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The Faber & Faber press release for Volume 8 of T. S. Eliot’s letters states that it “tells the story of the decision to commit Vivien Eliot to a psychiatric asylum” and quotes Eliot’s lament that avoiding his estranged wife makes him feel like a “wanted” man (305). This volume does indeed document the notorious and often misunderstood incident of Vivien’s commitment, and Eliot occasionally complains of coping with “more than one kind of nightmare: hence my interest in Orestes” (81). Yet the 1936-38 letters reveal a consistently good-humored and amusing correspondent. The impression is stronger in this volume because the ratio of personal to business letters has increased thanks to many of the latter appearing on the tseliot.com website. Annotations are full though not consistently so. Some French words are translated (*paroissienne*, 719) and some are not (*bondieuserie*, 286). Some biblical allusions are annotated (Luke 11:25, p. 516) but some not (Psalm 78, p. 471). Some items are annotated in exhaustive detail while others receive brief comments or are passed over (for example, the reference to the pistol shot in Anton Chekov’s *Three Sisters*, 818). The thoroughness, however, is generally useful and often crucial. For example, Eliot has been criticized for not signing a public letter condemning anti-Semitism. But a long footnote expands on Eliot’s reason (given in his reply to the request) for not signing this particular appeal and discusses his efforts to oppose anti-Semitism. Nevertheless, it is a relief when a footnote briefly directs the reader to the notes in the annotated *Poems* or other established sources rather than presenting a large note in small type. In any event, as Eliot warns in another context, some editorial decisions are “likely to appear to another person slightly capricious” (527).

Many letters reveal a benevolent and relaxed Eliot writing humorously to his friends Polly Tandy, John Hayward, James Joyce, Ezra Pound, Bonamy Dobrée, Frank Morley, and Virginia Woolf. Particularly enjoyable are the letters he writes to his godchildren (Susanna Morley, Tom Faber, Alison Tandy) containing poems about cats that he sometimes decorates, in the manner of Lewis Carroll, with his own drawings. The continued on p. 9
T. S. Eliot’s Dialectical Imagination, by Jewel Spears Brooker


Reviewed by Fabio L. Vericat
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

T. S. Eliot’s Dialectical Imagination is about the poet’s religious quest, propelled by “[Eliot’s] chronic anxiety about psychophysical dualism” (4)—an anxiety for which the academic, philosophical method proved insufficient therapy. By the end of his philosophical studies in the mid-1910s, Brooker tells us, the “dialectical impulse” to overcome the “tensions between realism and idealism” left Eliot stranded in a hopeless relativism that is, for Brooker, masterfully self-diagnosed in The Waste Land (5, 7). He would, however, gradually overcome this intellectual impasse poetically, culminating in Four Quartets, where Brooker finds that philosophy is finally sublimated as religious experience. Brooker proposes, however, that there is an overall pattern underlying such a journey, one guided by a new kind of dialectic that she terms the “dialectical imagination.”

Brooker significantly recasts the term “dialectic” outside the analytical boundaries of philosophical usage. The term becomes, instead, a rhetorical tool that she uses to invoke the idea of thought as something which, paradoxically, is not merely thought but experienced. That is what makes the dialectic “imaginary.” This, to me, is a great move. Brooker does not err on the side of being over-technical, nor in prosaically deducing Eliot’s philosophical studies in the poetry. Brooker’s point is that Eliot had felt short-changed by his postgraduate studies and chose against becoming a philosopher precisely because of a disillusion with its language, its failure to express truth.

In Brooker’s reading, Eliot’s admiration for the Anglican sermons of Lancelot Andrewes (whom she considers at length) is about seeking a new kind of discourse where facts are felt rather than philosophically intellectualized. His search for this novel discourse signals Eliot’s move from philosophy to poetic thought, from logic to rhetoric. Andrewes’s prose sermons work toward “the ecstasy of assent,” which Brooker explains as the “unification of sensibility and intelligence.” Yet, she adds, “assent to what?” In her reply Brooker addresses the heart of the dialectical imagination: “The answer . . . is the Incarnation . . . . It is a state of being that combines spirit and flesh.” But, more important, “[it] would not be viable in a world without objects” (115). Here, in a nutshell, is Brooker’s answer to Eliot’s angst about dualism.

Brooker foreshadows the importance of the Incarnation’s role in Eliot’s theological poetics early in the book. Paul Gaugin’s Le Christ jaune (1889) evokes precisely such incarnational convergence of the abstract and the concrete. It stands as the central motif of T. S. Eliot’s Dialectical Imagination. (An illustration of Gaugin’s Crucifixion fittingly adorns the bookjacket.) In Brooker’s words, Gaugin’s use of what has been described as pictorial Synthetism illuminates a particular kind of spiritual transcendence—one that does “not . . . abandon the object, but . . . subjectifies it” (18). In applying this approach to Eliot’s own body of work, Brooker is effectively introducing a prefiguring method that encourages enriching intratextual readings of his early and later poetry and criticism.

Brooker insists on Eliot’s incarnational poetics for good reason. She is saying that a subject is not opposed to but is a very special kind of object, one whose awareness of itself does not transcend its physicality. In this context, Brooker encourages us to rethink Eliot’s ideas about the artist’s “impersonality,” not as the suppression of subjectivity but as the subjective refinement of the object by technique. For example, in Eliot’s later appreciation of Yeats, the Irish poet “expresses his personal feelings so intently that this particularity becomes his universality” (88). Paradoxically, for Eliot, universality may be achieved by a peculiar exercise of subjectivity. As Brooker would have us look at it, Eliot’s “impersonality” is really a particular way of being personal, but it is also a process whose completion is not easily determined. For how intently and for how long would one have to manage one’s personal feelings to universalize them?

In coining the term “dialectical imagination,” Brooker is not only alluding to a mode of thought but to a pattern wherein thought is experienced as progression. Not the kind that logically gets you to a definite philosophical destination, but that is sensually enjoyed along the way (just as Dante does on his way to Paradiso). Eliot, for instance, was not attracted to F. H. Bradley for his philosophical answers, but for his style, which Brooker best understands as espousing a “dialectical triad”:
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Reviewed by Craig Woelfel
Flagler College

Janice Brown’s new study of the Christian message in the work of T. S. Eliot, C. S. Lewis, and Dorothy L. Sayers offers a chance for Eliot’s readers to see his work and thought alongside two contemporary Anglican writer-critics. Brown is a Sayers scholar, and placing Sayers alongside Eliot and Lewis is an implicit argument of the study—a worthy one, given that Sayers’s gender, combined with her powerful personality, made her an outsider in both literary and Christian discourse. As Brown quips early on: perhaps most of the influential men of the era “could have benefited from closer association with a woman like Dorothy L. Sayers, had times been different” (24). The book gives Eliot admirers the chance to read Eliot and Sayers in close association, and there is much to be gained thereby, as readers discover Sayers’s wit, intelligence, and power. Comparative attention to Lewis’s work and thought completes the study, and Brown deftly manages the task of giving attention to all three, and to the relationships between them and their work. This includes her own revision of the (in)famous tensions in the Lewis/Eliot relationship, where Brown takes pains to cast them as allies in sentiment—even though, she must admit, it took Lewis some time to see that this was so. Each author is given fairly equal attention and is accorded equal weight in the book’s title, though it must be said that the argument of the whole is derived most directly from Sayers.

Sayers is best known as the author of the Lord Peter Wimsey detective novels. But Sayers was a Classics scholar, poet, playwright, critic, and admired translator of Dante, all of which bring her close to Eliot’s sensibility. She much admired Eliot, though she did not know him personally. Sayers was also an Anglican apologist and evangelist, who advocated for artists and critics to produce “Christian propaganda in disguise” in order to combat what she saw as a pervasive secular societal decay (56). Brown’s study unifies all three writers around this calling, echoed in the book’s title: each, she argues, was a “prophet to their own generation,” combining “creative imagination and spiritual vision” to present a fearsome salvation [the “Lion”] as a “challenge” to the “resistant secularism of the modern world [the “Waste Land”] and [its] godlessness” (231).

Brown tracks each writer’s development into this prophetic role, as well as in sections dedicated to themes appropriate to it: “the nature of Christ, the experience of conversion, the ministry of angels, the meaning of suffering, and the hope of heaven.” The final three chapters of the book explore each author’s treatment of a Christian message—emphasizing the ideas that redemption is possible only through Christ and that this journey was only possible through a historical (i.e., traditional) form of Christianity that challenged the “resistant secularism of the modern world and [its] godlessness” (231).

But Brown doesn’t just wish to characterize Eliot, Lewis, and Sayer’s work. She argues that the traditional Christianity and anti-modernism she emphasizes “[continue] to illuminate the redemptive message in the twenty-first century, an era that might also be deemed a Waste Land” (31). The book is thus not only a devotional study, but an actively polemical one, which aims to bring her redemptive, Christian message to our own time. Brown is of course entitled to such a view; but in this case it unfortunately often makes for problematic scholarship, of a nature that I think is especially evident in its dealings with Eliot.

The book offers a comprehensive, linear account of Eliot’s life-in-works as a redemptive Christian narrative: Eliot inhabits a “fearsome” secular waste land in his early poems and finds his way in the end to a redemptive vision which he explores and renders in effective, sometimes terrifying, beauty. Its guided readings provide a rich devotional gloss to Eliot’s creative and critical work. Though it engages with none of the recently published materials, and with only a fairly limited range of Eliot scholars, the readings are often illuminating within their scope. This is especially true of Brown on the plays, which Sayers much admired and which Brown sees as a critical part of Eliot’s major works; Brown calls Murder continued on p. 11
Literature, Ethics, and the Emotions, by Kenneth Asher

Reviewed by Josh Richards
Williams Baptist College

A practical pedagogical question underlies Kenneth Asher’s Literature, Ethics, and the Emotions. If “parsing the ethical implications of the text” is a key part of literary study, what do those “down the hall in the philosophy classroom” have to say about ethics and literature (175)? Asher finds the usual approaches taken by literary theorists, “the house philosophers of the preceding age,” unhelpful and suggests that we turn instead, particularly, to the Neo-Aristotelian theories of Martha Nussbaum (175). For Nussbaum, “emotions may recognize and respond to ethically crucial elements of a situation” (11). Nussbaum’s own engagements with literature focus on Henry James primarily, but Asher, in this book, takes Nussbaum’s theories for a rigorous test drive through Modernism.

Asher’s brief engagements with prominent literary theorists in the introduction alone are worth the price of admission. He interrogates the ethical repercussions of literary theories with insight and verve. For example, Asher concludes his discussion of New Historicism by stating that its “ethical norm” “is belied by a theory according to which the most that can be said against cruelty is simply that Greenblatt doesn’t happen to prefer it and has gained enough power to tell the story his way” (6). Fundamentally, Asher desires a philosophical approach that allows literature to make an “irreplaceable contribution to ethical knowledge,” and he feels that many critical theories do not serve this end (11). The core idea Asher takes from Nussbaum is that literature, through “the exploration and refinement of emotions,” may lead readers to a greater ethical awareness, although this requires, philosophically, an Aristotelian understanding of character as “a fixed intertwining of beliefs, emotions, and dispositions” (157, 150). In each of the subsequent chapters of Literature, Ethics, and the Emotions, Asher focuses on the challenges that modernist texts with “their elaborate rethinking of the self and the role of our emotional lives” pose to the ability of literature to contribute to the ethical awareness of the reader (13).

The chapter on Eliot, entitled “Eliot’s Emotive Theory of Poetry,” is a survey of Eliot’s attitudes towards ethics and emotions, which do not seem to fit tidily with Nussbaum’s theories. Eliot’s interest in the monadic philosophies of F. H. Bradley and his later belief “that no ethical system can do without religious underpinnings” (51) point us away from relying on literature to teach us how to live ethically. But Asher insists that attending more carefully to the affective dimensions of literature and redressing the “general failure” by critics “to recognize the importance of the emotions for Eliot” (52) can show us why and how the arts and ethics can be understood together in Eliot’s work. Eliot’s valuation of the emotional aspects of experience is overlooked, Asher says, because it is “set forth” in the “technically daunting pages of his doctoral dissertation” (52). For Eliot, emotional experience is more central to being than is cognition because it “retain[s] a continuity” with immediate experience (57) that is weakened as we begin to think about that experience. Asher finds Eliot’s critical judgments to be founded upon a “rank[ing] according to the depth and range of emotion for which [the author] can construct an appropriate equation” (64). Eliot’s later career, Asher insists, can be understood as a “struggle to accommodate [this] emotive theory of poetry to his increasing insistence on the importance of Christian belief” (77). Asher tracks this struggle through various expressions in Murder in the Cathedral and Four Quartets but insists that he thinks Eliot “erred . . . in assuming that Belief was necessary to guarantee regularity in more limited beliefs,” which are necessary for the ethical perception Nussbaum desires. In the end, Asher concludes that “Eliot worked throughout his creative and critical career to craft and justify a poetry that would solder community through a shared emotional intelligence” (79).

Though the analysis, particularly of Eliot’s PhD thesis, is strong, I do feel that certain choices could have greatly improved its usefulness to Eliot studies. Much Eliot material, primary and secondary, has been published since Asher’s 1997 monograph, T. S. Eliot and Ideology, but I found no citations to these resources beyond two critical pieces, the latest of which was written in 2004. The failure to include more recent, relevant scholarship appears limited to the Eliot chapter as others are built around more up-to-date bibliographies. Asher’s book could have increased its impact for Eliot scholarship by
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Disturbing. Former US Secretary of State John Kerry in his commencement address to the graduates of Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government: “One of my favorite poems is T. S. Eliot’s ‘Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock.’ And I challenge all of you never to wind up fretfully musing as Prufrock did: ‘Do I dare disturb the universe? . . . In a minute there is time for decisions and revisions which a minute will reverse.’ Class of 2017: Your job is to disturb the universe.” (harvardmagazine.com, 24 May 2017)

Piacular pence? The dictionary.com “word of the day” for 15 Sept. 2018 was “piacular.” The quotation cited in illustration comes from Ben Yagoda’s When You Catch an Adjective, Kill It (2007): “T. S. Eliot made a fetish of using long-dormant adjectives like defunctive, anfractuous, and polyphiloprogenetive; he apparently felt piacular (meaning something done or offered in order to make up for a sin or sacrilegious action) was too run-of-the-mill, so he made up a new form: piaculative” (24).

All Our Exploring (1). Astronaut Anne McClain, who recently spent 204 days aboard the International Space Station, found a unique use for Little Gidding. On 24 June 2019, her last tweet from the station before returning to earth read, “‘We shall not cease from exploration. . . .’ Her next tweet, sent shortly after touchdown a few hours later, read, “. . . and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time.’—T. S. Eliot”

All Our Exploring (2). Anthony Lane reviews the movie An Acceptable Loss, in which a fictional national security advisor, Elizabeth Lamm, who had previously orchestrated a nuclear attack, is now retired from public life. The hard-edged president, Rachel Burke, wants to know what Lamm has been mysteriously writing. “Eventually an excerpt is revealed. It begins, ‘We shall not cease from exploration.’ Hang on, that’s not Lamm, that’s T. S. Eliot! Why the deep state wants to break into Four Quartets I can’t imagine, but it has to be good news for the national literacy rate. Either that or Burke wants to bomb the shit out of the Waste Land.” (“Special Powers.” Rev. of Glass and An Acceptable Loss. The New Yorker 28 Jan. 2019: 78–79)

British politics. Rory Stewart, according to Politico, “is running to be prime minister of the United Kingdom but he’s happy to make time for poetry.” Stewart, a dark-horse candidate, told reporter Charlie Cooper that he considers the opening verse paragraph of Little Gidding V (“What we call the beginning is often the end / And to make an end is to make a beginning,” etc.) a particularly good reflection on “this moment in British politics.” He added that he memorized Four Quartets in toto “while walking alone in the Himalayas in 2001. He also learned Eliot’s The Waste Land by rote when he was 14 years old (‘I can still do most of it,’ he says).” (“Rory Stewart Shakes up Tory Leadership Race,” 5 June 2019.)

The cruelest clue. TLS Crossword No. 1256, 23 Across: “His cruelest month was April: flipping graft and effort primarily (5 letters).” According to expert solver William Harmon, one meaning of “graft” is “labor, work, toil,” and “toil” flipped is “liot,” to which the “e” from “effort” is fixed “primarily” to yield “Eliot.” Either one works that out or one just recognizes the reference to The Waste Land. (21 Dec. 2018)

On the low damp ground. “One of the year’s best albums, Laura Veirs’s The Lookout, is a welcome addition to” the tradition of optimistic psychedelia. “‘Margaret Sands,’ the new album’s opening track, is based on a T. S. Eliot poem and depicts a woman’s decomposing body on an ocean beach, not with a sense of horror but a sense of strange wonderment at nature’s processes.” (Geoffrey Himes, “The Curmudgeon: Different Kinds of Psychedelia,” pastmagazine.com, 18 July 2018)

O.M.G.

(25 March 2019)
Eliot in Summer 1919:  
A Holiday in France

By Elysia Balavage  
University of North Carolina—Greensboro

On 9 August 1919, a particularly sweltering summer evening, Vivien saw T. S. Eliot off at London’s Waterloo Station on his first journey to France in over eight years. There, he would meet his friend Ezra Pound for a three-week holiday in the Dordogne region. Indeed, Eliot needed the break following his father’s death in January, Vivien’s emotional and physical health problems, and the strains in their relationship. Eliot, too, suffered from illnesses, and Vivien called him “IMpossible—full of nerves . . . very morbid and grumpy” (Letters 1 381).

Arduous but exciting for Eliot, the trip to France included more than twenty-four consecutive hours by train and boat, concluding with a night train from Trouville to Périgueux. As dawn approached, Eliot could finally see the landscape from his carriage, “beautiful . . . hilly and wooded” (Letters 1 393). Having arrived in Périgueux at 7:30 in the morning, tired and hungry but enthralled by the beautiful atmosphere, he remarked, “The relief of getting into another country . . . and being able to speak another language, is a great stimulus and tonic” (Letters 1 395).

Eliot and Pound, accompanied by Dorothy Pound, began their holiday in the village of Excideuil, a town of narrow streets, stone homes, a tenth-century monastery, and gorgeous flora. The sunburned Eliot considered this a “complete relief from London,” and he revelled in the melons, truffles, free-range eggs, “good wine and good cheese and cheerful people” he found there (Letters 1 388). Leaving Excideuil and Dorothy behind, Eliot and Pound hiked through the small towns of Thivier and Brantôme, taking in their historic charm and the French sunshine. While walking through Dordogne and Corrèze, Eliot had “no address at all,” and thus the seven blisters that he suffered on their walk seemed a small price to pay for the freedom that the journey afforded (Letters 1 388). Along the way, the two poets discussed “Gerontion,” with Pound making notes and suggestions on Eliot’s draft.

Eliot’s cultural and historical immersion in Périgueux seemed to stimulate an intense experience of the past that he would later describe as a “sense of dispossession by the dead” (Letters 5 287). Pound recorded this revelation in Canto 29, where disguised as “Arnaut,” Eliot confesses, “I am afraid of the life after death” (145). Such “dispossession” appears several times in Eliot’s subsequent works and, for the post-conversion Eliot, represents the only remedy for life’s difficulties (Worthen, A Short Biography 93). In “East Coker,” Eliot writes, “In order to possess what you do not possess / You must go by the way of dispossession” (Poems 1 189).

After Pound returned to Excideuil, Eliot continued trekking by himself south of Périgueux to Font de Gaume and Les Eyzies; here, he viewed the Magdalenian prehistoric art of the grottoes (Crawford, Young Eliot 334). These cave paintings appear in “Tradition and the Individual Talent,” where he offers the “rock drawing of the Magdalenian draughtsmen” along with Shakespeare and Homer as examples of what the changing “mind of Europe” contains (Prose 2 107).

After his return on August 31, Eliot wrote to his mother, “I enjoyed my holiday thoroughly, and feel (and look) very well indeed” (Letters 1 392). His health was not the only aspect of the poet that changed: while on holiday, Eliot had grown a beard. Vivien thought his new look “unusual,” but in September, Eliot proudly wrote to Pound, “I will come in tomorrow . . . to refresh you for a few moments with the sight of my beard” (Crawford, Young Eliot 334; Letters 1 395).
The Letters of T. S. Eliot
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playful pseudo-dialect he has customarily used with Pound must have lightened his mood when dealing with Pound’s ill-tempered essays and difficult verse. He now uses it increasingly with his other friends. For example, he writes to Polly Tandy to sympathize over an illness in her “pore afflicted fambly” with the hope that her husband is again “cussin and rarin and spittin terbacker juice up the chimley” (83). Letters to Hayward with droll remarks about returning a pencil by post, or sending a letter on plain paper, “as it may fall into the wrong hands” (76), may seem like old-boy tomfoolery to some readers. But I enjoyed the letters to Hayward so much that I went looking for more among the hundreds of letters relegated to the Faber website. I found a letter of 11 February [1936], a Sherlock Holmes style fantasy in which Eliot (indeed playing a “wanted” man) writes that he is attempting to elude a certain “Sir W. F.” and suspects an antagonist like Holmes’s Professor Moriarty (the model for Macavity the Mystery Cat) behind the scenes. In another letter to Hayward, he begins, “The shades are closing in...” and soon “there will be nothing left but the closing chapter of the Reichenbach Falls” (66). The Holmesian fantasy takes hold on him so much that he begins a note to Woolf: “In my case-book for June I find noted the adventure of the Rochester Skeleton, the mystery of the Methodist School, and the case of the abominable vice-chancellor and his toy ducks: but I have not seen Virginia Woolf.”

“In my case-book for June I find noted the adventure of the Rochester Skeleton, the mystery of the Methodists School, and the case of the abominable vice-chancellor and his toy ducks: but I have not seen Virginia Woolf.”

encouraging young authors, including patiently supporting George Barker, whom Eliot believed incapable of holding a job. His loyalty to his pre-war friends is unwavering despite many irritations. Negotiations with Pound included attempts to avoid legal jeopardy. No other English publisher but Eliot could deal with the challenge of printing episodes from Joyce’s Work in Progress. He supported Wyndham Lewis by sitting for the portrait (fig. 25) that was subsequently rejected for exhibition by the Royal Academy of Arts and then joined with other artists in a well-publicized protest. As he supports his fellow modernists, he looks for fresh literary innovations in the works of Henry Miller, Lawrence Durrell, Anaïs Nin, and especially Djuna Barnes. Eliot lobbied for the publication of Barnes’s Nightwood, despite worries about sales and censorship, because it was “very likely the last big thing to be done in our time” (152). The effort to publish Barnes is thoroughly documented by including letters between Faber editor Frank Morley and Geoffrey Faber as well as a revealing discussion of the novel’s sexual themes between Eliot and Morley. Eliot tells Morley that he rejects both E. M. Forster’s and D. H. Lawrence’s conceptions of human relations and that he “tried to express something of my belief at the end of Burnt Norton. I mean that the ‘illusion’ of love is something to pass forward through...” (201). Love of created beings should lead us to the only love that is wholly satisfactory and final, the love of God.” Yet he sounds rather like Lawrence when he suggests that a lasting relation between two people requires “coming to terms between the elements of attraction and repulsion” (201).

Eliot is also frank about his sexual feelings in the letter to his brother Henry that answers the scolding letter Henry sent him on 12 September 1935 (Letters 7 748-63). To the charge of insincerity and family disloyalty, Eliot answers mildly (having destroyed an earlier, harsher reply) that at times he may have been “too much engrossed in the horrors of my private life” and suffering from “a feeling of guilt in having married a woman I detested” (10). But he strongly defends the genuineness of
The Letters of T. S. Eliot
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his religious conversion and observes that his early interest in Sanskrit and Henri Bergson, as well as his “abortive attempt to make myself into a professor of philosophy,” was “due to a religious preoccupation” (11). And he rejects the idea that he should purge what Henry considers “blasphemous” works from his Collected Poems: “what I have written I have written. ‘It is all part of the progress’” (12).

As this letter shows, his family relations remain strong. He visits America (Aug.-Oct. 1936) and enjoys a family reunion in New Hampshire. He also visits Emily Hale and reports to a friend that she seemed much changed, “chiefly in the lack of any animation, in a kind of numbness to the external world.” He looks forward to seeing her in England despite his concern about the “suffocating influence” (360) of her elderly travelling companions. After Emily’s visit to England in 1938, he sends her back to America with a Norwegian elkhound he purchases for her as a companion (fig. 7). After his sister visits him in 1938, he gives her a large gift of money for her return. As he tells his brother, his financial worries are over thanks to the unexpected success in England and America of Murder in the Cathedral.

The crisis with Vivien occurs in July 1938 when her brother Maurice Haigh-Wood informs Eliot that Vivien “was found wandering in the streets at 5 o’clock this morning” (909) and taken to a police station. She later asked her doctor if it was true that her husband had been “beheaded” (910). Earlier she wrote as a persona she called “Daisy Miller” (255, n. 2, 314-15). The inclusion of letters from Vivien to people such as her brother, Geoffrey Faber, and Henry Eliot, indicate her deepening obsessions about her husband. Correspondence between Eliot and Maurice Haigh-Wood shows the role Vivien’s brother took in his sister’s commitment and contradicts Carole Seymour-Jones’s interpretation of it in Painted Shadow. The extensive footnotes on the crisis (909-912, 930-33) will be invaluable to Eliot’s often ill-informed biographical critics.

The approaching close of The Criterion, the abdication of Edward VIII, the Munich Conference and the threat of war hang over Eliot at the close of 1938. Yet he is gratified by the success of Murder in the Cathedral and energized by working with theatrical professionals such as Ashley Dukes of the Mercury Theatre and his collaborator on The Rock, E. Martin Browne, who now guides Eliot in his work on The Family Reunion. Eliot ponders the rhythms of a character’s entrances and exits, learns from “my Master, Tchehov” [sic] (821), and weeps when attending Three Sisters. Browne’s critique of a draft of The Family Reunion (837-840) elicits a fascinating reply from Eliot (844-47). The letters were published in Browne’s The Making of T. S. Eliot’s Plays but now appear annotated and in context with the crisis over Vivien. Browne objects to Harry Monchensey, the play’s protagonist, using the word “push” in referring to his wife’s fatal fall into the ocean. Eliot insists on the word to suggest the possibility of murder since “the desire for her death was strong in his mind” (846). Eliot dreads having to rewrite the play to satisfy all of Browne’s criticisms since “political events make one feel that one is working against time” (845). In 1938 Eliot turned 50 and later brooded in East Coker (1940) on his “middle way . . . trying to use words” amid the “general mess of imprecision of feeling.” The letters in volume 8 are evidence that these years were not “largely wasted.”

Dialectical Imagination
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“‘immediate experience,’ ‘intellectual experience,’ and ‘transcendent experience’ with the first and third phases made up of feeling, and the intermediate term made up of thought” (53). Under Bradley’s influence, Brooker concludes, Eliot’s “dialectical imagination is by definition triadic, a structure that in itself nudges the mind to move beyond contradictions.” Crucially, however, it is not the “beyond” of a straightforward transcendence, but that of a return “that moves forward by looping back,” to the present, to the object as a renewed encounter (53).

For Brooker this spatial projection of the dialectical imagination increasingly establishes itself as the ruling principle in Eliot’s life and poetics—especially when it comes to the question of his acute sense of being always the foreigner. Her exploration of Eliot’s “exilic imagination,” in the last sections of the book, is the best example of this: “[I]t is triadic and dialectical, moving from expatriation to wandering to homecoming” (130). If in The Waste Land, Marina, and Ash-Wednesday it takes the embryonic form of a
poetics of renewal, in *Four Quartets* the dialectic of the exilic imagination takes its most literal form—in what is the most exquisite of all the poetic readings Brooker offers throughout her book.

In referencing part V of *Little Gidding*, Brooker invites us to revisit the very beginning of her book where the following verses accompany the opening dedication:

We shall not cease from exploration  
And the end of all our exploring  
Will be to arrive where we started  
And know the place for the first time.  

(*Poems 1 208*)

The meaning of these lines is augmented as we near the end of the book. It is as patterns, not only as explicit ideas, that thought permeates Eliot’s poetry. Recurrence invites renewal and further understanding as circularity adopts a forward motion. In Brooker’s rendering: “The overall structure of *Burnt Norton*, in keeping with the predominant tendency of Eliot’s thought, is dialectical, progressing from one first world to the other and ending in a return to the beginning that includes and transcends both in a more comprehensive form” (153). Thus, Brooker’s “dialectical imagination” emerges throughout her book as she guides us, in true Virgilian style, through the circles of the poet’s poetic and spiritual pilgrimage.

**T. S. Eliot’s Dialectical Imagination** is a work of masterful critical synthesis whose immense scholarship (especially with reference to *The Complete Prose*, including enlightening readings of his postgraduate essays, as well as to the collected *Letters*) is easy to follow thanks to the effortlessness of its writing. Brooker’s interest in Eliot’s Christian belief does not require that the reader should believe too, but her book does give us a real sense of what belief might feel like. She suggests that “Eliot himself hoped to achieve dogma without dogmatism” (119). That is, in opting out of the Unitarianism he was brought up with in America, Eliot was rejecting the dogmatism of the middle-ground. In converting to Anglo-Catholicism (not Roman Catholicism) he was adopting the via media as dogma. The imagination would not be dialectical otherwise; it would be doctrinaire. Brooker must be praised for salvaging the Christian Eliot by getting us as close as one can possibly be to the experience of Eliot’s belief.

---

**The Lion in the Waste Land**
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in the Cathedral “perhaps the greatest Christian play” (9), because it so powerfully “convey[s] the terror that is integral to redemption” (26) in modernity.

Problems emerge from two forms of flattening which affect her readings of all three authors, but can be demonstrated via Eliot: a monolithic and reductive view of a “traditional Christianity” advocated for by the three writers, despite the rich differences in even these three Anglican contemporaries; and an equally reductive view of “secular modernity” as an absolute waste land antithetical to Christian redemption. Brown insists that Eliot was anti-modern (both aesthetically and religiously), and his traditionalism firmly of the past. In doing so, Brown reads Eliot right out of his complex situatedness within his modern context—before, during, and after 1927—as writer, critic, and Christian. The result is first an anachronistic and limited view of the early work: “Prufrock” and *The Waste Land* merely serve to bemoan modernity for its lack of spiritual values and mark the hole in Eliot that Christianity will fill. But more problematically, the reading of even Eliot’s explicitly religious work glosses right over the nuance, ambiguity, and complexity that give it its power.

To provide an example: *Ash Wednesday* is, even Brown must admit, a poem of “extreme and puzzling images,” and “very clearly a poem of brokenness” (101). And yet her reading of the poem itself finds only a positive, complete, transformative experience of conversion. The question of whether the speaker’s bones in Part II are to be revitalized is one on which “the feeling is optimistic,” and “he has learned to sit still” (103-4). By Part VI, the speaker is “calm and glad because the sense of loss is no longer accompanied by mournfulness”; “the relinquishment is complete.” Dante’s *Paradiso* is echoed with no irony or caution, even after the return to earth and time. The world that the speaker can “taste again” is “good,” and “hope rests in God alone because all else has dropped away” (105). This is an *Ash Wednesday* that seems to ignore everything that makes it so distinctly Eliot: its multiplicity and fragmentation, its inescapable irony (right alongside its earnestness), its crippling self-consciousness, its play with tense, the contingency of its possible redemption and its honest doubt. (Brown does not mention Eliot’s own complex rejection of
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the notion of “conversion” itself, nor engage with recent scholarship about the problems with that term relative to his experience.) The reading of Eliot-as-critic is similarly one-track, and often as problematically reductive, especially where Eliot’s religious engagement is most complex.

“Like many who love old literature,” Brown says of Eliot, Sayers, and Lewis, “these writers regarded themselves as belonging to an earlier time, spiritually and intellectually” (232). But much of the beauty in Eliot’s work, I would insist, came from his knowledge that his affinity for the past did not mean he belonged there. He strove to make his work, including his Christian work and thought, of his time; at any rate, he knew such was inescapable. Problems aside, the study still offers much that Eliot readers will find of value in its insightful, comparative arrangement of so much interesting work from these three authors, which groups a variety of criticism, letters, and creative work around Christian themes. It is in particular a welcome opportunity for Eliot readers to be introduced to the work of Sayers in more depth, and by an expert.

Literature, Ethics, and the Emotions
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addressing more of the newer work—the many critical studies as well as the enormous amount of newly released primary material—in the field.

The chapters on D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf are the finest in the book. The Lawrence chapter is divided between an exposition of Lawrence’s emotive theories found in Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious and their application to Women in Love. The exposition of these obscure nonfiction works is interesting and valuable. In the Woolf chapter, Asher notes the difficulty that Woolf’s “epistemic skepticism” and “rejection of traditional character” pose to enhancing “ethical awareness” (114). Like the Eliot chapter, this is a survey of Woolf’s major works from “The Mark on the Wall” to The Waves in light of the epistemological problem of other minds. He concludes that only certain of Woolf’s works are amenable to “Nussbaum’s Jamesian engagements” with character (143). The chapter on George Bernard Shaw addresses directly the problem that “Shaw is not terribly interested in character” in the Aristotelian sense (150). Additionally, the “tightly-controlled ethical didacticism” of Shaw’s plays is challenging for Nussbaum’s theories as not allowing the needed reflection and empathy.

Asher’s prose is genial and lucid, even on recondite topics, which makes this book accessible even to those scholars who are not deeply engaged with philosophy routinely. I will make two general critiques, though. The first is that the Aristotelianism at the core of this study can sometimes fade from view during the close readings in the individual chapters. I did not feel the readings to be digressive or irrelevant, but I was sometimes left wanting a reminder of or clearer tie to the overarching philosophical questions. The second is that the logic behind the choice and order of these case-studies is not made readily apparent; Eliot and Shaw are delineated as test cases for Nussbaum’s theories in the fields of poetry and drama, but why Lawrence and Woolf (12)?

For scholars of Eliot specifically, Asher’s book offers some intriguing readings of F. H. Bradley and Eliot’s interest in the emotions. Those studying Eliot’s aesthetics and his philosophy will want to engage with this work. Additionally, teachers of literary theory may also enjoy his critiques of theorists as a stimulus to class discussion.

The eighth and final volume of The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition, Still and Still Moving (1954-1965), co-edited by Jewel Spears Brooker and Ronald Schuchard, is in production at JHUP and scheduled to be online on Project Muse in mid-September. Society members will be getting news this fall about free access to the volume for the month following the volume’s publication.

A group of Eliot scholars (including International T. S. Eliot Society members Teresa Gibert, Didac Llorens, Viorica Patea and Fabio Vericat) has been awarded a grant from the Spanish “Ministerio, de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades” to produce new translations of Eliot’s plays into Spanish, as part of a critical edition. The project (“T. S. Eliot’s Drama from Spain: Translation, Critical Study, Performance”) will be developed during the next three years.
**AMERICA CALLING: ELIOT’S WOOD THRUSH**

As a young boy, Eliot was an avid bird watcher. The wood thrush was the main bird that lingered in his imagination as a reminder of his youth in America. This paper deals with the relation of the wood thrush to Eliot’s desire to return to the world of his youth, the world that included his family and Emily Hale, and to the change in the meaning of the bird that occurred during his residence in America in 1932-33. In *Ash Wednesday* and *Marina*, he idealized the memories of his youth; the year in New England led to a de-idealization that can be seen in *Burnt Norton*, forcing him to re-conceptualize his “first world.”

*Jewel Spears Brooker*  
*Eckerd College*

---

**“PROJECTIONS IN THE HAIKU MANNER”**: RICHARD WRIGHT, T. S. ELIOT, AND TRANSPACIFIC MODERNISM

In the months leading up to his death in 1960, Richard Wright composed over 4,000 poems, 817 of which he selected for *This Other World: Projections in the Haiku Manner*, a collection that was not published until 1998. I hope to show how these experiments with haiku mark a significant advance in a vibrant tradition of East-West exchange in American literature that includes T. S. Eliot. Wright’s close study of Buddhism and haiku, most notably in scholarship by R. H. Blyth and D. T. Suzuki, helps to explain why these haiku-inspired poems are best understood in light of his early, formative encounter with Eliot’s *The Waste Land*, and the abiding memory of Eliot in works published throughout Wright’s career. As we shall see, Wright’s constant revisiting of Eliot’s *The Waste Land*, including Eliot’s allusions to Buddhist scripture in that poem, fundamentally shaped his style and perspective in *This Other World*.

*Anita Patterson*  
*Boston University*

---

**SEGREGATED SENSATIONS: T. S. ELIOT AND THE COLOR LINE OF ST. LOUIS**

“Easter: Sensations of April,” Eliot’s 1910 notebook poem, offers a rare glimpse of the poet’s childhood experiences in a densely populated, mixed-race urban neighborhood. Significant details such as the heat of April, the smell of asphalt, and the sight of a “little negro girl who lives across the alley” place this poem in turn-of-the-century St. Louis, Missouri, a former slave state that stayed in the Union, developed a system of partial racial segregation. Streetcars were not segregated, for example, but playgrounds were. Residential city blocks were not segregated, but families were. In this poem, how do the poet’s sensations (or are they memories?) reflect the child’s consciousness of St. Louis’s color line? And how were Eliot’s perceptions of space, sensation, and other people shaped by the regime of segregation, which is a form of estrangement? My paper examines “Easter: Sensations of April” in the double context of Eliot’s college reading in the philosophy of sensation and memory and his childhood environment of Locust Street and urban St. Louis, to propose a new understanding of Eliot’s preternatural attentiveness to sensation and his lifelong sense of alienation.

*Frances Dickey*  
*University of Missouri*

---

**ELIOT’S AUDITORY IMAGINATION: THE POETICS AND POETRY OF SOUND AND SILENCE**

T. S. Eliot’s poetry and prose feature auditory experience as content and organizing principle. In his “Matthew Arnold” essay, he broadly defines the “auditory imagination” as something “penetrating far below the conscious levels of thought and feeling, invigorating every word; sinking to the most primitive and forgotten, returning to the origin and bringing something back, seeking the beginning and the end.” Later, in “The Music of Poetry,” Eliot claims, “the music of poetry is not something which exists apart from the meaning.” Far from escaping into obscurantism, Eliot’s auditory imagination opens towards a nonrational conception of meaning, one that simultaneously engages the senses and the limitations of language itself. As Eliot developed his poetry in tandem with his changing religious beliefs, he progressively figured listening, music, and silence as the auditory encounter with the divine, one that limns between sounds and silence. Most analyses of Eliot’s auditory imagery focus on historical accounts of auditory technology or the poet’s various musical influences. I propose a critical shift that sutures historicist and hermeneutical methods by examining how Eliot’s auditory imagery materializes his theories on poetic form, meaning, and
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religious belief. In particular, the dynamic interplay of music and words with silence and stillness provokes us to think of bodily, aesthetic experiences as analogues to and initiators of abstract or religious thought. The Waste Land and “The Hollow Men” abound with imagery of voices, while in Burnt Norton, Eliot writes, “Words, after speech, reach / Into the silence. . . .” In order to ground this analysis, I will employ the rhetorical figures of apophasis and aposiopesis, which both signify language’s limits by producing silence. Ultimately, this paper will demonstrate how Eliot’s poetics of sound and silence resonate in his poetry and beliefs.

Alexander Ruggeri
Tufts University

AT THE FRONTIER OF METAPHYSICS OR MYSTICISM: THE RELIGIOUS AESTHETICS OF ELIOT’S POETIC IMPERSONALITY

T. S. Eliot’s poetological essay “Tradition and the Individual Talent” gives a philosophical account of his theory on poetic impersonality. He attacks the personality and praises the ideal of impersonality as a corrective against the Romantic impulse to celebrate “what is individual.” Eliot appeals to a much older allegiance—tradition—and “halt[s] at the frontier of metaphysics or mysticism,” confining himself to the realm of aesthetics. Eliot’s early ideas about poetic impersonality prefigure the outright mysticism of his life’s culminating poem, Four Quartets. My paper sees poetic impersonality as a fundamentally religious aesthetic. It will encounter and resolve the seeming opposition between kenotic self-annihilation and creativity, examining these through the matrices of the religious and artistic. It will find the tradition of negative theology instrumental as a framework for resolving the inherent tensions between negative apophasis and affirmative cataphasis. In so doing, the paper will tease out the religious stakes of poetic impersonality and show that self-annihilation and creativity are engaged in a dialectical relationship.

Emily King
Stanford University

SITUATING THE MODERNIST GROUND OF ENGLAND’S PASTS: T. S. ELIOT’S POETIC LANDSCAPING

T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land (1922) and Burnt Norton of his Four Quartets (1943) abound with moments where depictions of the tropology of landscape—both natural and unnatural—appear as material representations of British pasts, jutting up through its present—what one might call an anachronistic native primitivism. My paper will consider how this points to what, materially, constitutes the ground of modern England according to Eliot’s particular brand of Modernism. For example, his depiction of the church of St. Magnus Martyr is a figure of a London space constituted by its layered history as much as the modern cataclysms that threaten to alter it—such as the many dead flowing over the bridge. Both are part of the Unreal city that constitute the new version of realism through which Eliot seeks, like Ezra Pound, to “Make It New.” The realism of this Britain is a Thames characterized by rats and rot—decay being more symbolic of the heart of empire than his predecessor Joseph Conrad’s glorious darkness of the Roman’s first landing on British shores in the opening pages of Heart of Darkness. I argue that Eliot uses such remnant pasts figured as unreal futures and presents to aid him in inviting readers to re-see English history in the present via depictions of the internal residues of pre-Enlightenment English pasts—from the Roman to the Norman, the Celtic to the Medieval—figured here as ruins and scars upon the matter of England itself—its landscape.

Molly Volanth Hall
University of Rhode Island

SOCIETY NOTES

Congratulations to Nancy Hargrove, who was invited to give a lecture (this June) on Eliot’s year at Merton College at Oxford during the MSU Honors College Oxford Summer School.

Patrick Query was promoted to the rank of full Professor of English at West Point. Congratulations, Patrick! [Editor’s note: also see p. 19]

If you are aware of any 2018 citations that do not appear here, please contact Joshua Richards (josh.c.richards@gmail.com). Omissions will be rectified in the 2019 listing.

Books


Smith, Steven D. Pagans and Christians in the City: Culture Wars from the Tiber to the Potomac. Eerdmans, 2018. [Note: Eliot’s Idea of a Christian Society is a key text in this volume.]


Chapters


Waterman, Sally. “Re-Imagining the Family Album through Literary Adaptation.” Global Photographies: Memory–History–Archives. Edited by Sissy Helff and


**Articles**


Perry, Seamus. “Eliot, Blake, Unpleasantness.”


diary’s note: There are a number of articles in Korean in the Journal of the T. S. Eliot Society of Korea (vol. 28) that are not indexed in this English-language bibliography.

In the Arts


Theses and Dissertations


Tan, Zihua. At the Still Point for Orchestra. 2018.


Reviews
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ANNOUNCEMENTS

Election Results

Four candidates received nominations this winter for three positions on the Eliot Society board. As a result of the election, Patrick Query joins the board through June 30, 2020. In addition, Julia Daniel and Melanie Fathman will return to their seats on the board through June 30, 2022. Welcome to the board, Patrick, and thank you, Julia and Melanie, for your continued service.

Conference Registration

Registration for our 2019 meeting will soon open, so keep an eye on your inbox for a message from the Society. You can also check for registration by going to our website, http://www.tseliot.sites.luc.edu/ and navigating to our membership portal. This is a good time to renew your membership (but our lovely system will always send you a reminder).

Peer Seminars

If you missed the deadline to send in a proposal but still want to present some work at our meeting, peer seminars are a great way to participate. See our website for descriptions of the three peer seminars on offer at our 2019 meeting, and send an email to tseliotsociety@gmail.com to enroll.

See you in St. Louis!
T. S. Eliot Society

website: http://www.tseliot.sites.luc.edu/
facebook: www.facebook.com/tseliotsociety
e-mail: tseliotsociety@gmail.com
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Society Business
To make suggestions or inquiries regarding the annual meeting or other Society activities, please contact the president, Jayme Stayer, at jstayer@luc.edu

Conference Proposals
To submit papers for any conference session sponsored by the Society, please send your abstract to tseliotsociety@gmail.com, or to the specific individual named in the call for papers.

Membership and Registration
To join the Society, renew your membership, or report a change of address, please access our secure membership portal via our website (http://www.tseliot.sites.luc.edu/) by clicking on “Membership.” To register for a conference, click on “Annual Meeting” and “Conference Registration.” For questions regarding payment of membership dues or conference fees, contact the treasurer, David Chinitz, at Dchinit@luc.edu or by mail at:
Department of English
Crown Center for the Humanities
1032 W. Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60660

Time Present
For matters having to do with Time Present: The Newsletter of the T. S. Eliot Society, please contact the vice president, John Whittier-Ferguson, at johnaw@umich.edu

Reviews
To inquire about reviewing a book or having a book reviewed, please contact Book Review Editor Ria Banerjee at Ria.Banerjee@guttman.cuny.edu.

Email List Serve
To subscribe to the Society’s informational list serve, which is used for occasional official communications only, please contact Tony Cuda at ajcuda@uncg.edu.