Three Reflections on Hope Mirrlees’ Paris

We take the occasion of the Eliot Society’s first meeting in Paris as an opportunity to (re)consider the 1919 poem by Eliot’s friend Hope Mirrlees. The first scholarly edition of the poem appeared in Bonnie Kime Scott’s Gender in Modernism: New Geographies (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2007), ed. by Julia Briggs. And then, in April of 2011, Pegana Press published a deluxe, hand-crafted edition of the poem limited to 50 copies. Readers can easily find the former edition; the latter can be purchased directly from the publisher at a reduced price of $295 plus shipping; check or money order. See abebooks.com for some views of this edition. To purchase, contact Mike Tortorello at peganapress@live.com.

Modifying Modernism: Hope Mirrlees and “The Really New Work of Art”

Nancy Gish
University of Southern Maine

When The Waste Land was published in 1922, it received many reviews, both good and bad. But whether praising or critiquing, reviewers agreed that it was a major shift in poetic form, and, emphatically, new. A key example is Gilbert Seldes’s account of the poem as seeming at first remarkably disconnected and confused, with scraps, fragments, juxtapositions, pastiche—but nonetheless revealed as having a hidden form. Others thought it merely a hoax. Regardless, it was seen as important. Yet no such interest greeted Hope Mirrlees’s poem Paris—sometimes mentioned as similar in general structure, and published in 1919, three years before Eliot’s contribution to the annus mirabilis of modernism.

The key word here is “mentions”: her name appears, in passing, in letters, including her own statement of friendship with Eliot later in life. Yet though her strikingly avant garde poem—described as “brilliant” by Virginia Woolf, has been recurrently, briefly, rediscovered and “mentioned,” it has not been reclaimed as a major, innovative work. Even in its own time, it seems to have been neglected: in a completely unscientific survey of my own collection of anthologies, some from the early twentieth century, I do not find her work in any, not even in the 1995 Poems for the Millenium, devoted to reclaiming experimental poetry. As early as fall 1974, Bruce Bailey, in the T. S. Eliot Newsletter, pointed out its importance but concluded that it was “a slighter work than Eliot’s,” and that “this great and unfortunate difference in reception would seem to be accountable mainly to the vagaries of distribution.” We have learned so much more since 1974 about the erasure of women writers that this hardly seems sufficient reason. Yet given the renewal of women’s work, continued neglect seems even more inexplicable. Whatever the reason, the new edition by Pegana Press (2010) calls for the kind of recovery now familiar for such writers as Mari-
anne Moore, H. D., Mina Loy, or Djuna Barnes.

I have spent the day reading and rereading Paris with that sense of amazing discovery one has only a few times in a life of reading. And what strikes me is less that Mirrlees anticipated by three years Eliot's radical methods, and much not in Eliot—the sustained bilingualism, the graphics, and the allusions to many women's lives and work. We have become so familiar with modernist form that it is no longer as startling as in 1919 or 1922. Rather, what is equally or perhaps more striking is the tone. Like Eliot, she creates her effects largely by juxtaposition and ironic contrasts; unlike those in The Waste Land, they range across far more emotion and close with anticipation neither of utter desolation nor renewed peace (depending on readers) but with an awareness of the vile and the joyous, even loving and gracious, in a world devastated by the Marne that will never again “Flow between happy banks,” Poilus, the General Strike, Whores like lions, American astigmatism. If Eliot is capable of great heights and depths, he is also often narrow in emotional range; Paris takes in a day's experience of all that is there. That is, whether “slighter” or better is not what distinguishes this major modernist text: it is the fullness of emotional presence, the absence of general judgment brought by a woman to the streets of post-War Paris. It is long past time for serious study and evaluation of this cultural and poetic treasure. The horror and the glory are also there, but we still find “and yet,” “Whatever happens, some day it will look beautiful,” “Little funny things,” “the sky is saffron.”

Athens in Paris

John Connor
Colgate University

Whether as Bloomsbury familiar, intimate of the Parisian avant garde, or pupil and partner of the Cambridge Ritualist Jane Harrison, scholars have long sought to reclaim for Hope Mirrlees the place she abdicated in 1928, when in her early forties she largely retired from the public life of Modernism to cultivate her pug dogs and her thyroid gland. Early efforts to rehabilitate Mirrlees in the 1970's were unsuccessful; it has only been recently, and thanks primarily to the late Julia Briggs and the kindly offices of the fantasists Neil Gaiman and Michael Swanwick, that her fortunes have begun to turn. Briggs' excellent annotated edition of Paris: A Poem (1920) appeared in Bonnie Kime Scott’s Gender in Modernism anthology (2007) and Carcanet are scheduled to release an edition of Mirrlees' collected poems this Fall. The next few years will likely see revived interest in Mirrlees' three novels and in the two unfinished biographies on which she labored in the half century between Harrison's death and her own.

Claims continue to be made for Mirrlees' influence on the major writers of her generation, but it is her own susceptibility to influence, her sensitivity to the cultural and intellectual trends of her moment, that makes her work most interesting. In the seven years (1919-1926) that separate her first novel from her last, Mirrlees seems to anticipate, as well as to condense in brief, the journey from metropolitan Modernism to national culturalism traced by Jed Esty in the careers of her more famous friends (Eliot, ever so slightly her junior, Woolf, slightly her senior). With Eliot, Mirrlees shares a friendship and a sensibility; she was one of his few friends to take trouble with Vivienne, and it was at her and her mother's house in Surrey that Eliot lived out the war-years, writing there, as he later confessed to her, “what will be regarded as my best work,” his Four Quartets. Eliot warmed to her family's wealth and hospitality, and to the “whole set of hunting people” her siblings gathered around. But in memorializing Eliot in 1971 for the BBC, Mirrlees remembered that though he “felt most violently English,” he remained the resident alien. “I once said to him: ‘You know, there is this indestructible American strain in you.' And he was pleased. He said: ‘Oh yes, there is. I’m glad you realised it. There is.’” Against the temptation to read Mirrlees as an Eliotic epigone, as such, in later life, she surely seemed, it is important to remember not only that aspects of her early work anticipated his, but also that their cultural politics, at least in the 1920s, are significantly different. The imaginative proximity of Mirrlees' major poem Paris, handset by Virginia Woolf at the
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Hogarth Press in 1920, to Eliot’s *Waste Land*, is uncanny, both in terms of formal consideration and thematic preoccupation. But though they share a common stock of references, these poems do, I think, do different things with the cultural materials they process.

Julia Briggs has written extensively on the poem’s French avant-garde connections, but the Classical anthropology of Jane Harrison is equally important. *Paris* is dedicated to Dionysus, whom Harrison had celebrated as year-spirit archetype, “the daimon, of death and resurrection, of reincarnation, of the renoveau of the spring”; the Anthesteria was his festival, and, as Plato famously recorded, it was from this festival’s “Spring Song,” or dithyramb, of new birth and new blossoming, that the art of Tragedy was born. Adopting the narrative arc of the Anthesteria to regiment the random details and disorienting shock-effects of metropolitan perception, Mirrlees suggests a mythical method to enact at the level of form the work of cultural repair she saw performed in the ancient rite.

As dithyramb or Spring Song, *Paris* describes its “renouveau” of man and nature in an almost impenetrable play of reference. Written in “Spring 1919,” the poem evokes “The lovely Spirit of the Year” laid out at first “stiff and stark” in “acres of brown fields,” but then coming to life in the “newly furled leaves of the horse chestnuts” and the “jeunesse dorée of the Sycamores.” Weaving the Song of Songs into its celebration of the season, we are told that “SPRING IS SOLOMON’S LITTLE SISTER” and also his spouse, whose sealed fountain nourishes vines and tender grapes, fruits of the valley and pomegranates. According to the Canticles, Solomon’s sister-bride was as the rose of Sharon and the lily-of-the-valleys. According to *Paris*, these last are “the goldsmith’s chef d’oeuvre.” Fabergé’s artificial flowers reproduce les brins de muguet traditionally sold on the streets of Paris on the “first of May,” though for the *Mois de Marie* celebrations of 1919, as the poem informs us in its single most striking typographical experiment – the line running vertically down the length of two pages – “There is no lily of the valley.” An endnote explains that on account of the May Day General Strike that year, no lilies of the valley were for sale. Thus the Canticles’ celebration of sexual love doubles in antiphon the work of the dithyramb, and the poem, which begins with reference to the fallen heroes of the First World War, closes with “babies being born” in the converted maternity hospital of “the Abbaye de Port Royale.”

Aggressively modern in its evocation of urban sexuality, Mirrlees’ poem makes its way at nightfall to Montmartre where, in anticipation of Joyce’s Night-town, and set to the “obscene syncopation” of black jazz, we meet lesbian night-club “girls,” whores “like lions…seeking their meat from God,” and a chorus-line dancing the “Masque of the Seven Deadly Sins.” Unholy couplings proliferate, though Mirrlees would later excise the intimations of pederasty that draw child-exploitation, commerce and Catholicism in close configuration. The poem draws to a close with two last liaisons. While the “President of the Republic lies in bed beside his wife,” Mirrlees announces “DAWN”:

> Verlaine’s bed-time . . . Alchemy  
> Absynthe,  
> Algerian tobacco,  
> Talk, talk, talk,  
> Manuring the white violets of the moon.

The “Alchemy” that transforms night’s baser elements into the gold of rising sun (“The sky is saffron behind the two towers of Nôtre Dame”) also introduces Verlaine’s bedmate – the Rimbaud whose “L’Alchimie du Verbe” denies the adequacy of any personal poetic magic, and who turns in his “Adieu” to a truth beyond words, beyond “talk, talk, talk”—a return to the people and the patterns of action.

“Art, as Tolstoy divined” and as Harrison explained, “is social, not individual,” and has its origins in “the common act, the common or collective emotion” that is ritual. And so it is, in a poem set against the fateful negotiations of the Paris Peace Conference, that Mirrlees looks back to ancient rite to begin the work of postwar reconstruction.
Though it mimics the hermetic idiom of international Modernism, Paris inhabits this language only to denounce it, to describe a politics more participatory and inclusive. And in the shift from her ritual inflected day-poem to the novel for which she is most popularly remembered, her 1926 work of fantasy, Lud-in-the-Mist, Mirrlees confirms the move for which she made the unnamed Rimbaud mouthpiece: a renunciation of elite Modernism's aesthetic virtuosity for an art expressive of common culture and shared values.

Mirrlees, Modernism, and the Holophrase

Cyrena Pondrom
University of Wisconsin

The occasion of the imminent release—at last—of a collection of Hope Mirrlees poetry (Hope Mirrlees: Collected Poems, ed. Sandeep Parmarr, Carcarnet, 2011) is a splendid moment to revisit the possibility of this “lost” woman modernist’s possible influence on T. S. Eliot, and in turn, his influence on her. The former is a subject which was addressed long before—by Bruce Bailey in the fall of 1974—but has for many years been largely forgotten. Recently, however, Julia Briggs, Michael Swanwick, and a few others have sought to bring Mirrlees back into the attention of modernists, both for her poetry and her narratives (including the fantasy Lud-in-the Mist, 1926).

Mirrlees (1887-1978), who received her degree from Newnham College, Cambridge in 1913, was a companion of the great classicist and archeologist Jane Harrison from shortly after her graduation until Harrison’s death in 1928. She made repeated visits to Paris in 1913-15 and 1919 (ODNB on line), writing the poem Paris in 1919, while staying at the Left Bank rue de Beaune address with which she signs the poem. Paris was published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press in May, 1920. The immediately previous volume published by Hogarth Press was Eliot’s Poems. During the 1920’s Mirrlees and Eliot became close friends, and at the end of that decade Mirrlees became a Catholic (ODNB on line). During the years of World War II, Eliot spent weekends with Mirrlees and her mother in Surrey, although she wrote to Bruce Bailey, “I never discussed Paris with him, and I am unaware whether he ever saw it. We were not yet aquainted [sic] in 1919.”

There is thus plenty of circumstantial evidence that Eliot knew of Mirrlees’s Paris, but no explicit confirmation. What then are the internal suggestions that Eliot’s Waste Land owes something to the poem? And what of the possibility of influence by Eliot on Mirrlees?

A quick description of the poem provokes intriguing parallels: this 600 line poem is devoted to a one day peregrination through a modern metropolis, with its range extended both geographically and chronologically by memory, dream or trance (Paris 16, 17). Paratactic in structure, variously deploying both collage and pastiche, it is relentlessly allusive, both to high and low culture and to literary and historical texts, even on one occasion to music. It makes use of white space to establish a visual pattern and to elide that which escapes language. It supplies its own footnotes. And it seems as dismissive of traditional religious allegiance as it is to traditional poetic structure, yet it begins with a dedication “A/Notre Dame de Paris/En Reconnaissance/Des Graces Accordes” and closes what is unmistakably a quest structure with the assertions: “The sun is rising,/ Soon les Halles will open,/ the sky is saffron behind the two towers of Nôtre Dame./ JE VOUS SALUE PARIS PLEIN DE GRACE” (22).

Certainly the poem takes its place besides Joyce’s Ulysses, Mina Loy’s Songs to Joannes, and The Waste Land as one of the masterful quasi-mythic journeys through a city on a single day. It would be hard, however, to claim for Paris priority of inspiration for The Waste Land on that count, since “Songs to Joannes” had appeared as a special issue of Others in April, 1917, and been noted in print by both Eliot and Pound. And ten of the eighteen episodes of Ulysses had appeared in Paris in The Little Review be-

1. The citation is to the Pégana Press edition, a facsimile of the Hogarth Press edition dated 1919 and printed in May, 1920. The most easily accessible complete text of the poem is probably Briggs’ extensively annotated edition in Scott’s Gender in Modernism (261-303), but that text also shows the Hogarth pagination.
before Mirrlees probably showed Woolf the poem during a visit in August, 1919, and indeed two episodes had appeared in The Egoist where Eliot was assistant—that is Literary—Editor. (Woolf, Letters June 30, [1919] 381; Aug. 17, [1919], 384; Diary 282, 295)

One cannot dismiss the possible significance of Eliot’s simply seeing the poem on the page, with its white spaces and its collage-like succession of perspectives which the readers was forced to synthesize like a cubist city. This impact could indeed have helped embolden the poet to adopt the characteristics of structure and style which occasioned so much of the uproar The Waste Land elicited (though we must recognize the certainly greater significance of Pound’s editing of the manuscript).

There is another way in which the poem could have helped to focus the thinking of a young Eliot about The Waste Land, however, in ways at once more independent and more substantive. In the opening line Mirrlees declares: “I want a holophrase.” And she immediately demonstrates the vastness of the synthesis the holophrase must encompass. The allusions encompass the North-South metro line, cigarette papers, a display in the Louvre, a metro stop, an ad in a train car, the chorus in Aristophanes’ The Frogs, a simple narrative statement, a sidewalk observation and an allusion to Revelations 17.3.—but at the same time they draw within a common circle the zig-zag journey across town of a central consciousness, observing high art and popular advertising, recalling Aristophanes’ advice for ending war and warnings of the prophet John as she observes a prostitute in the streets.

The idea of the holophrase was used by Mirrlees’ companion, Jane Harrison, in her germinal book Themis, where she explained the term as one indicative of man totally inseparable from his environment: “Language, after the purely emotional interjection, began with whole sentences, holophrases, utterances of a relation in which subject and object have not yet got their heads above water but are submerged in a situation. A holophrase utters a holopsychosis. . . . As civilization advances, the holophrase, overcharged, disintegrates, and, bit by bit, object, subject, and verb, . . . are abstracted from the stream of warm conscious human activity in which they were once submerged” (Themis 473-74). One can immediately see the parallels with the image, which Pound defined as “that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time (“A Few Don’ts”), or with the expanded form which Pound gave it in “Vorticism.” There it became a point of maximum intensity, “a radiant node or cluster; . . . a VORTEX, from which, and through which, and into which, ideas are constantly rushing” (92), and more important, it became an ordering concept which actually “caused form to come into being.” That idea of the ordering form, expansive enough to order the understandings of a whole culture evolved somewhat later (1938) into Pound’s concept of “paideuma,” which in Guide to Kulchur he defined as “the tangle

2. Although I do not rely on them without exception, I must give extraordinary thanks to Julia Briggs for the annotations which have made the work of a reader of Paris immeasurably simpler. See her contributions to Gender in Modernism.

Causaubon Pension, where Eliot lived from fall 1910 through spring 1911
or complex of the inrooted ideas of any period” (57). Attributing the term to the African archeologist Frobenius, he distinguished it from “Zeitgeist” by calling it “the grisly roots of ideas that are in action.”

Clearly, this, in 1919, is the “holophone” Hope Mirrlees sought in Paris, whether she identified it with the primitive Greek societies of Harrison’s study of classical archeology or with a primal and communal substratum of ideas of the metropolitan vortex which was the city Paris.

And it is at least in part the loss of the living if primitive community which Eliot laments in The Waste Land, when he turns overtly to the suggestions of ancient vegetation and religious rites contained in Jesse Weston’s From Ritual to Romance. Though Eliot laments the loss of the communal concept and Mirrlees discovers in its synthesis a Paris “full of grace,” the presentation of the fragmentary shards which may be found in the civilization of a modern city is strikingly similar.

**THE PARIS CONFERENCE**

**The Eliot Society in Paris**

*Gabrielle McIntire*
*Queen’s University*

51 bis, Rue St. Jacques, just around the corner from the Pantheon, was T. S. Eliot’s home for most of the academic year, 1910-11 (see photo on page 5). During that time Eliot studied with Henri Bergson, developed a profound friendship with Jean Verdenal, read the major French writers in the original, and got to know the city intimately. On the occasion of the centenary of Eliot’s stay in Paris, the T. S. Eliot society held its Thirty-Second Annual Conference just a few blocks from Eliot’s former home, in an elegant amphitheatre and courtyard at the Institut du Monde Anglophone, at the Nouvelle Sorbonne.

The conference was, I think all would agree, stimulating and delightful both intellectually and collegially. With papers on topics ranging from T. S. Eliot and Bergsonianism, to European and Parisian influences on Eliot’s work, to psychological and psychoanalytic presences and echoes in Eliot’s verse, to Eliot and religion, to name just a few topics, the range of material covered was striking. We found attention paid both to Eliot’s best-known material and to his lesser known verse and essays, leaving us with the sense that there is still a great deal of work to do on the oeuvre of this enigmatic and still-mesmerizing figure. Participants ranged from distinguished professors with decades of expertise in Eliot Studies to Master’s students who were giving their first conference paper, and although the program ran for a full five days there was a remarkably strong showing from its 80 participants.

Toward the end of the conference we were treated to the T. S. Eliot Memorial Lecture by Jean-Michel Rabaté entitled “Playing Possum: Symbolic Death and Symboliste Impotence in Eliot’s French Heritage,” which elicited many questions from the audience, and
promises to open new avenues of discussion about the meaning of death, dying, and symbolism in Eliot’s work. Another major highlight was an honorary membership in the T. S. Eliot Society granted to Jewel Spears Brooker in recognition of her decades of outstanding contributions and service to Eliot Studies. The announcement was followed by lengthy and hearty applause and makes Professor Brooker one of only eight living people with that distinction.

Aside from the engaging intellectual dialogues that took place, I must take a few moments to note the exemplary organization and hosting of the conference. Society President David Chinitz, William Marx, our host from Université de Paris X, and the whole organizing committee (Chris Buttram, Michael Coyle, Frances Dickey, Nancy Hargrove, John Morgenstern, and Cyrena Pondrom) deserve major thanks for not only convening a highly successful academic conference, but also for arranging for fascinating cultural outings that enriched our understanding of Eliot’s experiences in Paris. First, I must single out our host, William Marx, who could not have made us feel more welcome in Paris. He had worked tirelessly prior to our arrival so that not only were we able to hold the conference in one of the most glorious old buildings of the Sorbonne nouvelle, but we were wined and dined at receptions or dinners at some of the best restaurants in Paris, including Le Procope, a restaurant founded in 1686 and frequented by the likes of Voltaire and Benjamin Franklin. We were also lucky enough to be offered a tour of the interior of the late-nineteenth-century Paris Opera Garnier, a visit to the Louvre, and a tour of archival collections at the Bibliothèque François Mit-
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The Spanish Copla in T. S. Eliot’s “Landscapes”

Drawing from archival research, this paper explores the influence of folksong on Eliot’s “Landscapes.” In an undated letter to his French translator, Eliot discloses a detail that challenges traditional readings of the five-poem sequence. In the beginning of the letter, Eliot questions the appropriateness of translating these poems at all, as “the effect and meaning depend so very much upon the particular arrangement of the syllables in English.” However, Eliot then makes a revelation that challenges not only his own doubts about the translatability of “Landscapes” but also the habitual ways in which the poems have been read. Eliot divulges that he modeled “Virginia” on a popular musical form of another Romance language: the Spanish copla. The copla is a Spanish folksong that often playfully and poignantly evokes the struggle between romantic and divine love. Literary critics tend to discuss “Landscapes,” if at all, as warm-up exercises for the Four Quartets, and the difficult, gloomy, and rhythmically plodding “Virginia” receives particularly scant attention. Reading “Virginia” as a copla, however, transforms the spiritual trajectory of “Landscapes.” The sequence becomes a cohesive musical work in its own right, linked not by an alternation of vibrant and desolate landscapes but rather by an evolving struggle between human love and religious devotion. This paper will consider Eliot’s unpublished letter to his translator, the American and European origins of his interest in the copla form, and the musicality of his own public readings of the poems to emphasize the sustained spiritual struggle at the foundation of “Landscapes.”

Margaret Greaves
Emory University
Co-winner of the Fathman Young Scholar Award for 2011

“Between the idea / And the reality”: Hyperconsciousness and Schizophrenia in Eliot’s Early Works

“Racine or Donne looked into a great deal more than the heart. One must look into the cerebral cortex, the nervous system and the digestive tracts.” —Eliot, “The Metaphysical Poets”

In recent years, new sites of interdisciplinary interest have emerged between literary studies and the cognitive sciences, exploring the ways in which the literary text may be viewed as symptomatic of broader trends in the development of human consciousness and cognition. One such groundbreaking study is Louis Sass’ Madness and Modernism [1992], in which the author investigates the parallels between the modernist and post-modernist world-view and the core phenomenology of schizophrenia. In particular, Sass utilises the term “hyperconsciousness” to denote one of the main distortions in the relationship between the self and the world; namely, the way in which certain elements of the self and experience which need to intuitive and unconscious become the objects of a detached, alienating attention. In this paper, I aim to utilise Sass’ conception of the pathology of “hyperconsciousness” (or, the “awareness of one’s own awareness”) in conjunction with other relevant perspectives in contemporary neurological research, as a model for examining a number of Eliot’s early works.

I will begin by relating Eliot’s conception of the “dis-sociation of sensibility” in post-Descartian society to the model of schizophrenia presented by Sass and neurologist Iain McGilchrist in their discussions of enlightenment philosophy. Having briefly traced the emergence of a hyperconscious tendency in post-enlightenment society, I will examine its manifestation in the imagery, metaphor and philosophy expressed in a number of Eliot’s early works, from Prufrock to The Hollow Men, incorporating a brief discussion of Eliot’s philosophical influences during this time. Subsequently, I will investigate the manifestation of hyperconsciousness in the language of Eliot’s poetry, keeping in mind the authors directive that it may sometimes be necessary for the poet “to force, to dislocate, if necessary, language into his meaning.” In this section, particular attention will be paid to such factors as linguistic fragmentation, inconsistencies in the space-time structure of verb tenses and dissolution of the symbol-referent relationship in the early poetry. I will conclude with a brief discussion of how my findings may help to further contextualise Eliot’s thought and writings within the broader concerns of literary modernism, philosophy and the development of human cognition in the twentieth century.

Charlotte Webb
Lund University, Sweden
Co-winner of the Fathman Young Scholar Award for 2011
In this paper I examine relationship of Eliot’s ideas about the nation and the international to French thought, especially to that of Paul Valéry. This is the second part of an analysis of Eliot’s politics in the 1920s. The first part was presented at the Eliot Society in St. Louis in 2008. In that paper I established a chronology for Eliot’s reaction to communism, discussed his reviews of books by Trotsky and other direct comment on the Russian Revolution in the Criterion, and laid the groundwork for considering Eliot’s journalism in terms of what might be called a strategy of “entryism” into the public sphere. In that account, by presenting the bibliography of the publication of Trotsky’s works in Britain, including two books with cultural topics reviewed by Eliot, I begin to show in what aspects the Criterion can be considered as part of a larger public sphere. That public sphere has already put pressure on the artist to become a public intellectual, as the example of Wells shows. Moreover, the national public sphere was becoming internationalized by external events and a widespread doubt of nationalism which was perceived to have fueled the war.

The imperative that the artist bow to public function was given an additional impetus by the new Soviet State, which determined that art must have a clearly defined social function. Eliot turned in part to French thought to generate responses to these circumstances and find alternatives to the internationalizing force of the League of Nations and the Communist International. The alternatives in which he saw imperfect parallels included Marinist and Massis.

In this paper I discuss this trajectory of Eliot’s internationalism as an attempt to find a “third way” between the capitalist and communist internationals and to create a defensive “European” model based on difference rather than universality and resistant to a universalizing imperative grounded in the U.S. (Wilson’s League) and in a Russia which was both Asiatic and European; and I make especial reference to Valéry. Valéry’s essays on European civilisation were influential in Britain, he was a model of the public intellectual not least in his involvement in the League, and his “politique de l’esprit” became a perhaps surprising point of reference for Jacques Derrida, suggesting a certain amount of unfinished business and enabling an unanticipated connection to be made between Eliot and more recent French thought.

David Ayers
University of Kent

Mythological allusions in “Sweeney among the Nightingales” seem to be deprived of any specific associative implication and are sometimes hardly discernible in the text. Yet the poem is saturated with myth. The overthrown coffee cup, which can be identified as a ritual chalice; the coffee-drinking as a modern-day substitute for ancient wine ritual; and the behavior of Rachel should by no means be perceived as an impressionistic sketch, creating only a concrete ironic mood. The grapes represent a traditional symbolic image of the formidable god Dionysus, and Rachel, who “tears the grapes with murderous paws,” alludes to the Maenads, the ecstatic admirers of Dionysus, by way of which Sweeney’s “nightingales” are symbolically turned into women-escorts of the god. After the tearing of the zoomorphic Dionysus, the Maenads devoured his raw flesh the same way as Rachel is tearing and gobbling the grapes in the poem.

Temur Kobakhidze
Caucasus University, Tbilisi, Georgia

“By Hypothesis Unknowable”:
Prufrock—Eliot—Hamlet—Freud—Joyce

Despite the anti-biographical doctrine of New Criticism, and the despite its legacy across various author-absent theory since, the temptation has frequently proven too great to identify the very real frustrations of a very imaginary J. Alfred Prufrock with the biography of his 22-year-old creator, T. S. Eliot. Yet, however unsophisticated or unproductive the search for causal connections, the line between author and character is breached by Eliot himself in his infamous Hamlet essay, where he suggests that “[t]he supposed identity of Hamlet with his author is genuine to this point: that Hamlet’s bafflement at the absence of objective equivalent to his feelings is a prolongation of the bafflement of his creator in the face of his artistic problem.” Furthermore, Eliot’s essay defines Hamlet’s and Shakespeare’s shared problem in terms we can hardly resist comparing to Prufrock’s “intractable” delay, especially given the poem’s own telling denial of such likeness.

However, rather than repeat a cruder biographical
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Analysis, this paper focuses on the unstable triangulation of Prufrock and Eliot with Hamlet/Shakespeare in order to explore broader questions about the dogmatic dissociation of literary and historical voices, finally proposing a more open-ended subjectivity which can accommodate the textual reality of both. To this end, I trace this compound figure’s delays and deferrals across a decidedly non-causal web of reference, including Freud’s 1910 study of Da Vinci, which dwells on these very issues and concludes by linking the painter to Hamlet; and Ernest Jones’ study of Hamlet, written under Freud’s direction in 1910. The latter not only reaches conclusions similar to Eliot’s, I will argue, but directly informs James Joyce’s Hamlet/Shakespeare hypothesis, as voiced by 22-year-old, familiarly hesitant Stephen in Ulysses – another “autobiographical” text, whose mythic model comes full circle to provide the objective “solution” to the Prufrock/Hamlet problem for Eliot’s next masterwork.

J. T. Welsch
University of Manchester
Co-winner of the Fathman Young Scholar Award for 2011

T. S. Eliot Summer School 2011

Marianne Huntington

I feel an anticipating sensation of returning home as I enter through the wrought iron gates on Mallet Street, pulling my eyes away from the handsome and tall central tower above, contrasting the cornflower blue London sky, altering my focus on the well-worn marble steps of the colonnade leading to the Senate House. I push through the rotating doors with New York intensity expectating a large gathering around the registration table, eagerly claiming their name tags and “see-through” plastic envelopes filled with carefully thought out programs for the extended week ahead. Involuntarily, I lock my attention with the welcoming arms of the central staircase of South Block hall, almost passing the crowded reception table manned by Ron Schuchard and the beloved directors from the English Department at the University of London, Zoe Holman and Wim Van Mierlo. After a warm reunion and finding my own among many neatly placed name tags, after clutching my clear plastic folder just as I pictured it, I learn of the massive stateside storms narrowly missed. Ron and I concur it was a good strategy to fly the day before an event, “many a slip twix cup and lip.”

The smooth registration process left me plenty of time to sit on the grass of Russell Square awaiting the start of the opening ceremony. The third annual T. S. Eliot International Summer School was proudly honoring the highly acclaimed author and poet Simon Armitage, who read from both Eliot’s work and his own. A portion of my favorite piece echoed in my mind: “You’re beautiful because for you, politeness is instinctive not a marketing campaign. / I’m ugly because desperation is impossible to hide.”

Following Simon’s captivating reading was the granting of the bursaries, where Wim decided that “the naming a bursaries is a difficult matter,” cleverly giving each the name of a cat and finishing with expressions of gratitude to the benefactors: Mrs. Valerie Eliot and the Estate of T. S. Eliot, Dr. Julius Cruse, Rick Gekowki, Professor Joseph Hassett, Joan and Joe McBreen, Professor Ronald Schuchard, and Mark Storey for making all of this happen.

The reception afterwards across from Beveridge Hall (ironically), offered a spread of highly popular cheeses and appetizers, creating a setting for old friends to meet for the first time, and bonding over refreshing cocktails under the well-lit chandeliers of Macmillan Hall. Fortuitously, the Ezra Pound Society happened to be finishing up their week-long seminar at Senate House as the T. S. Eliot Summer School was commencing, creating a brief, priceless moment where the two shall meet.

Ron opened the first day of seminars with a forgiving lecture titled “The man who suffers and the mind which creates in The Waste Land,” delivering an in-depth view into Eliot’s complex psyche before the taking of coffee and cranberry cookies. His talk was followed by award-winning biographer Lyndall Gordon’s paper, “Eliot’s Unattended Moments,” which deliberations were followed by a well-attended lunch discussion over freshly made sandwiches and rocket.

Monday night we enjoyed a private reception at the Francis Kyle Gallery on Maddox St., celebrating a collection (called “This Twittering World”) of contemporary paintings representing Four Quartets. Also in attendance was Jim McCue, co-editor of Faber and Faber’s new edition of Eliot’s poems, who spoke about the philanthropic endeavors of the East Coker Preservation Trust, an organization spearheading the project to save East Coker from being “engulfed by an urban sprawl of 3741 new houses.
and an industrial site. East Coker today is still very much as Eliot knew it, with its Heritage buildings, 'shuttered' deep lanes, beautiful trees and farmland.

Each morning we heard papers presented by distinguished lecturers. Jason Harding opened Tuesday morning speaking about “Eliot's Shakespeare,” while notes were being taken feverishly throughout the room. His talk was followed by Sir Christopher Ricks' “Eliot and the Auditory Imagination,” which paper left us keenly aware of our own diction, understanding that the changing pronunciation of a word will most certainly change the meaning: “one must be so careful these days.”

Jewel Spears Brooker gave a gripping paper titled “Eliot Among the Poets in Hell and Purgatory.” Shortly afterwards, Stephen Regan graciously presented a paper for the absent Professor Crawford, “T. S. Eliot and Anglophobia.” I am not, he quipped, “Robert Crawford, nor was meant to be,” continuing with a bit of “pawky humor.”

Anne Stillman's paper, “T. S. Eliot and the Architecture of the Nerves,” left many students and professors in deep discussion for days on the subject. Later, as William Marx considered “Eliot's Classicism: A French Idea?” it was noted that his paper was unintentionally, yet appropriately, scheduled on July 14th, Bastille Day.

Michael Coyle's rich paper, “Eliot, Pound and the Idea of Literary Criticism,” addressed his subject in formal as well as biographical terms. I personally benefited by this lecture because I was also enrolled in Professor Coyle's seminar, “Eliot and Pound: Instigation and Divergence, 1917-1924,” which left me knowing just enough about Pound and his work to carry me through the rest of the year. Professor Coyle's discussion about Eliot's relation to Pound was followed by John Kelly's talk, “Eliot and Yeats: A Mutual Illumination?”

On Friday night at the London Library, where Eliot was a long-standing member, during the reading of his book, “How the Snow Falls,” Craig Raine shared darkly intimate and personal poems. Our mood lightened, however, at the reception generously offered by Mark Storey of the London Library on St. James Square.

After the seminars on Tuesday and Wednesday we had a choice between viewing the BBC Arena biographical documentary simply titled “T. S. Eliot,” or taking the walking tour of “Eliot's London” led by the enthusiastic Carey Karmel. Starting at Lower Thames Street, where the walls of “Magnus Martyr hold / inexplicable splendour of Ionian white and gold,” and where the Vicar, after giving a detailed history of the Church, and a brief one of St. Magnus, the early 12th century, ironically peaceful Nordic warrior and co-ruler of Orkney (to some, a pacifist), questioned why Eliot would have suggested the word “inexplicable.” Leaving most scholars in attendance stumped by the question, we concluded it would be a good subject for a paper. A slippery walk on the algae-coated steps down to the river Thames, looking for “cardboard boxes and cigarette ends, led us on to where St. Mary Woolnoth kept the hours. Finding the doors locked and no Stetson in sight, the group split between going back to the Lamb or continuing on to St. Paul's, and then to the Lamb for an after-tour discussion over a cool Guinness. Nightly gatherings at the Lamb became an integral part of the Summer School, with the sharing of ideas and talk and company effecting a real community, even as they made early morning lectures a bit harder to make on time.

An overcast Saturday morning on the bus; it's the last official day of the Summer School Program. The branches of the berry trees leading to Burnt Norton had grown quite thick this past spring as they pushed and scraped the sides of the buses, reaching through the roof vents and leaving snapped-off branches as a reminder of the disturbed pristine setting. Contrastingly we were received with warm hospitality from our hosts Sir Conroy and Lady Caroline, graciously offering their home as a perfect setting for lunch al fresco, overlooking the majestic English estate. The tempestuous wind that rose subsequently fazed neither hosts nor guests during the compelling lecture and a reading of “Burnt Norton” by Craig Raine and John Kelly, as a few of the attendees valiantly prevented the large tent from blowing away. In closing, as the sun emerged, Lady Caroline drew from her soon-to-be-published book on the subject a history of Burnt Norton, giving detailed accounts dating back to 1620 when Lord Saye built the original farmhouse (which is their home today), leading up to the dramatic tale of the large mansion built by Sir William Keyt to please his rapacious mistress. Keyt himself torched the mansion in 1941, taking with it his own life and the lives of members of his staff. Lady Caroline closed by noting that the estate was called originally called “Upper Norton,” coming to be known as “Burnt Norton” only after the fire.

**Tom & Viv**

Between November 14th and 19th 2011 the Talisman Theatre Company of Kenilworth England staged a production of Michael Hastings’ “Tom & Viv”: we would be eager for reports from anyone who was able to attend.
The week closed with a visit to East Coker; however, I was unable to attend. I unfortunately had to leave my new friends disembarking the bus from Burnt Norton, rushing off to Paris the next day for more T.S.E. seminars and papers. There is finally no satisfying way to thank the hard-working coordinators of the Summer School—except perhaps to say that I look forward to returning soon.


Reviewed by Anderson D. Araujo
*University of British Columbia*

In this bold study, Andrew John Miller takes stock of the first stirrings of a “planetary consciousness” (xxi) in the modernist era. He does so with an impressive body of evidence, even if at times he only glances at it. Miller engages with the heavily freighted terms in the title—modernism, crisis, and sovereignty—as interdependent categories. The book goes to great lengths to flesh out this vexed alliance. It locates in Yeats, Eliot, and Woolf the foremost expression of modernism’s response to the crisis of territorial sovereignty—not that the six-chapter discussion is evenly divided. The lion’s share goes to Yeats. Early on, Miller situates the poet at the “bloody crossroads where aesthetics and political sovereignty meet” (xiii). But all three writers crossed paths in their “postnational” hermeneutic (vii). The international webs of aesthetic and political connections in which they trafficked were at odds with the geographical limits of the modern nation-state, as formalized by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Their postnationalism was also born of chagrin at the failure of modern nation-states to prevent global warfare. Miller cogently argues that Yeats, Eliot, and Woolf came to consider the boundaries between the public and the private spheres virtually impossible to distinguish due to the steady erosion of Westphalian-bourgeois notions of sovereign power, autonomy, and privacy. Hence modernism itself emerged at the nexus of this crisis of sovereignty.

Foundational for Miller is Carl Schmitt’s definition of “sovereign” as “he who decides on the exception” (xiv), by which Schmitt means a state of emergency declared during times of national or international crisis. Miller locates this widespread sense of crisis in World War I, while also citing the Irish independence movement, the Russian Revolution, the Spanish Civil War and, at an ideational level, the “civil war of language” (33). He borrows this concept from Lyotard and associates it most strongly with Yeats, a “shape-shifting” Anglo-Irish Protestant Theosophist. Like Yeats, so too did Eliot and Woolf dig trench lines in the global civil war with texts that defy the hegemonic status of the nation-state. As Miller points out, even in our own era of “transcendental homelessness,” as Lukacs puts it, this linguistic civil war is far from over (15). Strong as Miller’s evidential claims on the modernist discourse of war and sovereignty may be, his self-confessed willingness to overlook “fissures” (xxvi) sometimes leaves the reader to do much of the work. And it is theory that emerges as his gap filler of choice.

Specifically, Barbara Herrnstein Smith provides much of the book’s theoretical ferment. Of note here is the paired opposition she sets up between “privileging” the self and “pathologizing” the Other (55). In a similar vein, her Woolfian notion that we possess locally and provisionally unified “multiple selves” (34) compels Miller to interrogate Yeats’s “Irishness” as a poet. As such, he scoffs—too hastily in my view—at the bulk of “historicist” scholarship in Yeats studies (39). Cited without much commentary or even an endnote, Miller’s unflattering list of critics (Hirsch, Hutchinson, Deane, Cullingford, and Eagleton) begs further investigation. Yet his contention still appears to hit the mark. For Miller, these critics mimetically chart Yeats’s writings in relation to Irish national history, a category Miller finds too unstable to serve as an expressive foundation for the poet’s art. By the same token, he challenges “postmodern knowingness” in recent Yeats criticism, as it so often betrays essentialistic visions of Irishness (35). In its stead, he sees Yeats’s Ireland not, strictly speaking, as a historical locale, but as a “virtual,” “deteritorialized” fantasy (40-41).

Thus Miller aims to explore texts by Yeats, Eliot, and Woolf that he sees as typifying still unresolved, non-spatial conflicts which in turn render it nearly impossible to “establish a clear line of demarcation between war and peace” (164). One of the main assumptions underlying Miller’s keen-sighted analysis here is the degree to which all three writers’ transnational and geopolitical concerns prefigure McLuhan’s technocentric vision of a global village. However, Miller is deeply sceptical of McLuhan’s
neo-Thomistic optimism about a world without margins. He takes on Thomas Friedman’s recent formulation of a flat world and other contemporary versions of “the homogenizing logic of essentialized forms of identity” (xx). In short, Miller appears to reject the discourse of globalization. But it is precisely this stance that sometimes puts him on the defensive. He insists, for example, that his use of the term “postnational” is to be understood not in a prescriptive but in a descriptive sense (22). Clearly, he does not want to be seen as hawking postnationalism. Still, his critical aloofness cannot seem to escape the irony of his own conviction of the “potential value and interest of readings of Yeats that rely little, if at all, on a detailed knowledge of Irish history” (40). This sounds about as postnational as it gets.

Miller’s anxiety at times seems to stem from the very tension he locates in Yeats, Eliot, and Woolf. After all, the writers face the paradox of “their virtual membership in an imagined community that floats free of national ties” even as they rely on a “continued need for the privileges and protections that, it seems, can only be guaranteed by means of a national civic order grounded in geopolitical claims to national sovereignty” (24). Miller builds a compelling case for this strain of “neo-medievalism” in Yeats and Eliot, adumbrating as evidence their “celebration of peasants and nobles” (25). I am, however, skeptical that both writers purposely published in British and Irish, and British and American anthologies respectively in order to escape national constraints. Given the literary-intellectual networks in which they circulated and their residential ties and citizenships, it is hardly surprising that they (like their fellow modernists) would publish in these English-speaking centers of cultural production.

That said, Miller rightly asserts that it is by giving the transnational context its proper due that we can effectively make sense of modernist writings, Yeats’s in particular. He is also astute in framing his discussion of Yeats’s nationalism along the lines suggested by Rogers Brubaker, who envisions nation not as “substance” but as “contingent event” (37). This standpoint allows Miller to enter the Lyotardian civil war armed with a critical vocabulary that contests normative conceptions of the nation-state as inevitable or natural. The book also rigorously charts the uneasy dialectic between Yeats’s and Eliot’s intellectual cosmopolitanism (e.g., A Vision and Notes towards the Definition of Culture) and their specific, local poetic settings (e.g., Yeats’s Ballylee or Eliot’s East Coker). Like Bhabha, Miller thinks that this double discourse engenders anxieties in the poets about national belonging and becoming. As Miller contends, Yeats posits a “nationalist hermeneutics” (81) for the universalized artist-citizen out of the interplay between national tradition and artistic autonomy. Eliot’s work, in turn, is all about “the politics of location” (100).

The chapter on Eliot, one of the book’s strongest, will interest readers of Time Present for its succinct and cogent look at “The Hippopotamus” and “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock.” Miller situates the Gautierian poem at the intersection between geopolitics and Christianity. As for “Prufrock,” the phrase “muttering retreats,” suggests for Miller “spaces of private irresponsibility” (113) that are at odds with all kinds of public responsibility (120). He also warns against treating Eliot’s work as high philosophical discourse. As such, he chastises critics who portray Eliot as more of a demi-god than a striving bank clerk with little spare time left to write poetry. Miller sees this kind of transcendental criticism typified in Louis Menand and Langdon Hammer. However, Miller’s brief mention of Eliot’s alleged anti-Semitism as egregiously symptomatic of the “modernist snob” (124) may strike some readers as too casual, perhaps even glib. Later, Miller illustrates Yeats’s “notorious” snobbery with Pound’s quip in Canto 83 about the elder poet not dining on ham at Stone Cottage so as to avoid eating like the peasants (158). And yet there is no hint of racial prejudice here. “Snobbery,” it would seem, is much too broad a term to subsume both racism and classism.

Elsewhere, Miller’s nuanced chapter on aesthetic sovereignty in Woolf’s pacifist-feminist cultural politics seems too short to tease out her political relativism in Between the Acts and Three Guineas. And even as he defends Woolf against charges of having grossly underestimated the dangers of Nazi Germany, he himself downplays the Nazi affiliation of one of his main critical sources, Carl Schmitt. By dubbing “opportunistic” (78) the antiliberal German jurist’s support for Fascism and Nazism, Miller glosses over the fact that Schmitt’s influential Weimar-era polemic, The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy (1923), lobbied against open democratic debate a full decade before Hindenburg appointed Hitler. This is not to suggest any sly scheme behind Miller’s application of Schmitt’s neo-Hobbesian thought. Far from it. I bring it up simply to illustrate how easy it is to leave oneself open to the very charges one has lobbed against other critics. It is nonetheless fair to say, as Miller acknowledges, that interpretations of modernist politics tend to force critics into the standpoint of either prosecutors or apologists. To his credit, he surveys the field with a skillful handling of poststructuralist theory, enough to avoid getting stuck in either camp.

Except for a few under-discussed points, Modernism and the Crisis of Sovereignty makes an important contribution...
to our understanding of the modernist concern with the crisis that attended the slippery concepts of national and individual sovereignty as well as the ensuing loss of boundaries between war and peace. The last sustained treatment of the intellectual parallels among Yeats, Eliot, and Woolf was Donald Childs's *Modernism and Eugenics*, ten years ago. Thus, Miller's book is both timely and necessary.

A Heap of Branching Images:
The *Waste Land* as iPad App

Will Gray
University of St. Andrews

For those who believe the twentieth century's greatest poem has always been ahead of its time, Faber and Faber have good news. The publishing house recently teamed with Touch Press to produce a digital version of the poem. All you need is an Apple iPad device and $13.99.

Scholars of Eliot, imagine the possibilities. No more need for multiple paperweights and broken book spines while you prep for your teaching or draft an article on *The Waste Land*. Now you can scroll through the poem with the swipe of a finger. Selected entries from Southam's notes and Pound's marked-up manuscripts are only a click away. Text fades in, search produces a clickable list of previews, and selecting a line is as simple as a single tap.

In other words, as a format of the poem this is less sacred wood pulp and more heap of branching images. The smell of a new (or used) book is clearly missing, as is the ability to scrawl your own notes, dog-ear, or highlight. In exchange, however, the reader can choose to read the poem in elegant isolation, or instead to create an enhanced experience by browsing through a constellation of relevant resources, which include an image gallery of contemporaneous Eliotiana and readings from such luminaries as Alec Guinness, Ted Hughes, and the poet himself.

One of the app's heights, in fact, is a specially staged video “performance” of the poem by renowned actress Fiona Shaw. In this reviewer's opinion, the app would be worth its value for this element alone. If all oral readings are interpretations, Ms. Shaw is one of the better translators of Eliot. There is also a broad range of video interviews featuring other famous readers, who discuss such topics as Eliot's illnesses (Paul Keegan) the poem's uniqueness (Jeanette Winterson) and Sibyl tattoos (punk rocker Frank Turner).

The app does assume that its users are mobile savvy. A basic Tips section will get you started, but some may feel comfortable only after watching a Touch Press instructional video (not included, but on YouTube) for a primer on reading the poem with your fingers.

For those who prefer to see the glass half empty, one might imagine improvements to the app, including full sets of Southam notes and the marked-up manuscripts. One puzzling limitation is the fact that Eliot's own notes are treated as a separate section of the poem, rather than what they could have been here—a hyperlinked layer allowing the reader to encounter Eliot's own take next to his poetic lines.

But then again, this reviewer likes to see any considered addition to Eliot studies as a glass at least half full. On the subject of a digital Eliot, hurry up please it's time.


Lee Oser
College of the Holy Cross

Five hundred years ago, Erasmus and Luther debated the perennial question of free will. Reflecting on that landmark debate, the distinguished Protestant scholar E. Gordon Rupp makes a compelling point: “where the influence of ideas is concerned, with their background of mysterious moods and tempers in any age, it is precarious to try to solve problems by dates and people and books.” Precarious, we must agree—but also necessary. The question of free will is a problem about justification for Luther, and, by and large, a problem about art for the modernist. However, Luther's insistent position on the bondage of the will was meaningfully developed and adapted. It winds its way through innumerable byways and bolt-holes, from its origin to Schopenhauer and on to Nietzsche, Freud, and the passions of the modernist period. For those who traffic in ideas, it is a challenge to combine a detailed focus on the most immediate contexts with the wide-open vistas of intellectual history. You constantly have to get the right adjustment. Too much swarming context and you forfeit your broader interest. Too many shining names and you end up sounding, as Philip Larkin observes with a defiant snicker, like a literary understrapper showing that he knows the right people.

Our generalizations can be shrewd, but they should not be hasty. When Eliot declares, “In English writing we seldom speak of tradition,” we are inclined to overlook
the fact that John Henry Newman spoke of “tradition” fairly often, and the word was no stranger to Matthew Arnold’s vocabulary. But, in general, to generalize is to risk losing the point in a welter of material: “Even the humanistic, anti-stoical thinkers in the Western tradition for whom passion is both necessary and justified maintain that it departs from the normative states of the human organism” (Cuda 14). If passion is “both necessary and justified,” how does it depart “from the normative states of the human organism”? To his credit, Anthony Cuda, in quoting Aristotle, cites Book VII of the Nicomachean Ethics. But if we slow down a minute, we will recall that Aristotle saw the moral struggle of controlling one’s passions as a normal part of life, something to be expected. The human soul achieves its potential by striving to give form to formless matter. The soul does not undertake any such striving in Descartes, who is much more dualistic where soul and matter are concerned (we think of the ghost in the machine). And so we must hesitate to classify passion in Aristotle in the same way we classify passion in Descartes. However, Cuda appears to regard passion in both philosophers to be analogous, such as when he says: “For Aristotle, passion ‘carries a man away’; for Descartes, it is always ‘accompanied by some disturbance which takes place in the heart’” (13).

Writing intellectual history, or reading it, can feel like rowing upstream in a leaky boat. Here is another example, concerning that esurient sea, Romanticism. In his Introduction, Cuda summons the Shelley of the Defense to bear witness to “the conventional dichotomy whereby passion and action—in this case, inspiration and composition—remain opposing, mutually exclusive states” (8). Shelley writes, “A man cannot say, ‘I will compose poetry,’” Coleridge, whose countervailing evidence is missing from Cuda’s account, says something quite different, and much more important: “The poet, described in ideal perfection, brings the whole soul of man into activity… This power [imagination], first put in action by the will and understanding, and retained under their irresistible, though gentle and unnoticed, control (laxis effertur habeis) reveals itself in the balance or reconciliation of opposite or discordant qualities.”

Now a lot turns on the dualisms in question, for Cuda wants to argue that the dominant model of modernism is one of intellectual “order and self-mastery” (182). Calling this model the “compensatory paradigm,” he holds that his “modernist models of passion…challenge the assumption, implicit in the compensatory paradigm, that the two mental states—the active and the passive—are mutually exclusive…” (187). To buttress the dualisms Cuda wants to argue against, he turns to Georg Simmel and Wilhelm Worringer (not, I confess, the first authorities that come to my mind) to dutifully establish the “compensatory paradigm,” in which intellect rises above “threatening and chaotic external stimuli” (178). Cuda’s resistance to aesthetic autonomy sparks fine insights into the “immense passive strength” of Eliot’s imagination (178). But if I am skeptical about his paradigms and models, it is because “passion and receptivity” (185) have not been so thoroughly silenced as Cuda suggests.

Cuda refers us to Professor Eve Sorum, a colleague of his, “whose work on modernism’s masochistic aspects resonates… on many levels” (184) with his own. But where is Mario Praz, author of The Romantic Agony (1933), and Eliot’s chief aide-de-camp as he prepared the Clark Lectures?: “in Der Tod in Venedig we have Aschenbach deriving a painful pleasure from his impossible passion for a beautiful Polish youth, in the oppressive atmosphere of cholera-stricken Venice; in Der Zauberberg the sanatorium offers ideal surroundings for themes of love and death in the morbid passion of Hans Castorp for Madame Chauchat.” Where is Grover Smith (scantly recognized here), who perceived the personality behind “impersonality” decades before Ronald Schuchard and Lyndall Gordon, and the Romanticism behind the mask decades before Harold Bloom?: “In ‘Hysteria’…there is none of the implicit Laforguian self-detraction, but there is an exposure of the speaker’s own excitability.” Where is Charles Taylor’s critique of (what Cuda calls) “the compensatory paradigm”: “Such a self-enclosed reading manifestly will not do: not for Eliot or Pound, but not either for Thomas Mann, or D. H. Lawrence, or Joyce, or Proust, or Rilke…” (Sources of the Self, 1989). Where does Beckett fit in? Finally, I argued in The Ethics of Modernism: Moral Ideas in Yeats, Eliot, Joyce, Woolf, and Beckett (2007), a book that Cuda likewise ignores, though he works much the same ground, that “Yeats’s Dionysianism…expresses a need for greater passion and stranger vision than Christian Europe was willing to countenance.” None of these omissions (except possibly Praz) is glaring or grave, but they could be greatly multiplied.

The larger issue is that earlier understandings of activity and passivity differ from our own. As moods and tempers change, the accent shifts, the web of association is varied, and the “conventional dichotomy” wears a new fashion. Our common fallacy is to make the past an extension of our professional lives. Though I find Cuda’s use of intellectual history to be thin, like a movie prop when you get too close, it nonetheless helps him and his reader approach what is most valuable in the book: a trenchant study of how Eliot, Yeats, Woolf, and Thomas Mann interpret the passions. Cuda has identified an im-
important problem, one central to modernist creativity, in how passion affects the writing process and turns the human subject into an object. Within the healthy limits of literary analysis, he responds with commendable vigor. Highlights of the book include thoughtful discussions of Eliot’s relations to Poe, Baudelaire, and Maritain. Cuda’s most formidable talent, though, is for the illuminating biographical vignette. Again and again, he builds on strong research, to surprise the reader, and to mix scholarship with pleasure.

+++ 


Hazel Atkins
University of Ottawa

T. S. Eliot’s study of primitive ritual, and his statement in “Ulysses, Order and Myth” (1923) that “The maxim, Return to the sources, is a good one,” are not part of a nostalgic program of reaching into the past. The anthropological project of the modernists was one of re-visualizing cultural possibilities. Anthropology shows that the meaning of ritual, and the meaning of art, is not static over time. When Eliot famously says that the mythical method is “a step toward making the modern world possible for art,” he means that the mythical method proposes a renovation of the role of art in society in which art becomes as central to the modern experience of the world as it was in primitive cultures. A “return to the sources” approach teaches that art must be revivified in and for the present moment. Glenn Willmott’s recent book offers a new look at modernist primitivism and its relationship to the diversity and vitality of modernist art.

In his introduction, Willmott tells the story of philanthropist Charlotte Mason, who employed anthropologist and author Zora Neale Hurston to collect Southern black folk-stories which Mason then “protected” from the materialism of white culture. Willmott uses this story as an example of the ambivalences and complications inherent in modernist primitivism. One of the complexities of the modernist interest in primitivism is the way in which it combines capitalist market and non-market interests. In other words, a figure like Mason comes to “own” the primitive literally and materially by claiming ownership of the heritage of black folklorists. (She was, after all, paying Hurston to collect the folk-tales.) This interest in ownership is not, however, based solely in the market value of the folk-stories. Rather, Mason also claims ownership of a personal cultural identity by belonging to a symbolic, “new, cross-racial tribe” (5). Expanding from the story of Mason and Hurston to modernist authors more generally, Willmott argues that modernist primitivism is a utopian endeavor that revalues both aboriginal culture and Western cultural anemia by bridging the gap between capitalist and non-capitalist values.

Willmott attempts to expand the definition of “aboriginal.” This word has too often been used in a way that relegates critical understandings of aboriginal culture to categories of the past, so that a dialogue between aboriginal culture and modernity is always, mistakenly he feels, a dialogue between past and present. Willmott wishes to unlock this word from these categories and allow “aboriginal” to be part of the diversity of modernism. He does so by focusing on the shared ground between aboriginal and modern histories and symbols. In other words, he seeks an understanding of the ways that aboriginal histories evolve alongside imperialist histories, thus making the modernist quest for “the new” truly diverse. He uses the economic language of House (aboriginal heritage), Market (institutions of commercial exchange) and Gift (social identity of the original owners), and he includes authors such as Yeats, Lawrence, Conrad, Eliot, Woolf, and Joyce in his study of the ambivalences inherent in modernist primitivism.

Willmott is at his most lucid when he is discussing specific modernist works. He uses The Waste Land as one of his case studies and responds to the ways that critics have reacted to the anthropological and occult subtexts of the poem. Looking first at Eliot’s famous essays about anthropology, Willmott says, “He [Eliot] selects the shaman as his unique example of authentic aboriginality, from whom genuinely we should learn” (161). He argues that Eliot desires to transform the poet into the shaman. He suggests that Eliot’s essay “War Paint and Feathers” posits “that the shaman enters modern poetry as a construction of science,” that is, anthropology (166). This vision of the shaman, Willmott says, lends itself to readings of Eliot that stress the scientific and the secular disjunction of works such as The Waste Land (166). However, he also argues that pagan myth is meaningful “only as the code for a purely individual and transcendental experience” (169, emphasis added). Therefore, the mythic and anthropological materials recorded in The Waste Land are “merely exoteric means to an esoteric end, historical fuel to be burned up like so much wood in a transcendental fire” (169). He doubts whether the elements of anthropological science and occult belief are in fact at variance in the poem. Nevertheless, he acknowledges the difficulty of discussing the sacred terrain of “primitive” religion in...
The Waste Land in any way that does not inevitably drift into vagueness.

This book draws on “new Marxist theory,” “neoclassical economics,” and “post-Maussian anthropology” (261). Willmott also relies on the theories of Freud, Kristeva, and Jameson. For readers uninitiated into the complexities of Marxian, psychoanalytic, and other contemporary theories, Willmott’s book will be hard reading. In this reader’s opinion, the intricacies of the argument and of the theory would have been better conveyed through stylistic and syntactical simplicity and clarity. Instead, however, Willmott’s sentences are long and convoluted. The argument is impeded and rendered less effective than it otherwise might have been by lengthy asides that function as diversions rather than examples. For instance, a digression about Dracula in the introduction, while perhaps interesting in itself, is only linked back to the main point with difficulty. The book is therefore very difficult to negotiate and is recommended only to the most specialized of readers.

T. S. Eliot Bibliography 2010


Buchanan, Bradley. “Anti-Humanists at Colonus: The Oedipus Myth in Wyndham Lewis and T. S. Eliot.” Oedipus against Freud: Myth and the End(s) of Humanism
T. S. ELIOT BIBLIOGRAPHY 2010


---. T. S. Eliot Reads T. S. Eliot: Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats and Other Poems. Tolpuddle, Dorset, UK:
Regis Records, 2010. mp3 format.
---. “St. Louis’ Dead Poets to be Honored at Fundraiser.” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* [MO] 11 Apr. 2010: D1.


McGurl, Mark. “Ordinary Doom: Literary Studies in the


### T. S. Eliot Bibliography 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, John</td>
<td><em>Chopping Wood with T. S. Eliot</em></td>
<td>Cliffs of Moher, Ireland: Salmon Poetry, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiliford, Lawrence</td>
<td>“Canticle V: The Death of Saint Narcissus: op. 89.” <em>Divine Musick</em></td>
<td>Benjamin Britten, the late works for tenor and harp. Montreal: ATMA Classique, 2010. CD and mp3 formats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Society Notes

Compiled by David Chinitz

And his brow so grim. “Poet with features of clerical cut, not nice to meet.” 26 across (5 letters). TLS Crossword 873, 1 April 2011.


Conflicted chieftains. “Cézanne’s strangely combined radical penchants and conservative nostalgias, both advancing worldly change and resisting it, call to mind other conflicted chieftains of modernism, such as T. S. Eliot.” —Peter Schjeldahl, “Game Change.” New Yorker 28 Feb. 2011: 78.

Another Righteous Babe. The spring edition of this column reported on the music of Animal Prufrock. In “Before the Eyes of Storytelling Girls,” Anais Mitchell, another artist with Righteous Babes Records, sings: “In the rooms the women come and go / Talking on the mobile phones / And the television talks about the war.”

“An Ode to Fuddy-Duddies,” a May 15 opinion piece by Ron Grossman in the Chicago Tribune, adduces the poetry of Eliot, together with that of such other greats as Walt Whitman and W. S. Gilbert, in order to argue that “Seinfeld isn’t Shakespeare,” that “Jerry Lewis isn’t Aristophanes,” that rap is not poetry, and that the rapper Common should not have been invited to a poetry event at the White House. Eliot’s and Common’s photos were juxtaposed to reinforce the point.

And more on the app. “The most pleasing thing is that we have earned out—we’re in profit now,” he [Henry Volans, head of Faber Digital] says. “We planned for it to take a year to earn out, but in the event it happened in about six weeks.” —Stuart Dredge, The Guardian “AppsBlog,” 8 Aug. 2011. (Headline: “The Waste Land iPad app earns back its costs in six weeks on the App Store / Landmark poetry app prospering without price cuts says Faber Digital’s Henry Volans.”)

Please send your own “public sightings” to David Chinitz (dchinit@luc.edu).

Linda Lee Wyman (1937-2011)

Among my personal memories of Linda Wyman, the one I cherish most is of the time when she, uniquely, bestowed upon me a sort of messianic status, which, as those who know me will recognize, is far from my usual condition. It happened when she was Treasurer of the T. S. Eliot Society, which was meeting in the Chase Park Plaza in St. Louis. Towards the beginning of the meeting, I was loafing in the ballroom, where some of the papers were to be delivered. On a shelf in one back corner, as in dreams I sometimes have, I found a paper bag containing cash and checks. For once withstanding temptation, I took the bag to Linda, who was seated at a table in the other back corner. “I found this.”

“You have saved me!” I am not sure whether she called me her savior or just her saver, but her beautiful voice bestowed a degree of grace on everything she said. It was not like her to misplace Society funds—and I never found out exactly what happened—but it was indeed like her to express her gratitude in the warmest and friendliest terms.

Later, she employed that beautiful voice to promote the public reading of poetry as the final session of society meetings, called “Eliot Aloud,” and it has always been a favorite feature of the meetings.

If I had thought about it, I would have recognized that she was a Southerner, but I figured that, Missouri being a border state, her accent was one of many in what was, after all, her home for years. As a Southerner myself, I know that there are many authentic dialects all across the region, and I should have recognized Linda’s as that belonging to the Gulf Coast. What I could not have guessed, however, was that she grew up in an old hotel that was owned by her parents. (The Battle House in downtown Mobile, Alabama, dates back to 1852, and is still in operation, now as a Marriott property.) I cannot imagine what such an upbringing would do to a child—and Linda was...
no Eloise. For whatever reasons of nature and nurture, she was an extraordinarily warm-hearted person, and her work as an officer of the Society for more than ten years always showed that great spirit of friendliness and humor.

Linda earned an A.B. from Southern Methodist University, the M.A. from the University of Missouri-Columbia, and a Ph.D. from George Peabody College for Teachers (before it merged with Vanderbilt). An enthusiastic traveler in England and an adherent of drama, she studied at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre Summer School in Stratford, England. She taught at Christian College in Columbia, Mo., Western Kentucky University, George Peabody College, and Motlow State Community College. In 1975 she came to Lincoln University as professor of English and chair of the Department of English, Foreign Languages and Philosophy. When she retired thirty-six years later, only four months before her death, she was named Professor Emerita. And, in the hearts of many members of the Society, Linda remains a luminous and enduring presence.

William Harmon

Actions of the T. S. Eliot Society
Board ~ 18 July 2011, Paris, France

The Board elected Tony Cuda to the position of Secretary, beginning 1 Jan. 2012, when Cyrena Pondrom steps down. The Board thanked Cyrena for her years of fine work and wise counsel. To her we owe the inception of the Eliot Society’s listserv and many particularly attractive programs for the annual meeting.

The Board voted to confer honorary membership—the highest distinction the Society offers, limited to ten living persons—upon Jewel Spears Brooker for her outstanding contributions to Eliot scholarship. Dr. Brooker joins an impressive list of seven honorary members, including Valerie Eliot, A. D. Moody, Christopher Ricks, Craig Raine, Ronald Schuchard, Grover Smith, and Marianne Thormählen.

The idea of publishing proceedings of the Paris conference was discussed and approved. (A publisher has contacted the Society to propose such a volume.) When Jayme Stayer volunteered to serve as editor, the Board formally accepted his offer and delegated the task to him. Because of the larger size of this year’s conference, the Board agreed to award three Fathman Young Scholar prizes. (In general only one prize is given annually.) Ultimately Margaret Greaves, Charlotte Webb, and J. T. Welsch were voted the 2011 prize-winners.

President David Chinitz reported on the Society’s relations with other organizations such as the MLA, ALA, Louisville Conference, SAML, and M/MLA. The Eliot Society is sponsoring panels at the conventions or conferences of all these organizations this year.

Anderson Araujo has accepted a tenure-track Assistant Professorship, primarily in Modernism, in the Faculty of Creative and Critical Studies at the University of British Columbia (Okanagan campus).

Presidential Thanks
(from the closing session of the annual meeting in Paris)

“I’d like to express the Eliot Society’s gratitude once more to our conference co-sponsors, the Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, the Institut Universitaire de France, and the Université Paris III Sorbonne Nouvelle. Please join me also in thanking the members of the Society’s Paris organizing committee: Chris Buttram, Michael Coyle, Frances Dickey, Nancy Hargrove, John Morgenstern, and Cyrena Pondrom. We have had gracious help as well from Miranda Crispin; our keynote speaker, Jean-Michel Rabaté; and our seminar leaders, Andrzej Gasiorek, Jason Harding, and Kinereth Meyer. Nancy Hargrove has been most generous with her time and her considerable expertise, which enriched the plans for this conference in numerous ways.

“And finally, please join with me in extending a most heartfelt thank-you to William Marx of the Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, who first conceived the idea of an Eliot Society meeting in Paris. William has been superhuman in his efforts to make this conference a success, and we certainly would not be here today if not for his generous labors.”

David Chinitz
Sessions Sponsored by the T. S. Eliot Society

M/MLA [MIDWEST MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION] CONVENTION
3–6 Nov. 2011, St. Louis, MO
http://www.luc.edu/mmla/annualconvention.html

T. S. Eliot: Gender, Politics, Form
Chair: Frances Dickey, Univ. of Missouri
1. Cultural Contexts for T. S. Eliot's Understanding of Gender in the Early Twentieth Century – Cyrena Pondrom, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison
3. Conversation and Caricature: Experimental Drama in Virginia Woolf's The Waves and T. S. Eliot's Sweeney Agonistes – Alison Rutledge, Univ. of Missouri

2011 SAMLA [SOUTH ATLANTIC MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION] CONVENTION
4–6 Nov. 2011, Atlanta, GA
http://smla.gsu.edu/convention/convention.htm

New Perspectives on T. S. Eliot
Friday, Nov. 4, 1:30–3:00 pm
Chair: Anthony Cuda, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
1. New Insights into Eliot's Parisian Year – Nancy Hargrove, Mississippi State Univ.
2. From Ghost to Ghost in Little Gidding – Jewel Spears Brooker, Eckerd College
3. Eliot as Collector – Bartholomew Brinkman, Emory Univ.

Also of interest:
The session “Transatlantic Exchanges” (Saturday, Nov. 5, 1:00–2:30 pm) includes "The Truly Great’: Ted Hughes and T. S. Eliot,” by Gillian Groszewsilk, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
The session “Editing Poets of the Modern World,” sponsored by the Society for Textual Scholarship (Sunday, Nov. 6, 12:30–2:00 pm), includes “Editing T. S. Eliot's Early Criticism,” by Tony Cuda, Univ. of North Carolina, Greensboro.

127TH ANNUAL MLA CONVENTION
5–8 Jan. 2012, Seattle, WA
http://www.mla.org/convention

Eros, Empathy, and Sacrifice in T. S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf
Saturday, Jan. 7, 12:00–1:15 pm
Chair: Gabrielle McIntire, Queen's University
1. Empathy and Elegy in Eliot and Woolf – Eve Sorum, Univ. of Massachusetts, Boston
3. “Other Echoes”: Sacrificial Narratives and the Problems of Reading Virginia Woolf and T. S. Eliot – John Whittier-Ferguson, Univ. of Michigan

LOUISVILLE CONFERENCE ON LITERATURE & CULTURE SINCE 1900
23–25 Feb. 2012, Louisville, KY
http://www.thelouisvilleconference.com

T. S. Eliot I: The Other Arts
Chair: Andrew Karas, Yale University
1. The Modern Lilith: D. G. Rossetti and T. S. Eliot – Frances Dickey, Univ. of Missouri
2. Eliot’s Condition of Music – Michelle Witen, Oxford Univ.
3. “My opinions on art … have modified radically”: T. S. Eliot and Henri Matisse – John Morgenstern, Pädagogische Hochschule Schwäbisch Gmünd

T. S. Eliot II: Self-Allusion, Fragmentation, and the Body
Chair: John Morgenstern, Pädagogische Hochschule Schwäbisch Gmünd
2. “These Fragments”: The Epigraph to T. S. Eliot’s “Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a Cigar” – Rick de Villiers, University of Pretoria
3. “My Words Echo Thus”: Self-Allusion in Burnt Norton – Andrew Karas, Yale University
Reading Bradley After Reading Laforgue

Eliot’s Bradley is based on an opposition to empiricism that Bradley shares with the Symbolists. This opposition is based on the following claims. First, the basic difference lies in Bradley’s argument that objects are not facts in the world but simply positings that complete an intention. Objects are constructed so that we can make feelings for the world continuous with points of view on the world. Second, these objects are not merely subjective because their “degree of reality” depends on the aspects of continuity that are established by their relations with other intentional objects. Degrees of reality are based on the possibility of points of view acknowledging what must be shared in order for differences to develop: “whatever is gathered together in consciousness equally is, and is real or unreal only in relation” (126). Third, this dynamic view of reality means that imaginative constructs beginning as something close to hallucination can develop internal relations that confer public significance. Without these internal relations, imagination yields only the imaginary and it invites only questions about the biography of the author rather than about the public values involved in imagining a world in a certain way. Yet the poet can produce reality for the image by making present the force of the image for other points of view or voices. Finally “the life of the soul does not consist in the contemplation of one consistent world but in the painful task of unifying (to a greater or less extent) jarring and incompatible ones” and trying to include those conflicts in more comprehensive attitudes (147–48). Eliot’s poetics of complex feeling and tensions among competing voices begins here.

Charles Altieri
University of California, Berkeley

The Remarkable Relationship of T. S. Eliot and Mary Hutchinson

Although T. S. Eliot and Mary Hutchinson had a remarkable relationship that lasted from 1916 until the end of the poet’s life, it has received little attention. In this paper I explore the complexities of that relationship. I begin with a background information on Hutchinson, including her position in London society, her various affairs, her intellect, and her interest in art and literature, all of which help to explain why she was an appealing figure for Eliot. In the remainder of the paper I explore various facets of their relationship. She and her husband often invited the Eliots to dinners and parties at their home, and the two couples attended various cultural events together. Furthermore, she was a close friend and confidante both of Vivien and Eliot, and for a five-year period she and Eliot seem to have had a flirtation. But I argue that what is most remarkable about their relationship is their intellectual and literary bond. She was a published writer, and Eliot included her short story “War” in the December 1917 issue of The Egoist. He often sought her opinion about his work from his early poetry to his last plays. In later years, even after he married Valerie, the two continued to correspond, the last surviving letter dated just three months before his death. I conclude by suggesting what we may learn from their relationship and posing some of the intriguing questions which remain.

Nancy D. Hargrove
Mississippi State University

Darkling Eliot: Revenge & Other Shades of Black

Eliot’s modernist rejection of nineteenth-century optimism takes a distinctive form that differs (though not absolutely) from that of Thomas Hardy, Oscar Wilde, W. B. Yeats, or Virginia Woolf, to name a few of his less-than-optimistic contemporaries. That rejection manifests itself emphatically in his interest in and advocacy of writers of dark literary works and in the significant threads of darkness, or negativity (capable negativity), in his own writing. The history and character of the word darkling, meaning in the dark as a physical condition and a mental state, are relevant to Eliot’s work when compared to Hardy’s “The Darkling Thrush,” but also to “Ode to a Nightingale,” in which the word occurs. These poems provide a revealing basis for reading passages with implications for poetic creation from The Waste Land and Four Quartets involving the nightingale (a kind of thrush), the hermit thrush, and the “dark dove.”

The latter invites consideration of “Little Gidding” II as involving the hearing of a voice coming out of the dark (as in Hardy’s poem, in Beckett’s Company, and in Salomé) in a narrative of infernal descent that takes us to
OTHER CONFERENCES

Dante and to Eliot’s assertion in “The Lesson of Baudelaire” (1921) about Baudelaire as a “deformed Dante.” I fold his claim into our understanding of some of Eliot’s own writings (Eliot as deformed Baudelaire), in order to characterize them as significantly deformed, disfigured and deviant, monstrous and mangled, queer and twisted. That sense of them bears on “The Love Song of St. Sebastian” as a monstrous work that sends us back to Salomé, a revenge tragedy, because of extensive verbal echoes.

The range of authors and texts I adduce helps to establish Eliot’s place in a tradition of deformed or monstrous writings that keep us in the dark, as listeners and speakers, victims and perpetrators, shades (ghosts, shadowy doubles) of ourselves. By means of doublings and mangling he regularly invokes revenge and the gothic tradition of doubling and violence, which inform his presentation of aesthetic creation as dark, deformed, deviant, queer, twisted. Interpreting the encounter with the familiar compound ghost, key moments in the The Waste Land, and “St. Sebastian” by comparison with Hardy and as responses to Dante, Baudelaire, and Wilde, my argument emphasizes Eliot’s concern with darkling acts within processes of gothic history and infernal creativity. It closes by characterizing “And all shall be well,” taken from Lady Julian of Norwich, not as a statement of unalloyed optimism but as a moment of commitment and belief within a comic vision that, like Dante’s, takes a hard look at the various shades of black that discolor our world.

J. P. Riquelme
Boston University

The Courage of his Convictions: Eliot in 1910

In early 1910, Eliot penned his “Convictions (Curtain Raiser),” a poem that addresses various rhetorical problems discovered but not yet solved in November 1909: an indistinct audience, a divided voice, a thematic uncertainty. The tellingly entitled poem so neatly solves these problems that it is later deliberately placed near the beginning of the notebook, before the November 1909 poems, as if it were a solution, an artistic manifesto arrived at and announced. “Convictions (Curtain Raiser)” reveals an author writing with conviction to an audience seen more clearly as his curtain of rhetorical uncertainty is raised out of the way. Grouped together on a stage, the marionettes of the poem embody the tensions of an artist gesturing towards his audience, the puppets’ staged mannerisms enabling the author to put himself at a step removed from the ethos-pathos quandary. The objective distance he gains thereby gives him greater control over the effects he seeks to achieve.

On the formal-rhetorical level, the poem is an expression of artistic conviction, an “unshakeable confidence” that he attributes to his brush with Laforgue. Here, Eliot clears his throat, in both senses of that expression: he clarifies his own voice, and he signals for attention to a new kind of audience. On the biographical level, there are parallels between Eliot’s developing convictions as a writer and his increasing courage as a young man. No longer the obedient boy capitulating to his family’s expectations, he boldly demands permission—and gets it—to spend a year in Paris. That his secret plan to remain in Paris falls apart—he returns to Harvard for another philosophy degree after all—matters little. What matters is that he has summoned the courage to concoct an escape. Its failure only defers, rather than destroys, his eventual liberation from familial expectations.

Jayme Stayer
Boston College

Eliot on the Window Sill: Jewishness, Ritual, and Cultural Memory in Eliot’s Early Poetry

Discussions of Jewishness in Eliot’s poetry seem inevitably to devolve into a debate about his alleged anti-Semitism, particularly since the publication of Anthony Julius’s T. S. Eliot, Anti-Semitism, and Literary Form, now in its second edition. Such debates, however, tend to obscure the deeper significance that Jewishness plays in Eliot’s poetry. To move beyond charges and defenses of anti-Semitism is to recognize that Rachel Rabinovich, Bleistein, Sir Ferdinand Klein, and the squatting “jew” in “Gerontion” all manifest the same ambiguous social position and cultural dislocation that plagued a certain Missourian in London.

In this paper, I place “Sweeney Among the Nightingales,” “Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a Cigar,” and “Gerontion” in conversation with Eliot’s contemporaneous prose in order to propose that Eliot’s Jews are not only inextricably linked with the cultural project first outlined in his dissertation on F. H. Bradley but are also its ideal figurations. In a modern world of fractured relations, the Jew provided a recognizable caricature to reinforce the cultural homogeneity necessary for ritual
and, thus, community. To put it another way, Eliot’s “anti-Semitic” poems can be read as a part of a larger effort to rebuild cultural signification and establish community. Jewishness therefore plays a pivotal role in this project as both a means towards reinventing cultural memory and the embodiment of its fragmentation.

Michael Spiegel
University of Virginia

T. S. Eliot’s Economies of Devotion

Mark Shell has claimed that a “formal money of the mind informs all discourse” (Money, Language, and Thought, p. 4). One might think that devotional verse, engaged with eschatological, spiritual, and theological matters, would be a striking exception to this all-encompassing observation. However, the minute that poetic language is used, the “tropic interaction between language and production is put into play,” even if the poem focuses on the state of one’s soul.

Devotional poetry is characterized by an inevitable disproportion. In engaging in a colloquy with God, or in meditating upon the spirit, an underlying incommensurability informs the relationship between the finite speaker and the infinite object. This disproportion gives rise to a kind of poetry whose economy is widely disparate—either “too much” or “too little.” T. S. Eliot, scion of an American family deeply rooted in Protestant New England, was acutely aware of the economies of poetic language, nowhere more so than in his post-conversion poetry. Like the early American poet, Edward Taylor, who responds to the largesse of God’s grace with an economy of overflowing excess (the “golden tree,…/Whose glorious limbs and fruitful branches strong/With saints and angels bright are richly hung”), Eliot evokes his experience of the Incarnation in Four Quartets through rich and elliptical imagery. At the same time, like Taylor and like George Herbert, Eliot engages in a conscious crafting of “poetic unsuccess” (Richard Strier, Love Known, p. 190) “canceling out” or undercutting his own linguistic productions by insisting on the inadequacy of the poet and the insufficiency of his poetry.

I have argued elsewhere that Eliot’s religious poetry re-presents and reconstitutes—performs—previous devotional stances and contexts (Church liturgy, St. John of the Cross, Lancelot Andrewes, Nicholas Ferrar, George Herbert). In this paper, I propose to re-examine Eliot’s post-conversion poetry in a context much “closer to home”—Puritan hermeneutics. Although Eliot became a British citizen and a member of the Church of England, he claimed in a 1959 interview that “in its sources, in its emotional springs,” his poetry “comes from America” (Donald Hall, Writers at Work, p. 110). Other readers have emphasized the significance of Eliot’s formative experiences—his family history, his childhood in St. Louis, and his yearly rhythmic return to New England. I claim that reading the post-conversion poems (“Ash Wednesday” and Four Quartets) together with the poems of Edward Taylor is not necessarily to “unearth” unacknowledged intertexts; it is a way to discover economies of poetic language that illuminate Eliot’s poetic strategies for examining the middle ground between interior, spontaneous devotional acts (such as worship or contemplation), and the formal exigencies of lyric verse.

Kinereth Meyer
Bar-Ilan University, Israel
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### CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The Supervisor of Elections seeks nominations for the position of Board Member to fill the seats presently held by Jayme Stayer and Nancy Gish. Those elected will serve three-year terms from June 1, 2012, to May 31, 2015.

A third position on the board recently opened when board member Tony Cuda was appointed Secretary of the Society. The candidate in the upcoming election who receives the third-highest vote total will be elected to complete the final year of Tony’s term on the board, from June 1, 2012 through May 31, 2013.

Board members must attend the annual meeting of the Society, at which the Board meeting is held, and will be asked to take on other tasks in service to the Society.

Nominations and self-nominations should be sent to the Supervisor of Elections, William Harmon (wharmon03@mindspring.com) by January 31, 2012. Candidates with five or more nominations will appear on the ballot.

The Board of Directors must also soon appoint a new Treasurer. (John Karel has asked to step down, effective December 31.) The new Treasurer will serve a three-year term from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2014. Members of the Society are welcome to make nominations for these positions, and any member of the Society is eligible to be nominated. Please send nominations to Supervisor of Elections William Harmon (wharmon03@mindspring.com) by November 30, 2011.
E-MAIL LIST SERVE

Members are invited to subscribe to the Society's informational list serve, which is used for occasional official communications only—never for discussion. To join, please contact the Secretary.

FOR HELP WITH SOCIETY MATTERS

To Submit papers for any conference 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 Time Present: The Newsletter of the T. S. Eliot Society, please contact the Vice President.

To pay dues, inquire about membership, or report a change of address, please contact the Treasurer. The Society Historian is Frances Dickey (dickeyf@missouri.edu).
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