

T. S. ELIOT SOCIETY

NEWSLETTER

Number 53

Summer 2004

Published by the T. S. Eliot Society (incorporated in the State of Missouri as a literary non-profit organization);
5007 Waterman Boulevard; St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Call for Nominations

Four seats on the Board of Directors (those held for the past three years by Chris Buttram, Michael Coyle, William Harmon, and Melanie Fathman) are now vacant. (Dr. Harmon will continue as a member of the Board by virtue of his being vice president, but his former board position must be filled.) Those elected to these seats will serve a term ending in June of 2007. Members of the Society may nominate themselves or other members for these positions, and in order to be placed on the ballot a member must receive at least five nominations and declare a willingness to accept the position.

Nominations must be in writing and may be sent either by e-mail or post to the Supervisor of Elections, Dr. Shyamal Bagchee, Department of English, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada T6G 2E5 (e-mail: shyamal.bagchee@ualberta.ca). Nominations must be received by October 1, 2004.

Calls for Papers

World Wide Eliot

Submissions are sought for a collection of essays on T. S. Eliot's international reception. The collection will explore how Eliot's writings and persona have entered the literary and cultural life of countries other than England and the United States where his reception has already been well documented. Submissions might address the different ways in which readers, critics, and writers from other cultural contexts have responded to Eliot's words, ideas, and politics—whether by assimilating, interrogating, subverting or rejecting them. Of particular interest is the encounter, within post-colonial, even colonial spaces, between indigenous voices and Eliot as a canonical English writer. Other submissions might focus on the matter of modernist poetics in respective world traditions as they are manifested in, or translated through, responses to T. S. Eliot. In addition to scholarly pieces, we also welcome more personal essays reflecting upon an individual's engagement with the words and ideas of Eliot and the particular social setting in which it took place. Please send abstracts of about 2 pages by November 30, 2004 to both Shyamal Bagchee at shyamal.bagchee@ualberta.ca and Elisabeth Däumer at edaumer@emich.edu.

The Twentieth-Century Literature Conference, to be held in Louisville, Kentucky, February 24-26, 2005, has invited the T. S. Eliot Society to Participate. Submit proposals by October 1 to Ben Lockerd, Dept. of English, Grand Valley State University; Allendale, MI 49401; (616) 331-3575; lockerd@gvsu.edu.

The American Literature Association's Sixteenth Annual Conference will be held May 26-29, 2005, in Boston, Massachusetts. The T. S. Eliot Society, which usually arranges two sessions, must submit its materials by January 30. Accordingly, by January 1, please send proposals to Ben Lockerd (addresses above).

Rev. Andrew Hawthorne
"T. S. Eliot and Anglo-Catholicism"
Presented on June 6, 2004

In his 1928 *For Lancelot Andrewes*, which was published shortly after his reception into the Church of England and his taking British citizenship, Eliot attempted to outline what he saw as "certain lines of development" which a discerning reader might have sensed from his 1920 collection *The Sacred Wood*. His "general point of view", he suggested, "... might be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic [sic] in religion."

Despite these strong assertions, made as he suggests to "refute any accusation of playing 'possum'", Eliot nevertheless undercuts his newly-found self-identity by a typically Eliotian set of sarcasms: "I am quite aware that the first term is completely vague, and easily lends itself to clap-trap; I am aware that the second term is at present without definition, and lends itself to what is almost worse than clap-trap, I mean temperate conservatism; the third term does not rest with me to define."

So Eliot declares that his new-found literary, political and religious identities are—respectively—completely vague, lacking in definition and defined elsewhere. If anyone thought that Eliot had given up "playing 'possum'", they were wrong. Eliot's proclamation of the features of his new turn in life are, according to his own terms, almost useless.

We must concern ourselves solely with Eliot's Anglo-Catholicism in this paper. Here, two questions must be addressed: firstly, what were the salient features of this Anglo-Catholicism to which Eliot seemingly subscribed? Secondly, what was Eliot's interpretation of it?

A Brief History of Anglo-Catholicism

The Church of England, which had its origins in the Reformation of the mid-sixteenth century, always had an element within it which stressed its Catholic nature. It had continued with the historic episcopate, for example, in an unbro-

ken apostolic line. It had not done away with the Eucharist as a sacrament, and if the Exhortation in the Communion Service were read carefully, the Church of England still held by sacramental confession. Yet the Church of England trod an ambiguous path, and many other of its members could with equal justification stress its Protestant side, as expressed in the 39 Articles of Religion. This ambiguity served the Tudor monarchs well as Europe began to tear itself apart in religious strife—England could be seen as a Catholic country (albeit of a different nature to European Catholicism), and it was not until 1570 that Elizabeth I was excommunicated by the Pope (the assumption being that until then she was considered a true daughter of the Vatican). This was the heart of the so-called "Via Media" of Anglicanism, the "Middle Way".

In the Elizabethan Age, churchmen such as Robert Bancroft (1544-1610), Archbishop of Canterbury 1604-1610, and Richard Hooker (1554-1600) were prominent members of this Catholic-thinking wing of the church, although in reality it was never so tightly-formed to be called a definite group.

After these "first generation" Anglo-Catholics (although we use the term anachronistically, as it was not coined until 1838; the term High-Churchman came into being at the end of the seventeenth century, and is sometimes interchangeable) came what is often termed the Golden Age of Anglican Divines. Such men as Eliot's beloved Lancelot Andrewes rose to prominence under the latter years of Elizabeth and then James I; he translated much of the Old Testament in the 1611 King James' Version of the Bible. William Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 and attempted to impose a more Catholic order upon the Church, which was one of the contributory factors towards the English Civil Wars. Throughout the Stuart period (1603-1688) the Catholics in the Church of England strove to forge a close bond with the Crown, developing the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings. This led to many leaving the Church of England when William of Orange was proclaimed King after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 (the Non-Jurors, such as Bishops Sancroft and Ken).

The eighteenth century saw a decline in the influence of High Church thinking. It was, by its leanings towards the Stuarts, tainted with Jacobinism, as those who refused allegiance to William of Orange were natural allies of the Old and Young Pretender, who were behind the Jacobite Uprisings of 1715 and 1745. Few High Churchmen were given preferment in the eighteenth century; Joseph Butler was an exception.

It was left to the Oxford Movement which began in 1833 to carry forward the Anglo-Catholic beacon within the Church of England. It began not with what Eliot might have called a profound historical sense. Its main exponents, J H Newman, John Keble, and Pusey, started the Movement out of a kind of panic brought about by politics. The 1829 Catholic Emancipation Act removed many of the obstacles put in the way of the Roman Catholic subjects of the Crown. Amongst these was the ability to sit in Parliament. Keble envisaged a threat to the Church of England—not because he feared the burgeoning of Catholic churches, but because Church of England Doctrine, defined technically by Act of Parliament, was potentially under threat of alteration by Roman Catholics and indeed non-Conformists who could, if they chose, change it.

The threat might well have been hypothetical, but the Oxford-based movement gathered force very quickly. It became fairly well defined, its chief protagonists publishing scores of tracts (hence their other name “Tractarians”) and gathering many followers. It began to collect together the work of previous like-minded Anglican Divines in the “Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology”, started in 1841 (Eliot’s own copy of Andrewes’ *Preces Privatae* was from this edition). This underpinned the whole movement and it continued forcefully well into the twentieth century, when Eliot first encountered it at St Stephen’s, Gloucester Road. However, we must note carefully that within the Anglo-Catholic Movement, there were many sub-sects and divisions. There were those who looked to Rome for authority, and whose churches used the Tridentine Roman Missal for their services, some from the Latin and some from unofficial translations. These would often import Roman ceremonial as well, such as the use of six candles on the altar and High Mass celebrated with priest, deacon and sub-deacon. There were those who remained very much Anglican, using the Book of Common Prayer—but sometimes in its 1549 version, and not the official 1662 edition. As the movement grew, so the variations of what it meant to be Anglo-Catholic seemed to multiply. A sceptic

might suggest that there were many different forms of Anglo-Catholicism as there were Anglo-Catholics. Membership being voluntary, there was never an enforced doctrinal code, and any who stressed the authority of the church, its sacerdotal nature, and the importance of the sacraments, could be accurately described as Anglo-Catholic.

In Eliot’s day Anglo-Catholicism underwent a renaissance. It was theologically one of the dominant strains of thinking within the Church of England, with such thinkers as Michael Ramsay (later Archbishop of Canterbury) and Austin Farrar. In 1933, on the centenary of the Oxford Movement, many celebrations and rallies were held, reflecting the strength and legitimisation of the Movement. Faber and Faber, under Eliot’s direction, was to publish much of a theological nature, and Anglo-Catholic authors featured prominently.

Eliot’s “anglo-catholicism”

I would suggest that Eliot’s brand of Anglo-Catholicism was as eccentric as any. This can be seen, perhaps, in the fact that in his famous declaration of himself in the Preface to *For Lancelot Andrewes* he uses lower-case in “Anglo-Catholic”, which I believe is a unique usage; quite why this was so must remain perhaps a mystery. That it was a typographical error, as some have suggested, is unlikely—the book’s second impression in 1929 contains the same lay-out. It was, perhaps, an example of Eliot playing ‘possum’ yet again—the use of lower-case letters where one would normally find capitals is a classic Modernist trait; Eliot may well be claiming to have carried over his Modernist credentials into his new way of life.

We can say with some confidence that Eliot was firmly within the Anglo-Catholic tradition. He held the Sacraments in very high regard. He was a daily communicant at St Stephen’s, Gloucester Road; he went to quarterly confession. We know that, living at the Vicarage, he fostered a kind of monastic existence. Fr Donald Nicholson, one of St Stephen’s Curates in Eliot’s day, and with whom he shared a bathroom, spoke of Eliot as a devout and holy man, for whom the act of communion was absolutely fundamental in his Christian life. Not only was his faith ascetic and personal. He also served his community as a Christian, too. He was Church Warden (an “Elder”, we might say) at St Stephen’s for many years—dealing, as he once

said, with such high things as dry-rot and broken windows.

Although he exhibited these traits common to Anglo-Catholicism, there was much in the way St Stephen's did things that was unique, even eccentric. (Here we meet the little a little "c" of Eliot's "anglo-catholicism"!.) Despite Eliot's stout defence of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, St Stephen's never actually used it, employing instead the Tridentine Roman Missal, in unofficial translation. It was actually breaking English Canon Law here, but the practice was widespread amongst Anglo-Catholic churches and the bishops turned a blind eye to it. Moreover, the ceremonial at St Stephen's, Tridentine to the last, with Three Sacred Ministers, hordes of acolytes and incense, was certainly not in the mainstream of Anglican practice. This was further highlighted by the theatrical use of lighting in the Mass—Fr Cheetham, its Vicar in Eliot's day, had a career in the theatre before ordination and utilised his knowledge in his church. Liturgy here was drama, a fact that influenced Eliot profoundly. (*Murder in the Cathedral!*)

In wider society, Eliot attempted to implement a broadly Anglo-Catholic programme in the spheres in which he had influence. In publishing, he fostered some of the most prominent Anglo-Catholic writers of his age. Amongst Faber's list were the following. There was Donald Baillie's *Theology of the Sacraments* (a very Catholic book written by a Presbyterian), and his *God was in Christ*; A. G. Hebert's *The Form of the Church, Liturgy and Society* and *The Authority of the Old Testament* (Hebert was instrumental in the move in the Church of England to reinstate the Eucharist as the primary act of worship on Sundays; beforehand, it was celebrated monthly if that in many parish churches); Hoskyn's and Davey's *The Fourth Gospel*, and several works by Reinhold Niebuhr, whose conservative stance on original sin and the authority of the Church would have appealed to Eliot.

Eliot was a born committee-man. He was a key member of many Christian Action and Discussion Groups in the 1930's and 1940's. He was a prominent member of the Chandos Group and Moot Group, which attempted to explore the meaning of what it meant to be a Christian Society. He also wrote regularly for Christian journals and was a guest editor on several.

Groups such as the Moot and the Chandos were essentially think-tanks; it is very difficult to see what practical effect they ever had. Eliot is famously quoted as saying that there was a fundamental problem with the term "Christian Ac-

tion"—it depended, he said, on where one put the emphasis, Christian, or Action. To his mind, it would seem, there was an inherent paradox between faith and its outward expressions in anything but worship, prayer and charity. Here we might recall his master F. H. Bradley's axiom, that action belonged to the world of mere appearance, and was itself contradictory.

Eliot's faith, apart from its outward expression in worship and the upkeep of his church, was, it might be claimed, perfectly cerebral, or—to put it more positively—it was almost solely confined to the realm of ideas. It depends on how much weight we put to ideas as to how influential we feel Eliot might have been as a Christian. He spoke at many conferences, his favourite topic being Christian Education. This was, he said in *The Idea of a Christian Society*, absolutely fundamental to the existence of a Christian Society. Everyone, he hoped, would be educated in what he termed "the Christian categories" of thought. Then, he claimed, even atheists would be able to govern England, for even if they didn't believe Christian doctrine they would have the tools with which to govern a Christian State.

Stephen Spender, in his little study of Eliot, claimed that Eliot's social criticism in the 1930's and 1940's shows just how little influence the Church of England had over society in that period. We might acquiesce, in the face of the evidence. The 1944 Education Act, which reformed the whole of the State provision of education in England and Wales, seems to bear no sign of the influence of Eliot, the Moot, or any other Christian group to which Eliot belonged. The notion that Christian doctrine be the basis for all education was simply missing.

Eliot, we might think, was a staunchly traditionalist and establishment figure. Underneath, however, lay an often radical programme. This was a strong strand in Anglo-Catholicism, and several prominent practitioners had what we might think to be almost subversive ideas. Eliot was a conservative subversive, if there is such a thing. On the other end of the Anglo-Catholic wing was the amazingly eccentric Norfolk Vicar Conrad Noel of Thaxted, who delved deep into English history on the one hand (Morris dancers often did a turn at High Mass in Thaxted Church), and on the other raised the flag of the Hammer and Sickle on his church tower. Anglo-Catholicism was really as broad as that, appealing to those who wore four-piece suits and those who wore sandals and beards.

Eliot is radical in several ways. Perhaps the most radical programme he suggests is in his *The Idea of a Christian Society*. On the one hand, Eliot here leaves himself open to the charge of elitism in this work. He recognizes a two-tier stratification to society made of a kind of lumpen of ordinary folk (which he calls "the Christian Community"), whose Christian beliefs are embedded in their everyday lives and are instinctual, and then a much smaller ruling group, which he confusingly calls "the Community of Christians". These people, "necessarily few in number", are those whose faith is more conscious and reflected upon. There appear to be a kind of Orwellian Inner and Outer Party (though no Proles!).

However, Eliot is radical in this book because he completely by-passes the role of the Church of England, or indeed any institution as such, in the implementation of his programme. *The Idea of a Christian Society* instead makes a direct appeal to the people at large to recognize their Christian calling and act upon it within society. Here we might assume that he is appealing only to the "Community of Christians", as the larger group would have no truck with books such as Eliot's.

By the time he came to write *The Idea of a Christian Society* we might discern that Eliot had in fact lost all confidence in the formal structures of the Church of England. As with many other Anglo-Catholics before and since, Eliot had an ambiguous attitude towards the Established Church. Believing in the authority of the Bishops, he was actually scathing in virtually everything he wrote about them in his Christian career.

That is, except, for the Bishops of the Historic Church of England. Eliot, we might think, was more of a Romantic than he admitted. He was forever holding before his eyes a vision of the Golden Age of the Church of England, of Hooker, Andrewes, and Bramhall, whose prelates were men of grand and (most importantly) European learning, who were nonetheless firmly rooted in the traditions of their Church and especially rooted in the language of Elizabethan England. To Eliot, these men carved a particular heritage for the Church which their progeny in the twentieth century simply had to take into themselves, in the style of *Tradition and the Individual Talent*.

Eliot's contemporaries, however, had not read Eliot's essay. To his mind, the contemporary Church of England was a mere shadow of what it should be. He always wrote of the con-

temporary Church of England with a profound sense of disappointment. The 1928 proposed revisions of the Book of Common Prayer were an assault upon the English language, he claimed, watering down the heritage of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. On the proposed substitution of "infinite" for "eternal" in the Book of Common Prayer, Eliot suggests that it "makes the English language vaguer", by "throwing a mathematical cloak over theology". Later in the year, in *The Monthly Criterion* of December 1927, in considering the language of the new revisions, he laments that "It is a pity when...ecclesiastics fail to think clearly, for if they cannot think clearly they cannot write well."

Reflecting on the Bishop's Statement from the Lambeth Conference of that same year, in "Thoughts after Lambeth" he wrote that "it ought not to be an occasion to us for mirth that three hundred bishops together assembled should, on pooling their views on most momentous matters, come out with a certain proportion of nonsense."

Eliot's most plangent criticism of his Church comes in his 1943 pamphlet *Reunion by Destruction*, which he wrote in response to the proposed union of Episcopal and Presbyterian churches in India. This scheme had the backing of most of the English bishops, but to Eliot's eyes the scheme put into question the very survival of the Church of England.

This little pamphlet shows Eliot at his most desperate, almost in panic. He sub-titles the work "Reflections on a scheme for Church Union in South India: addressed to the laity." Eliot never addresses "the reader" in any other of his works, except the 1934 *After Strange Gods*; he is appealing (as in *The Idea of a Christian Society*) over the heads of the Church Establishment to its rank-and-file members. This, for Eliot, is a radical move and we should note that he can play the democrat when he feels the need.

The arguments of the pamphlet are simple but striking, and show us how vehemently orthodox (some might say dogmatic) were his opinions. Eliot's position is based on theological logic, we might say. The proposed Union in South India was between the Anglican (i.e. Episcopal) dioceses of South India, and the Methodist Church of South India and the South India United Church, a Presbyterian church. In many and fundamental ways, Eliot argues, these three churches are founded on mutually exclusive ideas of church order. For the Anglican Church it was episcopacy and the Apostolic Succession, the idea (beloved by Eliot) of a living, vibrant

tradition being handed on generation by generation, to which one submitted. For the other two Presbyterian Churches, however, the idea of Episcopacy meant nothing; it was a mere title that Anglicans gave their elders. The proposal was that the newly created church was to have a fully recognised ministry drawn from the existing ministries of the three churches, each able, for example, to preside at the Eucharist. To those like Eliot who were devout Episcopalians, this was against all notion of catholic order: an Anglican priest is only able to operate as a priest by virtue of being ordained as such by a bishop. The scheme aimed to do away with this at one stroke. For Eliot this was intolerable, and he feared that the same kind of scheme would be proposed in Britain, as indeed it was and currently is. He ended his pamphlet by suggesting that the scheme for union in South India was merely "an elaborate artifice . . . a pantomime horse!"

A Conclusion

In conclusion, we may say that T S Eliot was a card-carrying Anglo-Catholic (and, as member of the Anglo-Catholic society, the Church Union, literally so!). He was a devout man, whose worshipping habits were second to none. He had a particular devotion to the Eucharist, and to that other touch-stone of Anglo-Catholicism, the role and authority of the Bishops. However, his own brand of anglo-catholicism was as eccentric as anyone else's, and for some other members of the Church of England, he would have seemed most peculiar (especially in his use of the Roman Missal). More importantly for us, who try to understand Eliot's enormously complex system of ideas, his devotion to the Church of England was we might suggest to the historic Church, that of Lancelot Andrewes, Richard Hooker and John Bramhall. The contemporary church which he encountered was always a disappointment to him and always failed to live up to the perceived standards of that Golden Age of Anglicanism. The trouble was, it seemed, that its bishops were just not good enough – they failed to properly inherit the tradition of Andrewes, Laud et al. They attempted to debase the Book of Common Prayer (although Eliot's St Stephen's hardly ever used it), they came up with theological nonsense in their statements, and their proposed union in South India was little short of heresy. This sense of disappointment and indeed frustration almost made a democrat of Eliot, we might argue, in his appeal directly to the people in his *The Idea of a Chris-*

Christian Society and Reunion by Destruction. In these works, we see Eliot the elitist appealing to the masses against the elite, who appeared to have abandoned their calling.

§

Selected Abstracts from the London Meeting

David Chinitz

"Popular Song and Eliot's Construction of Emotion"

Two years ago at the Eliot Society's annual meeting, I argued that many of Eliot's song allusions in the *Waste Land* manuscript and elsewhere share a set of common elements that I called the "assignation topos": a particular combination of a trysting scenario with such concomitant images as trees (or a garden), shadows, and the moon. The failed assignations in Eliot's poetry evoke and disfigure a recognizable motif drawn most immediately from turn-of-the-century popular culture. In the present paper, I take that argument a step further and argue, with all due deference to the complexity of the relation between Eliot's work and his life, that such influences were constituent elements not only of Eliot's poems but of his *self*. By shaping and delimiting Eliot's conceptions of love and sexual attachment, popular song scripted important relationships in his life and, through that channel even more than through conscious allusion, exerted a decisive influence on his art.

Eliot's attraction to the assignation topos predated his introduction to London in 1911. Even as a child, Eliot was transfixed by Poe's story "The Assignation" and the poem that supplied its epigraph, "The Exequy," by Henry King. This suggests that he was drawn to the bittersweet assignation topos long before he could have associated it with any particular person or relationship. I argue that not just Eliot's poetry but the feelings and incidents that went *into* the poetry were themselves given form by the popular topos. Through the representations of romantic love in popular assignation songs, in conjunction with his readings, the young Eliot reached an erotic self-understanding that awaited an object, Jean Verdenal, perhaps in his life and assuredly through his untimely death, stepped into a nostalgic role that was created for him by the yearning strains of Herman Finck's "In the Shadows" as well as by King's "Exequy" and other literary texts. (It does not matter, in this regard, whether the two men ever actually had a

sexual relationship.) Vivien Eliot, the transfigured bride, similarly assumed a character made available to her through an assortment of classical sources and grotesquely warped popular images. Like Verdenal, Vivien was latent in Eliot's imagination before she materialized in the flesh. The same is certainly true of Emily Hale. Such are the operations of Eliot's constitutional theatricality.

Yet this is by no means to imply that Eliot falsified his feelings, for it is a *function* of culture, to which Eliot, like anyone else, was subject, to structure our emotions—even those we consider our most private and authentic. What is more, Eliot was himself aware of this power of culture. For this is a theme, as I will show in conclusion, that he takes up with a certain regularity in his early poetry—in “Portrait of a Lady,” “Dans le Restaurant,” “The Death of the Duchess,” and elsewhere—usually with an interestingly rebellious discomfort.

§

Linda Wyman

“Common Liberation: The Idea of Salvation in the Plays of T. S. Eliot”

Although T. S. Eliot's plays are neither doctrine nor propaganda, they are decidedly Christian, and they make a number of significant statements on salvation. If I read them correctly, Eliot's plays may be said to have as their subject the necessary and saving interrelatedness of human beings.

Eliot's first play, *Murder in the Cathedral*, pivots on the definition of martyrdom which occurs in Thomas Becket's Christmas sermon. “A martyrdom,” he says, “is always the design of God, for His love of men, to warn them and to lead them, to bring them back to His ways.” Thomas's martyrdom, then, is not complete with his death; it will not be fully accomplished until someone is “brought back.” The evidence of “someone's having been brought

back” occurs in the last chorus of the play. That the Women of Canterbury can acknowledge Thomas's martyrdom is in part the effect of that martyrdom, and their coming to make such an acknowledgment is what this play is about.

The events of *The Family Reunion* are largely literal; as in *Murder in the Cathedral*, the drama is accomplished in what the characters say. The election of Harry, Lord Monchensey, cannot be accomplished, or comprehended, without his family, any more than the martyrdom of Thomas Becket can be accomplished without the Women of Canterbury. The differences between Harry and other members of his family are not absolute. Harry and his relatives do touch, upon occasion, and *The Family Reunion* is about the significance of their touching.

The Cocktail Party, like the two earlier plays, is very much a drama about lives in the process of changing, and of changing each other. In the beginning of the play, Edward and Lavinia were to have hosted a cocktail party, but Lavinia has left Edward and he is unable to entertain guests without her. In the end, Edward and Lavinia, reconciled, are hosting a party together, not just happening but choosing to be together, and all that has gone before in this play makes us recognize the saving differences in their lives.

The Confidential Clerk ends with the several characters resolved to try to understand one another. Similarly, in *The Elder Statesman* the principal characters are enabled to transform the idea that they have been “alone together” into the idea that one person is inextricably a part of another.

I understand T. S. Eliot to say in his plays that human beings are involved in each other's salvation—that they help one another whether they mean to or not, whether they want to or not, and, often, whether they even know it or not. I believe this may be another way of saying that the Incarnation happens over and over—happens perpetually, one might well say. In Eliot's plays, common liberation is the central fact.

The Society maintains a website at www.luc.edu/eliot, now featuring a slideshow of the London meeting.

The Society Historian seeks any Society-related artifacts, memorabilia, photographs, etc., with which members are willing to part. Items from the early years of the T. S. Eliot Society are particularly welcome. Please contact: David Chinitz, Department of English, Loyola University Chicago, 6525 N. Sheridan Road, Chicago, IL 60626. (773) 508-2241. email: dchinit@luc.edu

Awards

This year's Fathman Awards, given to some Eliot scholars in early stages of their careers, have been presented to three persons who made presentations at the London meeting: Iman Javadi (Cambridge University), Caterina Fornero (University of Turin), and Will Gray (Bob Jones University). Congratulations to all three.

The Board of Directors also voted to confer a Distinguished Service Award upon Dr. William Charron of St. Louis University. Dr. Charron served an unprecedented three terms as treasurer of the Society, during which time he took the lead in organizing the annual meetings in St. Louis. As editor of the journal *The Modern Schoolman*, Dr. Charron also published a number of articles on Eliot's philosophical concerns and book reviews of several books on Eliot. Dr. Charron has himself written important essays on Eliot's philosophical thought which have contributed substantially to our understanding of that subject. The Distinguished Service Award will be presented at the next meeting, in September of 2005.

The Board of Directors further voted to confer a lifetime Honorary Membership upon Craig Raine, who gave this year's Memorial Lecture. The Society's By-Laws allow the Board to name up to ten honorary members. Mr. Raine's remarkable accomplishments as a poet, critic, and editor have been detailed in an earlier issue of this newsletter. Sufficient it to say here that he has combined these diverse roles in a way that reminds one of Eliot himself. The Society is particularly appreciative of Mr. Raine's writings on Eliot, included in the volume of essays entitled *In Defence of T. S. Eliot*, published in 2000. The Memorial Lecture was regarded by all who heard it as a tour de force. For all he has done for literary art and scholarship, and in particular for all he has done to promote the love and study of Eliot's works, Craig Raine is made an honorary lifetime member of the T. S. Eliot Society.

For Help with Society Matters

To submit papers for any reading session sponsored by the Society, or to make suggestions or inquiries regarding the annual meeting or other Society activities, please contact the President. For matters having to do with the *T. S. Society Newsletter*, please contact the Vice-President and Editor. To pay dues, inquire about membership, report a change of address, or report failure to receive the *Newsletter*, please contact the Treasurer. Those having business with the Secretary are advised to contact him directly.

President: Benjamin Lockerd
Dept. of English
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI 49401
(616) 331-3575
lockerdb@gvsu.edu

Vice President: William Harmon
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3520
(919) 489-2766
wharmon03@mindspring.com

Treasurer: John Karel
Tower Grove Park
4256 Magnolia
St. Louis, MO 63110
jkarel@towergrovepark.org

Secretary: David Huisman
1134 Giddings Ave. SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49506
(616) 45200478
huisda@provide.net

T. S. Eliot Society Newsletter is edited and published, in behalf of the Society, by William Harmon, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC. Printing and mailing generously subsidized by the UNC CH Department of English, James Thompson, Chair. Administrative management by Anita Braxton.

Printed in the USA.