Jeremy Irons Reads Eliot’s *Four Quartets* at the 92nd Street Y, New York, 12 April 2018

Reviewed by Patrick Query
United States Military Academy, West Point

On April 12th, actor Jeremy Irons read T. S. Eliot’s *Four Quartets* in its entirety for a live audience at the 92nd Street Y in Manhattan. “Read” feels limp and inadequate, but the term was Irons’s own preferred description. In his brief introductory remarks, he dismissed the suggestion that he would be “performing” Eliot’s poems. My students and I reflected afterwards on the heady effect the sound of Irons as “reader” had on our understanding of Eliot’s words. So harmonious is the pairing of Irons’s voice with Eliot’s language that, in hearing the former, we felt ourselves to be hearing the “true” sound of the latter. It would make a suggestive addition to Eliot’s three voices of poetry: the voice of another, addressing the poet’s words to an audience. Robert Pinsky has said that he writes poems to sound good in another’s voice, not his own, and this expansion of the congregation for a poetic utterance is one to treasure. Much has been said about Eliot’s own speaking voice, both celebratory and critical. It is perhaps enough to say that for one man to have been gifted with Eliot’s words and Irons’s voice would have been concentrating wealth too narrowly.

Irons is known firsthand to a number of Eliot folks from his appearances at the T. S. Eliot Summer School in London. On this evening, he mentioned having read *Little Gidding* at Little Gidding. Through such events and with the new recording of *The Poems of T. S. Eliot* (BBC/Faber), he has become the contemporary voice of Eliot, as Valerie Eliot suggested he might be, and as he earlier became the contemporary voice of Evelyn Waugh with his narration of *Brideshead Revisited* for the 1981 BBC mini-series. I associate Irons primarily with that work and with the film *Lolita* (1997). My students know him as the
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Welcome to the Rose Library at Emory University

By Beth Shoemaker
Rare Book Cataloger
Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, & Rare Book Library

On behalf of the Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, & Rare Book Library, I want to extend an early welcome for the T. S. Eliot Society’s 2018 Annual Meeting. We hope you will have some time during the meeting to study some of our T. S. Eliot holdings and Eliot-related materials.

The core of the Rose Library holdings on Eliot were originally the private collection Julius M. Cruse, who was a member of the Eliot Society. Dr. Cruse has contributed widely to the field of immunology and microbiology as a researcher and educator. He collaboratively launched multiple journals in his field, has published hundreds of articles on diverse topics, and is the author and editor for Immunology Guidebook and Historical Atlas of Immunology among others. What is extraordinary is that beyond all his professional work, he also made time for his passion for the works of T. S. Eliot, collecting a broad array of published works and archival material related to Eliot. This extensive collection is now available at Rose Library.

Among the highlights of the collection are a first edition of Eliot’s Die Einheit der Europäischen Kultur with English and German printed on opposite pages. We also hold a chapbook of A Practical Possum, printed in a run of only 800 copies in 1947. A copy of Eliot’s critical essays on Dryden, printed in a small run of 100, also reveals a presentation inscription, signed by Eliot. Researchers additionally have access to a full run of the Criterion, as well as other newspapers and journals where Eliot’s poetry, essays, and critical writing appeared.

Furthermore, Rose Library has an archival collection of unpublished correspondence and Eliot-related ephemera. Other archival materials bearing on Eliot may be found in collections such as the Stuart Rose Literary Collection and our Ezra Pound Collection. And for those researchers interested in a longer view of twentieth-century literature, Rose Library is also home to the papers of both Ted Hughes and Seamus Heaney.

Before you visit Emory for the conference, I suggest that you peruse our holdings through both our catalog and finding aids. Emory’s catalog, DiscoverE, can be accessed at http://web.library.emory.edu/. While Emory libraries have many holdings by and about Eliot, you may want to limit your search by selecting “Rose Library (MARBL)” in the left-hand pane. Archival collections finding aids can be accessed from the Rose Library home page: http://rose.library.emory.edu.

Rose Library collections can be viewed in our beautiful, light-filled Reading Room. We strongly encourage you to make an appointment and request materials you would like to see in advance of coming to Rose. This guarantees that we will have your materials available for you as soon as you arrive for your appointment. If you wish to see a collection that is stored off-site, retrieval can take up to 48 hours, so planning ahead will let you access the items you wish to see in a timely manner. You can register your user account and learn more about requesting at our home page. If you have specific questions about using our collections, or to contact a Research Services staff member, you can send an email to our general address, rose.library@emory.edu, or phone us at 404-727-6887.

Additionally, you may be interested in visiting some of the exhibit spaces on the Emory campus. Rose Library will have an exhibit of artists’ books made by women creators in our cases on the 10th floor. The Michael C. Carlos Museum (http://carlos.emory.edu/) is near the library and boasts a world-class collection of Egyptian and Near Eastern antiquities, as well as other permanent and rotating exhibits. Additionally, the exhibit space at the Candler School of Theology will be showing an exhibit on Martin Luther and the German Reformation.

I wish you all the best for a successful meeting in Atlanta. We’ll see y’all soon.
T. S. ELIOT SOCIETY 39TH ANNUAL MEETING

September 21-22, 2018
Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library
Emory University, Atlanta

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 21

9:15-11:15  Peer Seminars.
No auditors, please.

Seminar 1: Eliot and Belief
Billops-Hatch Room
Led by Jewel Spears Brooker, Eckerd C
Laura Coby, U of Illinois, Urbana
Jenny Crisp, Dalton State C
Emily King, Sanford U
Junichi Saito, Kanagawa U
Jessica Slavic, UNC Chapel Hill
Charles Sumner, U of Southern Mississippi
Josh Wagner, Stanford U

Seminar 2: Eliot and History
Woodruff Commons 1
Led by Paul Stasi, SUNY Albany
Lynette Ballard, St. Louis
Michael Bedsole, UNC Greensboro
Adam Cotton, Queens
Amanda Howard, California State Fullerton
Qiang Huang, Beijing Foreign Studies U
Benjamin Lockerd, Grand Valley State U
Maria-Josee Mendez, U of South Carolina
Shazia Nasir, Kent State U
Paul Robichaud, Albertus Magnus C
Craig Woelfel, Flagler C
Danae Zevely, California State Stanislaus

Seminar 3: New Editions, New Writings: Fresh Perspectives on Eliot
Danowski Room
Led by John Whittier-Ferguson, U of Michigan, and Jayme Stayer, John Carroll U
Gabriel Hankins, Clemson U

Marianne Huntington
Joseph Fritsch, Emory U
Patrick Query, West Point
Joshua Richards, Williams Baptist U
Michael Sutterlin, U of Tennessee Knoxville
Annarose Steinke, U of Nebraska-Kearney

11:30-12:45  Lunch

12:45-12:50  President’s Welcome
Jones Room

1:00-2:30  Session 1 - Concurrent Panels

1A - Prufrock and Other Observations
Billops-Hatch Room
Chair: John Morgenstern, Clemson U
Aidan Wasley, U of Georgia
“Prufrock,” Puns, and Poetic “Will”
Naomi Gades, Loyola U Chicago
The Hypnotic Twist in “Rhapsody”: Bergson, Charcot, and Eliot in Paris
Christopher McVey, Boston U
Eliot, Modernism, and Boredom: Affective Economies in Prufrock and Other Observations

1B - Eliot’s Identities
Teaching and Learning Studio
Chair: Patrick Query, West Point
Edward Upton, Valparaiso U
The Complexities of Religious Identity in The Cocktail Party
Paul Robichaud, Albertus Magnus C
Archipelagic Eliot
Steve Pinkerton, Case Western Reserve U
Eliot among the Blasphemers

2:30-2:50  Coffee Break
Woodruff Commons

2:50-3:50  Session 2 - Concurrent Panels

2A - Ecological Eliot
Billops-Hatch Room
Chair: Julia Daniel, Baylor U
Kyle Joudry, Queen’s U
“The Last of Earth Left to Discover”: Original Sin, Environmental Abuse, and the Edenic Return in Four Quartets
LeeAnn Derdeyn, Southern Methodist U
Everyday Nettles

2A - Collaborative Eliots
Teaching and Learning Studio
Chair: Anthony Cuda, UNC Greensboro
Sheila T. Cavanagh, Emory U
Crowd-sourcing “Return to The Waste Land”: Margate and Coventry in 2018
Sara Palmer, Alyssa Duck, and Emily Banks, Emory U
Encoding The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot

3:50-4:10  Break

4:10-5:40  Session 3: Roundtable Reading The Waste Land with the #MeToo Generation
Teaching and Learning Studio
Chair: Patrick Query, West Point
Megan Quigley, Villanova U
Sumita Chakraborty, Emory U
Nancy K. Gish, U of Southern Maine
Michelle Alexis Taylor, Harvard U
Erin Templeton, Converse C
Janine Utell, Widener U

5:40-7:00  Reception
Woodruff Commons
Saturday, September 22

9:00-10:30  Session 4 - Concurrent Panels

4A Eliot/Pound
Teaching and Learning Studio
Chair: Vincent Sherry
Anderson Araujo, U of British Columbia
“I can’t print what he says without danger of libel”: Eliot, Pound, and the Politics of Editing
Michael Coyle, Colgate U
“Ideas in order but not in sequence”: The Form of Pound’s Culture
John Gery, U of New Orleans
There in/ by the Arena: Ezra Pound and Eliot in Verona

4B Eliot, Belief, and Negation
Billops-Hatch Room
Chair: Benjamin Lockerd, Grand Valley State U
Brett Bourbon, U of Dallas
Crucifixion Can Seem Like Standing in Air
Elysia Balavage, UNC Greensboro
The Uncanniest of Guests and a Proper Host: Eliot and Nihilism
Hyonbin Choi, U of Wisconsin, Madison
Not Nothing: The Virtual Potency of Negations in Eliot’s The Waste Land

10:30-10:50 Coffee Break
Jones Room

10:50-12:20 Session 5: Memorial Lecture
Teaching and Learning Studio

11:00-12:00 What is Over-annotation?: Interrogating the New Eliot Editions
David E. Chinitz
Professor and Chair of English Loyola University Chicago

12:20-1:45 Lunch
Jones Room

1:45-2:45 Session 6 - Concurrent Panels

6A Dramatic and Lyric Eliot
Billops-Hatch Room
Chair: Nancy Gish, U of Southern Maine
Andrew Walker, Liberty U
Eliot’s “Three Voices” after New Lyric Studies
Fabio Vericat, U Complutense de Madrid
In the Closet: Milton, F. M. Cornford’s “The Invention of Space” and the Awkward Staging of Eliot’s Sweeney Agonistes

6B After Eliot
Teaching and Learning Studio
Chair: Michael Coyle
Luke Carson, U of Victoria
“Wild Thyme”/ “Wild Time”: John Ashbery’s Eliot
Anita Patterson, Boston U
Gwendolyn Brooks, T. S. Eliot, and the Chicago Renaissance

2:45-3:15 Coffee Break
Jones Room

3:15-4:45 Session 7: Roundtable Editing The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot
Ronald Schuchard, Emory U
Jewel Spears Brooker, Eckerd C Anthony Cuda, UNC Greensboro
Frances Dickey, U of Missouri
Jayme Stayer, John Carroll U
David E. Chinitz, Loyola U Chicago

4:45-5:00 Break

5:00-6:00 Session 8

6:00-7:30 Reception
Jones Room

Sunday, September 23

No official conference events, but outings will be offered to Atlanta sites such as the High Museum of Art, the Atlanta Botanical Garden, and the Center for Civil and Human Rights.
The Waste Land Returns to Margate

By Michaela Atienza
Royal Holloway, University of London

In 2015, the Turner Contemporary in Margate put out an open call for local volunteers interested in curating an art exhibition built around The Waste Land. The work of this research group has culminated in Journeys with “The Waste Land,” which was shown at the Turner from February through May 2018.

The exhibition follows many different trajectories. Some pieces produce new echoes of the poem, continuing its work of collage and quotation. The epigraph from Petronius, reproduced in David Jones’s Nam Sibyllam, looms over the staircase that leads to the exhibition entrance. In John Smith’s The Waste Land, lines from “A Game of Chess” and “The Fire Sermon” are recorded over video footage of a pub (the Thames refrain is recited from inside the men’s room). Emma Talbot’s silk hanging, What Do We Have / To Give Up / To Be Free?, incorporates lines from “What the Thunder Said” into her depiction of the environmental degradation and moral decay plaguing contemporary society. Another vision of the ruined world is visible in If Not, Not by R. B. Kitaj, a painting which includes an image of Eliot. The poem undergoes even more drastic transformations in the hands of John Newling, who has shredded and recycled a thousand copies of The Waste Land to make new paper, and Vibeke Tandberg, who has cut it up and reorganized its words according to frequency.

The show also contextualizes the poem, drawing links to history, biography, and myth. The first gallery recalls Eliot’s time at Margate, presenting a letter from Eliot to Sydney Schiff on the progress of The Waste Land, some old photographs of the town and, hinting at Eliot’s state of mind at the time of his visit, a copy of Roger Vittoz’s book on neurasthenia. It moves on to World War I, and to images of wire, blasted land, and suffering bodies (hidden away in a corner is a photograph of Jean Verdenal). Elsewhere, there are references to the poem’s mythic backgrounds, with J. M. W. Turner’s The Golden Bough and Cecil Collins’s The Quest. Other pieces bring to life familiar images and episodes—Tarot cards, a chess set, a dead tree. In Carey Young’s Lines Made by Walking, the artist attempts to carve out space in a crowd of people on their daily commute. Paula Rego’s Abortion Sketches make clear and inescapable what is glossed over so casually in “A Game of Chess.”

The variety and unpredictability of these selections and the loose structure that holds them together are deliberate decisions on the part of the organizers, who have taken cues from their source material. This, they take pains to remind us, is in keeping with the style and spirit of the poem. However, the show’s fragmented, multi-voiced approach to curation is often undercut by its impulse to frame, unify, and organize. The headings which introduce each gallery draw broad and sometimes confusing categories. What gender, myth, and war—the themes of one section—have to do with one another is unclear; likewise, science, disorientation, isolation, and identity are lumped together in another section.

The exhibition chooses to highlight these general themes instead of playing up its more illuminating threads, especially the crucial idea of perspective. Like The Waste Land, many of the pieces are concerned with the power and limitations of sight. The arrangement of frames and screens in Lee Miller’s Portrait of Space forces a re-examination of one’s vantage point. Monir Shahroudy Farmanfarmaian’s Variations on the Hexagon continues this exploration of perspective, splintering both gaze and object. Meanwhile, Man Ray’s Dust Breeding, Ana Mendieta’s Burial Pyramid, and
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Reviewed by Annarose F. Steinke University of Nebraska-Kearney

Emphasizing the unique qualities of modernist spectrality, Matt Foley’s Haunting Modernisms urges critics to “move beyond undertaking a cursory genre reading” that facilely insists that “the Gothic must be cognate with haunting modernisms” (14). Foley traces this approach to Virginia Woolf’s assertion (in her 1921 review of Edith Birkhead’s The Tale of Terror) that “[i]t is at the ghosts within we shudder … and not at the decaying bodies of barons or the subterranean activities of ghouls” (qtd. in Foley 10). Foley concurs with Woolf that modernist ghosts are distinct from “the outlandish figures of fright” typical of Gothic romances, and he rejects recent studies that interpret modernist hauntings as mere appropriations of Gothic literary stylings. He also, however, cautions against conflating the modernist ghostly with the Freudian uncanny, which connotes a more “transitory experiential moment” that belies the “persistent nature” of hauntings in modernist literature (28). Rather, Foley argues that modernist ghosts remain to be reckoned with. He is particularly interested in moments when a ghostly apparition draws attention to the ways that modernist aesthetics problematize the ability to mourn productively and meaningfully. How, for example, might a poet reconcile the horrors witnessed on the front lines of World War I with the Imagists’ dictum to “go in fear of abstractions” (63)? Does maintaining a respect for finitude, as T. E. Hulme’s ideation of the “classical image” advocates (48), necessitate that the dead cannot “transform the living present”—even when the dead and living actually “cohabitate” as they do in T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land (83)? These are just a few of the questions Foley poses while exploring some dynamic exchanges between modernist aesthetic conventions and modern hauntings throughout a variety of poetry and prose.

Foley’s introduction describes the theoretical lenses that inform his discussions, especially Jacques Derrida’s foundational work in haunting studies. Building on Derrida’s interest in the ghost as “an agent of future justice” (15), Foley aims to unpack some crucial moments in modernist poetry and novels when the subject ought to learn from the ghostly Other but fails to do so. Engaging with the ghost is supposed to help mitigate moments of “ontological uncertainty,” a term that Foley coins to denote an “impasse” plaguing these texts’ speakers and characters (20). This impasse, Foley argues, is “not a programme for confronting or turning away from loss, but the moment at which the subject is yet to embark upon—or transition out of—these paradigms of consolation, anti-consolation, or resistance” (20). For Foley, the anxieties featured in these texts stem not from the fear that encountering the ghostly would prove fatal (as is often the case for the characters of Gothic tales) but that such encounters would fail to yield the guidance needed for living.

Each chapter explores how certain texts represent this moment of ontological uncertainty as to how to live after loss, and the extent to which these writers’ approaches might perpetuate or mitigate such moments. Foley posits, for example, that while Wyndham Lewis’s Vorticist perspective keeps him “consistently concerned with … ‘deadness’ as an aesthetic category” (54), Ford Madox Ford’s “invocation of a living dead” rejects such “deadness” (74). Including the more canonical modernists Woolf, Lawrence, and Eliot alongside Elizabeth Bowen (whose adherence to more conservative prose forms sometimes calls her modernist credentials into question), Foley exemplifies a growing interest in pushing the temporal and formal boundaries that once enclosed the “modernist” label more rigidly. Moreover, Foley makes generative connections between these writers beyond the overarching “haunting modernisms” rubric, which afford a cohesive and rewarding reading experience. He situates Eliot’s rendering of The Waste Land’s ghosts—that “are … not privy to any potentially transformative knowledge from beyond” (104)—as resonant not only with Lewis’s “deadness” aesthetic, but also with Woolf’s approach to memory, as both writers “share a common anxiety over a more radical form of remembering that is often traumatic” (113). Foley also engages Eliot’s After Strange Gods to introduce D. H. Lawrence’s approaches to hauntings. Eliot, Foley argues, “tellingly misreads” Lawrence when he surmises that Lawrence’s “profound intuition” produces the “wrong conclusions” (190). Such “intuition,” Foley argues, is not the means
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PUBLIC SIGHTINGS

Compiled by David Chinitz

Listen to the Warm. In an article on the unexpected connections between Andy Warhol and Norman Rockwell, Ed Siegel leads into his peroration as follows: “What does it say that Rockwell captured the popular imagination more than Warhol did? Despite their mutual attraction to artistic populism, it doesn’t say much. If it did, as my old college professor James Riddell used to say, we’d have to consider Rod McKuen a greater poet than T. S. Eliot.” (“Andy Warhol Meets Norman Rockwell in the Berkshires—Not Such Strange Bedfellows?” The ARTery. wbur.org, 5 July 2017)

Favorites. In an interview published just a few weeks before she died, Ursula Le Guin was asked what books she had “read over and over again.” Her answer: “Dozens. From Alice in Wonderland to Black Beauty, from The Jungle Book to Kim, from Pride and Prejudice to Jane Eyre to Little Dorrit to To the Lighthouse. And poets: Shelley, Keats, A. E. Housman, T. S. Eliot, Robinson Jeffers.” (EW.com, 8 Dec. 2017)

The great Rod McKuen; the not-so-great Robert Mugabe (Photos courtesy Wikipedia)

Prufrocked. Salman Rushdie’s latest novel, The Golden House (2017), includes many literary allusions, including this one, which occurs as the narrator, René, launches into a sex scene: “I rear back and halt myself, ashamed, prufrocked into a sudden pudeur, for, after all, how should I presume? Shall I say, I have known them all, I have seen her like a yellow fog rubbing her back against, rubbing her muzzle upon, shall I say, licking her tongue into the corners of his evening? Do I dare, and do I dare? And who am I, after all? I am not the prince. An attendant lord, deferential, glad to be of use. Almost, at times, the Fool…. But, setting aside poetry, I’m too deeply in to stop now. I am imagining her already. Perhaps kneeling beside him on the bed. Yes, kneeling, I think. Asking, is this what you mean? Or this? Is this what you meant at all?” (82–83; ellipses in original). This is not the only reference to “Prufrock” in the book.

Almost too plausible. A story in William Boyd’s 2017 collection The Dreams of Bethany Mellmoth features—as Phil Baker’s review in the Times puts it—“a student, sleeping with her professor, who admires a book that has the stereotypically academic title of Dark Labyrinth: Sexuality and Duplicity in the Poetry of T. S. Eliot.” Baker cites this fact in a list intended to show that Boyd’s book “is full … of plausible detail.” (19 Nov. 2017)

After this our exile. “And so farewell to Robert Mugabe…. It is hard to reconcile images of the ageing, cynical tyrant with memories of him as a younger man: dynamic, idealistic—and a lover of poetry. One of the most poignant portraits of the former president has been given to us by the Guardian’s former Africa correspondent, James MacManus, who interviewed him in 1974. Mugabe told him that while a political prisoner in the 60s he conceived a great love for the work of T. S. Eliot. Afterwards, Mugabe begged MacManus not to mention his passion for Eliot in the interview, clearly afraid that he would look in hock to the colonialist culture….Well, Mugabe has the satisfaction of knowing his presidency ended with a bang.” (Peter Bradshaw, “Poetic Justice for Mugabe.” The Guardian, 22 Nov. 2017)

The Hippopotamus. The 2017 film The Hippopotamus and the 1994 satirical novel on which it is based are titled after the Eliot poem. The novel was written by the actor and comedian Stephen Fry; its protagonist is “merely flesh and blood,” and, like the eponymous beast, he likes a good wallow.

A travelin’ man. The Federalist sums up an article by correspondent Elizabeth Kantor: “Bob Dylan’s Nobel acceptance speech could almost have been written to illustrate the famous words on ‘tradition and the individual talent’ from an earlier Nobel laureate.” According to Kantor, Dylan reveals a “literary artist’s ‘feeling’ for the ‘simultaneous existence’ of ‘the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer.’” As an example, she cites Dylan’s summary of the Odyssey: “He’s a travelin’ man, but he’s making a lot of stops…. You too have had drugs dropped into your wine. You too have shared a bed with the wrong woman. You too have been spellbound by magical voices, sweet voices with strange melodies.” (“Bob Dylan Rescues Literature from the Literary Set,” thefederalist.com, 6/12/2017)
Eliot in 1918: Contemporary Critic

By Annarose F. Steinke
University of Nebraska-Kearney

The warmer months of 1918 herald a prolific time for Eliot’s critical writing. He appreciates “getting quite away from [London] at the end of the day,” commuting from Lloyds Bank to summer lodgings in Marlow, and believing himself to “thrive on hot weather” (Letters 1 265). While he tells his mother of “sitting out in a back garden all day writing about Henry James and [Nathaniel] Hawthorne” (Letters 1 266), it is contemporary writers who garner the bulk of Eliot’s attention. The reviews that resulted from this summer work would not only cement his own critical legacy but also influence which writers would remain prominent in modernist studies for decades to come. Throughout the spring and summer, Eliot urges new writers to embrace risk and exhorts critics not to allow national borders to curb their search for new texts. Although he had been fairly established in the London literary scene prior to 1918, these essays more firmly situate Eliot as a global harbinger for the vital exchanges between literary culture and political climate that would continue to unfold throughout the twentieth century.

To Ezra Pound’s call for modernists to “Make it new,” Eliot’s reviews for the Egoist adds the challenge: make it risky. He remarks favorably that poet Sacheverell Sitwell is “not a blind follower” (Prose 1 720) and praises the “terrifying” work of Wyndham Lewis and James Joyce (Prose 1 719). He has little use for Clive Bell, whom he dismisses as “interested in the people one is interested in” (Prose 1 724). Coping with censorship in his editorial capacities, Eliot knew well the consequences of literary risk-taking. Eliot and Harriet Weaver ran into problems in printing Joyce’s Ulysses as a serial for the Egoist. Robert Crawford attributes their “difficulties” not only to securing paper during wartime, but to finding printers willing to face prosecution had the text been judged obscene (Young Eliot 295). In the March issue, Eliot decries the New York Court’s ruling in support of the U. S. Postal Service, which had deemed the October 1917 issue of the Little Review “unmailable” because of Wyndham Lewis’s story “Cantleman’s Spring Mate” (Prose 1 675). As Crawford observes, these clashes with anti-obscenity laws were concurrent with the development of Eliot’s own controversial Bolo and Sweeney characters (Young Eliot 297).

While defending new literature against moral policing by the state, Eliot also strove to correct nationalistic blind spots in literary criticism. In the same summer issue of the Egoist, he describes the magazine as “having always welcomed any writer who showed signs of international consciousness” and chides a Poetry reviewer for not having enough knowledge of French poetry to offer a substantive opinion on it (Prose 1 718). “Literature must be judged by language, not by place” (Prose 1 697), he asserts in his April review of Amy Lowell’s Tendencies in Modern American Poetry, which he takes to task for portraying Ezra Pound and other poets as “Laureates of some provincial Lycaeum” (Prose 1 696). His indictment of Lowell’s “all-American propaganda” also anticipates his letter to the editor of The Nation that November, in which he criticizes Massachusetts senator Henry Cabot Lodge for blocking the United States’ entry into the League of Nations—a move that Eliot suspects is “potentially even more nationalistic than it is at present pro-British” (Prose 1 696; 773). The rhetorical question he poses to his mother that April seems to sum up his approach to literary criticism and political commentary alike during the final months of World War I: “Your [American] papers talk about the ‘fight for civilisation’; do they realise either what civilisation means or what the fight for it means?” (Letters 1 260). For Eliot, this “fight” would have to be waged in the printing presses and publishing houses of both his British and American homelands, and such “civilisation” must include the unfamiliar and the unsavory in poetry and fiction. At a time when political boundaries and social taboos were posited as safeguards for survival, Eliot championed a literary culture that depended on those who were willing to cross lines.
EMIOT NEWS & SOCIETY NOTES

Eliot News

Call for Papers: Louisville Conference on Literature and Culture Since 1900, Feb. 21-23, 2019, University of Louisville; “T. S. Eliot: Intersections and Influence”

In “Tradition and the Individual Talent,” T. S. Eliot articulated one of the most enduring theorizations of literary history as an evolving, multifarious, and inherently collaborative endeavor. This panel invites papers that explore T. S. Eliot in terms of his expansive biographical, professional, and literary intersections with contemporaneous writers and thinkers, as well as his continued influence on literary and artistic culture today. Given the watershed of new material made available through newly released letters, as well as the significant expansion of access to published and previously unpublished material in The Complete Prose, we also seek proposals that complicate and nuance Eliot’s place in modernism and its legacies, especially given the definitional, spatial, and historical expansions proposed by new modernist studies. Finally, proposals might also explore Eliot’s career beyond his art, including—as he wrote in The Harvard Advocate in 1934—“subjects which I do not yet know very much about: theology, politics, economics, and education,” but which increasingly became the center of his professional life. Information about the Louisville conference can be found at their website: http://www.thelouisvilleconference.com/.

Please send a 300-word abstract (including title) and brief bio to Christopher McVey at cmcvey@bu.edu by August 25th.

Society Notes

Bravissima to Jewel Spears Brooker, whose book, T. S. Eliot’s Dialectical Imagination, is out soon from Johns Hopkins, and available now for order on amazon.com.

Warm congratulations to Deborah Leiter, who was awarded the Marshall Fishwick Travel Grant from the Popular Culture Studies Association. The funds allowed her to pursue Eliot- and mysteries-related research in the Baker Street Irregulars archives before they were moved from Harvard.

Chilly compliments to Patrick Query, who in February won his age group and was the top U.S. finisher in the Skate the Lake 10k in Portland, Ontario. The race was held on the frozen Big Rideau Lake.

Cheers to Sørina Higgins, the editor of The Inklings and King Arthur: J. R. R. Tolkien, Charles Williams, C. S. Lewis, and Owen Barfield on the Matter of Britain. This book may be of interest to Society members particularly because it contains a chapter by Jon Hooper comparing Eliot and Lewis. The Inklings and King Arthur recently received the Mythopoeic Scholarship Award in Inklings Studies, and it is available on amazon.com.

T. S. ELIOT STUDIES ANNUAL

John Morgenstern, editor of T. S. Eliot Studies Annual, announces the contents of the second volume, which is due out in September:

“My Madness Singing’: The Specter of Syphilis in Prufrock and Other Observations,” by Frances Dickey, with Bradford Barnhardt

Special Forum: Prufrock and Other Observations at 100
• “Prufrock’s Gestures,” by Elisabeth Däumer
• “The Right to Smile: Humor and Empathy in Prufrock and Other Observations,” by Rachel Trousdale

“Eliot, Blake, Unpleasantness,” by Seamus Perry
“T. S. Eliot, Modernism, and Boredom,” by Christopher McVey
“All Its Clear Relations’: Eliot’s Poems and the Uses of Memory,” by Tony Sharpe

Special Forum: Editing Eliot
• “Slip-slidin’ away: Metamorphosis and Loss in Eliot’s Philosophical Papers,” by Jewel Spears Brooker
• “What Happened to ‘Modern Tendencies in Poetry?’” by Anthony Cuda
• “Of Commas and Facts: Editing Volume 5 of The Complete Prose,” by Jayme Stayer
• “A Major Minor Document,” by David E. Chinitz

“T. S. Eliot Bibliography 2015,” by Elisabeth Däumer
Irons Reads Four Quartets
continued from p. 1

voice of Scar, in The Lion King. Irons is an actor’s actor, but his is also a voice’s voice: warm, woody, slightly nasal—“contemplative, cautious, inviting,” as one of my students had it. At Brideshead, Young Charles and Sebastian, boozing, try out their wine-characterizing chops: “And this is a wise old wine.” “A prophet in a cave.” They might have been describing Irons’s voice.

At least one other star actor was present: Laurence Fishburne, singled out by Irons in those opening remarks. The student next to me could not place him. I started to identify him as the actor from Boyz n the Hood, but thought better of it. So I offered The Matrix, which my student seemed vaguely to recognize. Irons had been pointing out that the audience certainly included many who knew more about Eliot than he himself did, as well as those who were similarly unschooled, like Fishburne. Downplaying any thorough understanding of Eliot’s poems on his own part, Irons encouraged the audience likewise to let go of the need to understand: let the sound of the language do its work. If one drifts off, that’s perfectly fine, as the half-attentive state is an ideal one in which to receive these poems which, recited straight through, take over an hour.

Irons, jaunty and disarming in these opening comments, settled down to the poems, and a meditative spirit descended on the hall and abided, like a bird coming to rest. I had expected applause between the individual Quartets, but, thankfully, there was none; Irons only sipped his water, the projected title behind him changed, and the next poem began. Besides the usual scattered coughing, there was no sound from the audience except (somewhat jarringly, my students and I agreed) a couple moments of laughter: it seemed not to be provoked by anything particularly humorous, but by some combination of words that were potentially describing our own present. For instance, the phrase “distracted from distraction by distraction” produced the laughter of surprised recognition rather than hilarity.

Once he began, Irons uttered not a word apart from those in Eliot’s lines, yet there were rare moments in which the incantatory spell of reading was nearly broken by “performance.” For instance, the actor seemed unable to refrain from performing the lines “You say I am repeating / Something I have said before. I shall say it again. / Shall I say it again?” This question was posed as though directly to the audience, and for a brief second it seemed the audience might respond in turn: “Yes.” I always encourage my students to think of poetry as an oral art form. And yet, in moments like this one, I missed the homely flatness of the printed page, whereupon the “I” and implied “you” communicate as though through a screen. The hiddenness of their interaction is made explicit, broadcasted, exposed to a reductive light, in the speech of any physical “I,” more still in that of a professional actor with a stage presence as magnetic as that of Jeremy Irons.

Still, for the most part, Irons managed to keep that presence surprisingly unobtrusive. He did not enumerate the individual sections of the poems, only pausing at the breaks. He varied tone and pace to suit Eliot’s registers, but not ostentatiously so, becoming by turns grave, conversational, mournful, fussy, contemplative. Hear these delicate shifts in the new BBC/Faber recordings. Irons may be reluctant to describe them as “performance,” but they are nonetheless the expert use of an instrument to respond to music written by another.

Heard in this way, patterns and harmonies in the Quartets emerge as they cannot on the page. As the poems fare forward, the audience’s memory of the experience becomes like the poet’s of the stages of life: sounds once heard, images momentarily perceived, recur but with a slightly altered inflection. Much fades away, but suddenly a correspondence, an echo, rings out. As a single sonic event, the Quartets gather up sounds, images, and ideas; they shake, sift, work, and refine them. The momentum is subtle but real—and culminating in this case, irresistibly, in Irons’s delivery of the final line “And the fire … and the rose … are one”—yet the overall effect is less of rolling the universe into a ball than of exploring, of trying, and trying again, up to a moment of happy surrender.

It was hard to be pulled out of that meditative state so roughly into applause, and then into standing, but what choice was there? The moment one wanted to prolong was already becoming the past.

Editor’s note: Irons discusses reading Eliot with The American Scholar, featured in their podcast, Smarty Pants, on 13 April 2018, episode #45: https://www.acast.com/smartypants/-45-voicingalegend
Benedict Drew and Nicholas Brooks’s hypnotic video installation, *Sump*, invite viewers to look more closely at texture, substance, and material—reminders that *The Waste Land* is filled with dirt, rock, wood, and dust.

The exhibition demonstrates not only that some works of art can enrich our experience of *The Waste Land*, but that the reverse is true as well. Approaching Edward Hopper’s *Night Windows* with the poem in mind complicates the painting, placing the viewer in the role of a voyeuristic, hovering Tiresias, and generating even more tension between what is visible and what is obscured. In the last gallery, a dead ash tree stands in front of Cy Twombly’s massive *Quattro Stagioni*, creating a new scene that is especially powerful in light of the poem’s opening lines. By this time, we are carrying in our heads echoes of *The Waste Land*—what we have heard, what we have remembered, what has sprung to mind during the show. Straining to make out what Twombly has written across the seasons, we are transformed back into struggling readers, cycling through cruel spring, surprising summer, and a winter that kept us warm.

I appreciated the exhibition most when I was wandering around without paying too much attention to the framing material, and allowing these more striking connections to emerge. While certain elements were confusing, there was still much to marvel at, and much that delighted, surprised, and disturbed.

**Benedict Drew and Nicholas Brooks’s hypnotic video installation, *Sump*, invite viewers to look more closely at texture, substance, and material—reminders that *The Waste Land* is filled with dirt, rock, wood, and dust.**

**Haunting Modernisms**
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but the end for Lawrence’s work, and allows him to refrain from “indoctrinat[ing] into discourse” those unconscious and primordial realms that lie beyond the constraints of language (190). These intriguing connections between the authors featured, paired with a learned background in the formidable critical heritage to which his work responds, inspire further reflection on the ways that modernist hauntings, as Foley’s conclusion asserts, “should act as incitements for replenishing a terminebale desire to know and welcome alterity” (213)—in other words, for returning to one of the most enduring contributions of the modernist movement itself.

While Foley deftly manages a plethora of modernist and contemporary theory and criticism throughout his analyses for the most part, there are some minor issues with clarity and depth. His argumentative scaffolding becomes somewhat awkward at certain places, as in the following: “Indeed, as I argue in Chap. 5, both Bowen’s understanding of spectrality as gesturing towards something just beyond the true—perhaps beyond the signifier itself—and her continual concern with ghostly gazes encourage a reading of her writing as reconciling the often playful scepticism of Woolf—whom Bowen admired—with haunting’s more radical potential that comes to be recognised in Lawrence’s ghost stories” (14). His discussions are strongest when he pairs meticulous close readings with modernist criticism and aesthetic theory, situating Derrida as temporary framer rather than persistent interlocutor: the frequent invocations of the Derridean “always already” add little that is not afforded by his own phrasings. Although covering a variety of genres from the 1910s to 1930s allows a broader focus beyond and within the modernism of Eliot and Woolf, some texts inevitably get more thorough treatment than others. *The Waste Land* excerpts featured in chapter three, particularly, could use some more of the lucid and incisive close reading found in the second chapter’s discussions of Aldington’s and Ford’s poetry. Seasoned Eliot enthusiasts might also wish for Foley to engage more recent scholarship. The examples of “recent critical work” he cites when noting attempts to “resurrect the tarnished reputation of Eliot’s theory of impersonal poetry” extend only as far as 2004 (106), which now seems dated given the multiple revisions of Eliot’s critical legacy that the *Complete Prose* and *Letters* alone have prompted within the last decade.

Nevertheless, *Haunting Modernisms* is essential for anyone interested in what literary hauntings might suggest about a culture’s (in)ability to mourn productively and meaningfully. Foley sets a rigorous precedent for treating modernist ghosts with more complexity and nuance than Gothic studies alone can afford. Such work is indeed, as Foley reminds us, long overdue for modernist and haunting studies alike.
ELIOT AND MODERNIST TRANSLATION

T. S. Eliot’s rarely considered critical prose on translation, the fundamental mechanism by which cultural material flows between languages, geographies, and remote epochs, helps to reconcile opposing critical narratives that regard him as a cultural isolationist on the one extreme and on the other as an architect of global modernism. Eliot’s many analyses of cultural transmission at the level of specific texts cumulatively adumbrate a theory of translation that joined the familiar with the foreign, the local with the universal, and etymology with innovation. His critical writings on translation provide a framework for reading him as a global poet who regarded the cross-fertilization of cultures and languages as vital to the development of the literature of his own language, in his own place and time. It also places him alongside modernist writers such as H. D. and Ezra Pound, who engaged in a shared enterprise of translation as a strategy for the extension of the linguistic, cultural, and aesthetic possibilities of literature in English.

John D. Morgenstern
Clemson U

T. S. ELIOT, SCOTT JOPLIN AND THE ROSEBUD CLUB

Scott Joplin, the “King of Ragtime Writers,” reigned at Tom Turpin’s Rosebud Club in downtown St. Louis from 1900 to 1905, at the epicenter of the ragtime craze and just blocks away from T. S. Eliot’s childhood home on Locust Avenue. As David Chinitz and other critics have observed, Eliot’s taste for popular music and his unique sense of rhythm were indelibly shaped by his hometown, where African-American musicians composed the newest hits next door to German immigrants performing the works of Beethoven and Bach. This paper focuses on Scott Joplin’s life and compositions, the specific character of their shared neighborhood, and the nature of the public discourse about him to illuminate Eliot’s complex relationship to both music and urban landscapes. In much of his early poetry, Eliot’s speakers prowl city streets hearing music, or under the aegis of music (as in “Preludes” or “Rhapsody”), with an undefined anxiety and, often, an unspoken goal. This paper maps Eliot’s musical sensibility onto downtown St. Louis in the opening years of the twentieth century, locating Joplin and the Rosebud Club at the intersection of the fears and attractions associated with music in Eliot’s poetry. Joplin modeled artistic achievement and celebrity, successfully blended traits of popular dance and classical piano music, and also inhabited a region of the city sometimes called “death valley” for the public health risks it posed. Eliot’s poetry bears the clear impress of the racial, sexual, and musical cityscape defined in his youth by the Rosebud Club and the King of Ragtime.

Frances Dickey
U of Missouri

THE EMBODIMENT OF ANXIETY IN THE EARLY POETRY OF T. S. ELIOT

This paper analyzes the generative and inhibitive effects of anxiety in a poet himself acutely attuned to its drawbacks and peculiar benefits. By its very rhetorical embodiment, Eliot’s early verse objectifies a crippling array of symptoms of the physical, moral, and spiritual devolution of European society. At stake is a nuanced questioning of the mental state most conducive to engendering timeless art in the modern age. Coupling the theories of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche with analysis of “Introspection,” “Portrait of a Lady,” “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock,” and other poems from 1910-17, this paper “worries” over what it means to write worried poetry. Discerning the connection between anxiety and artistic production requires exploring the skepticism, inaction, solipsism, and despair manifest in Eliot’s morbidly self-conscious personae. These personae embody anxiety—simultaneously personal and abstract, acutely felt yet perhaps impossible to articulate.

Eliot’s poetic enterprise thus reflects a broader dilemma: is creating ordered art possible in the chaos of the modern world? Might art instead serve a purpose more compatible with modernism’s dissociated sensibilities? The paper concludes by examining the intellectual and spiritual “work” that Eliot’s early verse accomplishes for his age. How, from within this very culture, does Eliot unveil the volatile psychological state hidden by the placid surface of bourgeois propriety? The paper’s underlying assertion is that anxiety—both
ABSTRACTS

Eliot’s anxiety and the ambient anxiety of his era—constitutes an undeniable and underexplored creative impetus for the modernist writer. Not in the clinical sense, but rather as a quotidian force with which the thoughtful individual necessarily grapples, modern anxiety is paradoxically both inhibitive and generative. This paper, in addition to demonstrating the young Eliot’s engagement with profound existential questions of meaning, affirms that anxiety is a valuable framework for analyzing the conditions of timeless artistic production in the modern world.

Anna Mukamal
Stanford U

American Literature Association Conference, San Francisco, CA
May 24 - 27, 2018

TAKING “DORIS’S DREAM SONGS” SERIOUSLY

Eliot first published “Doris’s Dream Songs” in Nov. 1924—the first poem from his hand to go into print since the appearance of The Waste Land. In the next three months he republished the poem twice: in January 1925 (as “Three Poems”) and again a few weeks later in Louis Untermeyer’s anthology, American Poetry 1925, this time calling it “Three Dream Songs.” As Ron Bush and others have discussed, Eliot subsequently broke up the sequence: Part III (“This is the Dead Land”) became Part III of “The Hollow Men”; Parts I and II were ultimately preserved in the section, Minor Poems, of Complete Poems and Plays 1909-1950. However completely redacted, in other words, no part of the poem was utterly discarded. That “The Hollow Men,” too, continued to change after publication has prompted scholarly commentary to hew to an essentially genetic approach: despite its having been published and republished, “Doris’s Dream Songs” has been treated only as a kind of draft of “The Hollow Men”—even though “The Hollow Men” itself changed after first publication, appearing in three parts in March 1935 and, in November 1925, in five parts in Poems 1909-1925. Eliot scholars have, since Sears Jayne’s essay of 1955, read the various materials that Eliot recursively worked and reworked in terms of where they seemed to lead. It is, to deploy a hermeneutic phrase, a satisfyingly “diachronic” approach, one that understands textual changes in terms of a narrativizable development. Obviously such an approach has allowed insight into an especially turbulent period in Eliot’s life and career. But what happens if we take “Doris’s Dream Songs” seriously as a poem?

Michael Coyle
Colgate U

CHRISTIAN BELIEFS AND CONSTRUCTIVIST AESTHETIC: GIVING CONCRETE BODY TO THE WORK OF SPIRIT IN ASH-WEDNESDAY AND FOUR QUARTETS

This talk demonstrates two features of my work on Hegelian aesthetics as a way of talking about the kinds of experiences sought by art and writing devoted to modernist constructivist principles as deployed by late Eliot. First, constructivism emphasizes the work of making embedded in the object rather than on the object’s capacity to represent actions and scenes in accord with criteria governed by the practical understanding. Second, this emphasis on making offers the possibility of talking about a distinctive inner sensuousness in art that encourages two states—aligning with the artist as maker in order to identify with how formal structures engage affective life, and using this alignment in order to focus on self-consciousness as the locus for exploring how the work of forming positions the self in the world. Eliot’s Four Quartets elaborates relations between the constructivist spirit in art and Christianity’s imposition of a second revisionary formal order on nature, where bread and wine become body and blood and death becomes access to a dispensation based on love. The result is what I call a poetics of habitation where the perceived world is doubled into the world established by grace and one can live as if every moment were a kind of arrival in sites inspiring love and gratitude.

Charles Altieri
UC Berkeley

ELIOT AND THE ECOLOGY OF DEATH

While readers have been tempted to read Eliot’s invocation of “dung and death” in Four Quartets pessimistically, this paper demonstrates how Eliot’s critique of modern burial practices reorients us into an ecology of dying where dung and death are the very stuff of living soil. Specifically, in Four Quartets,
Eliot celebrates the transformation of dead matter, whether a decayed house or our own flesh, back into healthy earth for organic, village-based agriculture. Following the population boom and urban drift of the twenties and thirties, English country churchyards were packed to capacity, so the dead were increasingly laid to rest in commercial cemeteries outside of city centers, far from the iconic “yew trees” of rural parish cemeteries. Embalming also became a highly popular practice as bodies were sanitized and largely removed from biological cycles of decay. Eliot criticizes this commercial, synthetic treatment of dying while offering a vision of ground burial where our bones might nourish “the life of significant soil.” This approach not only demonstrates Eliot’s ongoing engagement with the organicist movement, particularly what would become the British Soil Association, but also offers new, literal approaches to many passages in Four Quartets often treated symbolically. As Eliot shows, “In our end is our beginning” is true not only theologically but materially: our flesh begins and ends in dirt.

Julia Daniel
Baylor U

**THE WASTE LAND RE-CONFIGURED: T. S. ELIOT AND TADEUSZ RÓZEWICZ**

From the moment Tadeusz Rózewicz first encountered Eliot’s work through Czeslaw Milosz’s 1944 translation of Eliot’s The Waste Land, he not only continued to quote, rework, and ironically play with the image of T. S. Eliot, but he also exhibited a detailed familiarity with the subtleties of the biographical story, theoretical ideas, and conflicted visions of authorship which stand behind Eliot’s oeuvre. Rózewicz’s resistance to Eliot developed all the way from direct borrowing (visible in the 1947 poem “Voices”), to the sarcastic tone he acquired in his later works, depicting Eliot as a poet who “wrote lovely poems about cats / and won a Nobel prize for it.” What did Rózewicz hope to achieve from the poetical borrowing from Eliot? At first he hoped that this borrowing would enable him to more dramatically reflect the emotional distance of the war generation, but Eliot’s poetry did not seem to provide the solution either to this representation or to the pain and confusion that he actually tried to represent. This can only partially be explained by the religious shift within Eliot’s writing that made it impossible for Rózewicz to identify with Eliot’s voice. Instead, engaging in this self-reflexive concern, he pushed the metaphor of the waste land toward a rather surprising direction, ultimately provoking new debate over representability. Rózewicz incorporated T. S. Eliot’s voice into his own poetic project and ironically shifted the figurative imagery of The Waste Land to the most basic, “barren” metaphor of the rubbish heap in his 1989 happening “Smietnik” (“Rubbish heap”). In this work Rózewicz presents himself to the viewer throughout the series of photographs that capture how the author takes out the trash to the local garbage. The situation itself alternates the way in which Rózewicz had chosen to present himself to the public and (in the context of the actual post-modern poems and their link to Eliot’s work) it captures the concerns of Rózewicz’s writing: the problem of unrepresentability, the feeling of cultural crisis, and the decay of values.

Aleksandra Majak
U of St. Andrews

**REMAINS TO BE SEEN: ALIENATION AND AFFIRMATION IN ELIOT’S BURNt NORTON**

What would it change in our reading of Four Quartets to consider it as environmental literature? Or to consider parts of it through an eco-critical lens? In this talk, I reveal the ethical dilemma of exclusion and inclusion found in Burnt Norton and throughout Four Quartets as the unexplored interpretive framework of Eliot’s oeuvre: a world view that queries the boundaries of social justice, thus, fundamentally, an environmental view. Beginning with his initial Heraclitean epitaph pertaining to communal or individual wisdom, I expand critical analysis of his stances of privilege, explicating Eliot’s engagement with ancient philosophers and medieval mystics as an emergent process in understanding ethics and the modes of art through concepts of environmental space and place: nature-scapes, land-scapes, domestic-scapes, and city-scapes. His interest in micro-regional environments for which the sections are named fits with the tenets of second wave eco-criticism, whereas the materiality of place fits better within the integration and eco-poetics of the fourth wave. My reading of inclusion and exclusion as a picture of environmental literature in the clearly faux or descriptively real scenes in Eliot’s canonical Four Quartets challenges existing criticism, and exposes certain passages lauded for their mystical poetic effect as Eliot’s critique of romantic self-delusion and naturalism.

LeeAnn Derdeyn
Southern Methodist U
If you are aware of any 2017 citations that do not appear here, please contact Elisabeth Däumer at edaumer@emich.edu. Omissions will be rectified in the 2018 listing.
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Lavan, Rosie. Rev. of “Whispers of T. S. Eliot,” by Paul Muldoon. The Inaugural T. S. Eliot Lecture at the


Noteworthy:


Davey, Kevin. Playing Possum. AAAARG Press, 2017. [This is a novel published through an online independent press.]

Erratum. In the spring issue of Time Present 94 (2018), in the “Centennial Focus” section (page 7), two articles on Henry James published by Eliot in 1918 were incorrectly attributed to volume 2 of The Complete Prose. Eliot’s essays on James can instead be found in volume 1, whose co-editors are Jewel Spears Brooker and Ronald Schuchard. The error exists in the print version only: the pdf version was corrected before being sent. We apologize for the error, which was the editor’s misconduct, not the author’s.

Hunting Fugitive Items. A potential research project for some enterprising soul is suggested by the following revelation from Eliot’s letters. To E. McKnight Kauffer, on 29 Mar 1940, Eliot writes: “... which was why I had [the poem] sent to you in that impersonal way wrapt up in the N.E.W. (of which, however, I am a member of the Editorial Committee, and to which I contribute from time to time, sometimes anonymously in the editorial notes—as a rule, you can assume that any note attacking bishops or a bishop is from my Corona [typewriter]” (Poems 1 853).

To our knowledge, no attempt been made to comb through the anonymous, editorial notes of the New English Weekly to locate such bishop-attacking pieces. The Complete Prose project currently has no unsigned, newly attributed pieces from NEW. For the second edition of The Complete Prose, the editors of volumes 5 and 6 would be grateful for any help. If you, your library, or its databases have access to the full run of the NEW from 1939 onward, or if you have some knowledge of, or interest in corresponding with the NEW archives, please contact Jayme Stayer at jstayer@jcu.edu.
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