativity of Gender,” Professor Cyrena N. Pondrom, University of Wisconsin at Madison
“Scandalous Thoughts on T. S. Eliot,” Professor Patricia Sloane, City University of New York
“Eliot and Akhmatova,” Professor Ethan Lewis, University of Illinois at Springfield

PANEL II: Chair: Professor Lee Oser, College of the Holy Cross
“T. S. Eliot’s Poetry and Nineteenth-Century Prose,” Professor William Harmon, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
“T.S. Eliot: Environmentalist,” Professor Mary Graber, University of Georgia
“Habeas Corpus: ‘The Indigestible Portions,’” Professor Shyamal Bagchee, University of Alberta

For information about the conference, go to www.americanliterature.org.

These candidates have been duly nominated for positions on the Board of Directors.

Richard Badenhausen: Ph.D. University of Michigan; Associate Professor at Marshall University; delivered paper at Society meeting in Gloucester; essays published on Eliot in three books, in South Atlantic Review, English Language Notes, and elsewhere.

Christie Buttram: Member of the Society for five years; delivered paper at Society meeting; Ph.D. Columbia University; Assistant Professor at Winona State University; essays on Eliot published in Yeats Eliot Review and elsewhere.

David Chinitz: Associate Professor and Director of Grad. Programs, Loyola University; Ph.D. Columbia University; delivered paper at Society meeting; essays in two books, PMLA, and Journal of Modern Literature.

Michael Coyle: Current member of the Board; President of Modernist Studies Association; Advisory Board, National Poetry Foundation; chapter on Eliot in his book on Pound; essays on Eliot in books and in ELH, ANQ and elsewhere.

Melanie Fathman: Long-standing member of the Society and Member of the Board of Directors; architectural historian; has planned and hosted many events at the annual Society meetings in St. Louis.

William Harmon: Current member of the Board. James Gordon Hanes Professor in the Humanities at the University of North Carolina; has delivered the Memorial Lecture and several papers at Society meetings; Eliot articles in PMLA, Sewanee Review, Yeats Eliot Review, and several other journals.

Society members may cast votes for up to four of these candidates on the ballot enclosed with this newsletter.