T. S. Eliot Society Newsletter

Number 48 Fall 2002

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

CALL FOR PAPERS
ALA ANNUAL MEETING
BOSTON (CAMBRIDGE) 2003

As in past years, the Society will hold two multi-paper sessions at the 2003 Annual Meeting of the American Literature Association, to be held from May 22-25 at the Hyatt Regency Cambridge, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Members wishing to read papers or make innovative scholarly presentations of interest to Eliot scholars, are invited to send usefully detailed proposals or abstracts—between 300 and 500 words long—to the President, Professor Shyamal Bagchee. Electronic submissions are definitely preferred, and should reach him at <shyamal.bagchee@ualberta.ca> **no later than Monday, 20 January 2003.**

Individual presentation time is limited to twenty minutes. Readers and presenters must have current and paid-up membership in The T.S. Eliot Society—for details, please check our website at <www.arts.ualberta.ca/~eliotsoc>

Note: **no one may present more than one paper at the ALA conference.** General information about the conference is available at the ALA website: <www.calstatela.edu/academic/english/ala2/2003CONF.HTML>

AWARDS GIVEN AT SEPTEMBER MEETING

Several awards were presented at the Society's 2002 meeting. Two long-time members received the Distinguished Service Award: Anthony Fathman, and Jewel Spears Brooker. Four new members received the Fathman Award: Andrew Hawthorne, Aaron Jaffe, Rebecca Sutton Koeser, and Alexandra Leader. Congratulations to all.

SOCIETY MEETING
2003

Next year's meeting will be held September 26-28 in St. Louis. We will again hold most of our sessions at the St. Louis Woman's Club. A block of rooms will be held for members of the Society at the Best Western Inn at the Park, but next year we will also have the possibility of staying at the newly-renovated and luxurious Chase Park Plaza, just two blocks down the street. The Chase Park Plaza will hold a block of rooms (until Sept. 2) for our members and is offering a conference rate of $129 per night. Thus we will have greater choice of lodgings next year, something several members have requested.

MEETING IN LONDON
2004

The Board of Directors has decided to explore the possibility of holding the Society meeting in England in 2004. That year will mark the 25th anniversary of the Society's founding, and it seems appropriate to mark the occasion with a visit to London and other English sites that were central to T. S. Eliot's life and work.

Chris Buttram is leading the effort to plan this venture and is chairing a planning committee that also includes Melanie Fathman, David Huisman, and Ben Lockerd. Dr. Buttram's preliminary proposal for the meeting is enclosed with this newsletter.

Members will also find a questionnaire on the subject, which they are requested to fill out and send to the address on the questionnaire. The planning committee is most eager to have the suggestions of the membership before we fare forward on the voyage.

BOOK REVIEW

Painted Shadow: A Life of Vivien Eliot, First Wife of T. S. Eliot, and the Long-Suppressed Truth About Her Influence on His Genius, by Carole Seymour-Jones. London: Constable, 2001. New York: Doubleday, 2002. 624 pages. $35.00.

Painted Shadow, Carole Seymour-Jones's extensively researched biography of Vivien Eliot, is in some sense an extraordinary and long-overdue accomplishment. Seymour-Jones has amassed in her 600-plus page tome a plethora of archival data: Vivien's diaries, unpublished manuscripts of her prose fiction, letters to and from the Eliots and their friends, relatives and associates. Much of the material she used was previously unpublished and inaccessible to Eliot scholars. That she managed to secure permission to use this material is remarkable, and suggests the intrinsic value of the project.

Given that almost all prior critical consideration of Vivien focused on the detrimental impact of her illness on her husband's life and work, Seymour-Jones's stated goal, to tell sympathetically Vivien's side of the story, potentially offers a much-needed corrective measure. As her illness advanced and her husband distanced himself from her in order to preserve his own fragile stability and hard-won career advances, Vivien tended increasingly to perform the private disaster of the Eliot marriage as a public spectacle of dysfunction. In so doing, she earned some of the negative publicity directed at her. Most critics, apparently seeing no need to interrogate further the reasons for her behavior, unthinkingly perpetuated that publicity. Perhaps because it is so enjoyably catty, Virginia Woolf's famous description of Vivien—"this bag of ferrets is what Tom wears around his neck"—regularly accompanies most critical mention of Eliot's first wife. Because her biographies of Eliot are so well-regarded, Lyndall Gordon's purely personal surmise, that Vivien's "nervous hysterical, unsympathetic nature contributed substantially to their unhappiness," has largely gone unchallenged. Loretta Johnson, one of the few academics before Seymour-Jones to focus primarily and sympathetically on Vivien, tentatively defends Vivien with the suggestion that for a few years, during the period when Eliot wrote *The Waste Land*, "there was at least a marriage of the minds, in which they shared and influenced each other's work."

For some reason, popular culture mustered the sympathy for Vivien that academia could not. Michael Hastings' 1984 play *Tom and Viv*, and the highly acclaimed film made a decade later, cast Vivien as a spirited, lively, sensitive victim of early twentieth century medical prejudice and her husband's pathological emotional detachment.

Documentation suggesting that these popular interpretations were nearer the mark has long been available to any scholar who cared to consider it. The 1971 publication of *The Waste Land* Facsimile clearly showed that Vivien Eliot played a role in the poem's making. Several editorial comments and textual additions in her hand are evident in the manuscript. Her conversation appears in "A Game of Chess"; she contributed several other significant lines to the poem, and may have authored a less misogynist version of the infamous "Fresca" passage that Pound wisely excised. Valerie Eliot reproduces in her introduction to the Facsimile letters detailing Vivien's care of her husband and her management of his affairs, in the throes of the mutual illness that afflicted the couple while the poem was being written. Various correspondences Valerie published in the first volume of Eliot's *Letters* reveals that Vivien was herself a writer, who published several stories and poems in her husband's journal *The Criterion* (which she also named and helped him run).

Perhaps because Eliot still remains a central icon of literary modernism, the possibility that both Vivien's illness and her intelligence were essential to his work has not previously been considered. This is the task Seymour-Jones purports to accomplish, according to her introductory assertion that "Without Vivien, in all probability, Eliot would not have given the world *The Waste Land*."

The true story of the doomed Eliot marriage undoubtedly needs to be told, because it formed the circumstances under which Eliot produced his greatest work. The academic climate has never been more favorable for an in-depth biographical study of a tragically neglected female artist. Feminist scholarship of the past three decades has laid respectable precedent for recovering Vivien as a neglected artist in her own right. Even if Vivien's artistic accomplishments were too modest, especially compared with her husband's, for serious critical consideration, she certainly deserves more credit than she has received for her crucial role in her husband's work: as editor, collaborator, strategic adviser and nurse during his illness. Recent, iconoclastic critical focus on the less savory aspects of Eliot's personality—his anti-Semitism, submerged homoerotic impulses, misogyny and apparent horror of the physical aspects of sexuality—although sometimes frustrating to more traditional Eliot scholars, has also deepened and complicated critical discussion of his work. Judicious discussion of the serious troubles that beset Eliot's first marriage, if sensitively handled, could similarly illuminate some of the darker impulses that enliven the poetry he wrote during that period.

Painted Shadow could have been a balanced portrayal of a fascinating and deeply troubled marriage between two artists. Through careful exploration of the couple's collaborative experiments and mutual interdependence during their respective bouts of illness, it could have performed for Eliot scholars the invaluable service of demonstrating just how complex his artistic process was, and how astonishingly well his poetry infuses everyday misery with mythic

dimensions. It could have presented a compelling follow-up to the implication Hastings first raised fifteen years ago in *Tom and Viv,* that early twentieth century medical practices, biased by misogynistic and culturally manufactured notions of female "hysteria," made spirited but occasionally difficult women such as Vivien dangerously and permanently ill, blamed them for their worsening condition, determined that their increasingly visible symptoms too greatly inconvenienced their relatives and punished them with permanent incarceration—whether or not they were truly clinically insane, which Vivien in retrospect was not. Unfortunately, however, *Painted Shadow* accomplishes none of these things. Badly written, inappropriately speculative, agenda-laden and critically unfocused, the book is at best a squandered opportunity.

Seymour-Jones lays the groundwork for her fairly reasonable primary argument that it was Vivien, "no less than Tom, who was victim in the marriage," with a series of more troublesome assertions indicating a proprietary attitude toward her subject. Discussing the fact that Eliot burned some of his potentially compromising private papers but left other scandalous writings and correspondence, Seymour-Jones wonders, "Was he challenging readers to search for a new, personal understanding of his poetry?....How much did he want me to know?" Apparently, she believes that Eliot had her in mind when he made his housekeeping decisions.

Seymour-Jones's insertion of her first-person presence into her narrative could be read merely as a rather charming rhetorical device, except for the constant repetition of similar assertions: "As I followed the twisted trail of Vivienne's life," she tells us, "I felt strangely close to both Eliots." Feeling "strangely close" to one's subject is a common experience for biographical researchers. Ethical biographers, however, do not use this imaginary bond to justify asserting personal speculation as irrefutable fact. "It may seem," she states, "that T.S. Eliot was determined to preserve his reputation at all costs. However, it is significant that he failed to destroy revealing evidence." Eliot, it seems, is deliberately teasing her with partially-hidden clues, and Seymour-Jones takes this perceived evasiveness as a personal challenge. The "evidence" Eliot could not bring himself to destroy because he must have wanted his secret known, she claims, is the obscene and scatological King Bolo and Colombo verses recently published in *Inventions of the March Hare*. They reveal, she claims, powerful and irrefutable documentation of Eliot's homosexual orientation. "It is hard to believe," Seymour-Jones astonishingly states, that Eliot's "violent" homosexual feelings "were never acted upon," and from here goes on to enumerate a number of homosexual relationships in which Eliot supposedly engaged, based solely on the fact that he occasionally had male houseguests and housemates.

Sanctioned by her supposed bond with the dead Eliots, throughout the book, Seymour-Jones projects herself onto her subjects, relating the Eliots' various feelings, thoughts and responses as if she had direct access to them. Assuming that poetry is a direct expression of those immediate moods, she constantly reads Eliot's poetry as nothing more than thinly-disguised biography, expressive of all the shameful impulses that he could barely contain. His homosexuality, of course, explains his contempt for Vivien, who *is*, according to Seymour-Jones, all the shadowy monsters in all of his writing: "Vivien now represented for her husband his shadow side, the dark anima behind Eliot's urbane exterior of which he speaks in 'The Hollow Men.'"

Some reviewers have argued that in her portrayal of Vivien as essentially the victim of her husband's repression, Seymour-Jones is pursuing a blindly feminist agenda. But Vivien fares no better. Although she is the only critic to date who has focused on Vivien's published prose (or to have full access to what remains of her unpublished sketches), Seymour-Jones, maddeningly, never discusses Vivien's writing in literary terms, or takes her seriously as an artist. This is not because Vivien lacks talent as an author but because Seymour-Jones lacks insight as a reader: "Vivien's prose sketches," she decides, "were autobiographical." Her witty, sharply-observed portraits of social artifice, which strongly merit serious critical consideration at least as period pieces, are for Seymour-Jones no more than diary entries and fantasies in which only the names were changed.

Seymour-Jones most profoundly betrays the woman whose betrayal she is supposedly rectifying in her discussion of Vivien's illness. Taking at face value the completely unscientific critical consensus that Vivien's symptoms were purely "hysterical," Seymour-Jones decides that Vivien's constant menstrual bleeding, migraines, stomach pains, and myriad other symptoms ultimately "had no organic basis," but instead represented only a means of manipulating her husband: "Since she had no sexual hold over him, so was unable to withhold sexual favors, she had to use hysteria to gain his attention." Seymour-Jones not only fails to frame assumptions about female hysteria within the well-established critical context of early twentieth century medical and psychiatric ideology, it does not seem to occur to her that medical diagnoses even today can reflect current cultural preconceptions. Many hormonal and autoimmune disorders generate symptoms similar to Vivien's, and it is only in the past few years that doctors have begun to appropriately diagnose and treat these disorders rather than simply dismiss them as psychosomatic response, or signs of depression.

Painted Shadow's main contribution to Eliot scholarship is that it has made public some material that was previously inaccessible. It is regrettable that the writer entrusted with these materials so greatly misused them.

Shannon McRae
SUNY-Fredonia

MURDER IN THE CATHEDRAL ON AMERICAN RADIO

Murder in the Cathedral has a long broadcast history. On December 21, 1937, just two years after its stage premiere, the BBC televised it—an early production in that medium—and later the same year successfully aired the play on radio.

A year after being televised the play was first transmitted on radio in the United States. On Saturday July 23, 1938 the Columbia Broadcasting System put on the air a one-hour version of the play in its Columbia Workshop Series. This notable series lasted from July, 1936 until January, 1947 and aired a diverse list of plays and adaptations, from *The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner* to an early radio broadcast of Dr. Seuss, in 30- and 60-minute programs.

The caption title of the script for the *Murder* broadcast is:

> Columbia Broadcasting System
> Columbia Workshop—Murder in the Cathedral
> Saturday, July 23, 1938
> 7:00 to 8:00 p.m.

It then continues on 59 typewritten pages on rectos only. No other internal evidence is included, but production notes that concluded the broadcast (see below) provide information as to who was involved:

> Series Producer: William N. Robson
> Guest Producer and Director: George Zachary
> Adaptation: George Zachary
> Music: Bernard Herrmann
> Beckett: Reynolds Evans
> Chorus: Women from the Federal Theatre Project

The use of women from the FTP suggests a more than casual relationship between this production and the New York premiere of *Murder in the Cathedral* by the FTP in 1936. The FTP production had been a big hit, even though, as Hallie Flanagan, director of the FTP noted, it may have been because many in the audience anticipated a murder mystery. In addition, CBS was linked to the FTP through its "Federal Radio Theatre" series, also directed by Robson, based on mysteries by M. R. Rineheart, that was aired from October, 1937 until February, 1938. Finally, Orson Welles, who had been involved in the stage production, started his "Mercury Theatre on the Air" on CBS the same summer.

Murder in the Cathedral was subject to more revisions than any other Eliot play. Its director, Martin Browne, even admitted to making alterations as he toured the play in England. The radio version was severely altered. In reducing the play to fit within a one-hour time slot, at least a third of the lines were removed. In making the cuts, largely done in segments rather than by individual lines, many poetic lines were edited out in favor of those related to action. For example, the first mention of the turning wheel is absent from the Women of Canterbury's speech. Some speeches are also rearranged. Perhaps most striking are the changes made to the chorus. The chorus was a vital part of the premiere and remained on stage during the entire Canterbury performance. In the radio version, the women's lines are occasionally in chorus but more frequently spoken by individuals. Since the chorus frequently had difficulty speaking in unison the solution may have been more successful. Still, in many respects this was an effective performance that helped introduce Eliot in a new way to an American audience.

Fortunately the broadcast audio tape has survived and listeners can judge for themselves. It is available on disk and tape for a modest cost from Jerry Haendiges Productions: http://otrsite.com/radiolog/. He also offers a tape with readings of two of the *Four Quartets*.

Erwin Welsch
University of Wisconsin Emeritus

THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE T. S. ELIOT SOCIETY
27-29 September, 2002
St. Louis, Missouri

The poetry of T.S. Eliot is very much a poetry of place or space. Space or location figure prominently throughout: "the room" in "Prufrock," the hyacinth garden, the rose garden, the desert, along the Strand, Jerusalem, Athens, Alexandria, death's other Kingdom, vacant interstellar spaces, the drained pool, through the unknown, remembered gate. True, "home is where one starts from," but, as we are reminded in "East Coker," "as we grow older/The world becomes stranger, the pattern more complicated...." At times threatening, at others holding out a promise of redemption and peace, the spaces and places of Eliot's poetry require both the poet *and the reader* to "place" themselves in relation to language, to ideas and emotions, and to other people.

I think I can say, together with my fellow participants in the recent meeting of the T.S. Eliot Society in St. Louis, "*there*...[we] have been," both in geographical and in intellectual terms. Our lectures indeed demonstrated the complexity of the pattern, taking us from Paris to the South Pole, from Macchu Picchu to the music hall. We were asked to place ourselves in relation to genre and gender, philosophy and physics, hermeneutics, rhetoric, and thematics. We recited Eliot and sang Eliot. The "dichotomy" between theory and close reading was shown to be merely apparent. Prof. Marjorie Perloff's memorial lecture allowed us to enter another kind of space—the "cunning passages" and "contrived corridors" of Eliot's language—demonstrating how close reading can be used in conjunction with other interpretive contexts.

The greatness of T.S. Eliot is in the very complexity of the pattern that engenders such rich multiplicity. Focusing not only on the places of Eliot's poetry, but on the interstices and relations between them, Jewel Spears Brooker, recipient of a Distinguished Service Award, embodies this awareness throughout her work

The papers that we heard at this year's conference illustrate Eliot's view that while historical or biographical information is a valuable and "necessary preparation" for reading, "it can only lead us to the door: we must find our own way in" ("The Frontiers of Criticism," 1956). This felicitous phrase is followed by a description of the critic to whom he is most grateful. That critic is "the one who can make me look at something I have never looked at before, or looked at only with eyes clouded by prejudice, set me face to face with it and then leave me alone with it." As we listened to the ideas of our colleagues, we encountered, more than once, "something [we] have never looked at before." Under the expert guidance and organization of Shyamal Bagchee, the meeting of the T.S. Eliot Society in St. Louis, 2002, led its participants to many doors, from the open door of the Fathmans' warm hospitality to doors leading to new and challenging readings.

Kinereth Meyer
Bar-Ilan University
Ramat-Gan, Israel

ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE 2002 SOCIETY MEETING

Yuet May Ching, *Chinese University of Hong Kong*
"The March Hare and the Saffron Monkey: Variations on the Theme of Sacrifice in Eliot's Poetry and Plays"

In Eliot's poetry and plays, the theme of sacrifice is a remarkably pervasive one. From the early poem "The Little Passion / From 'An Agony in the Garret'" where Eliot writes of street lights that lead to "some inevitable cross," to the controversial death of Celia in *The Cocktail Party*, Eliot repeatedly wrestles with the issue of sacrifice. Murder in the Cathedral is one culmination of such efforts, as Becket, being a true martyr, willingly surrenders himself to the design of God. In this play, Eliot accomplishes the quest for "the inevitable cross" begun in his early years.

Yet a study of Eliot's early poems included in *Inventions of the March Hare* reveals that there is another aspect of the struggle. There is a strong sense of the fear and awareness of the pain of sacrifice and martyrdom. The fear is often associated with the fear of women. It is also reinforced by Eliot's skepticism, as Eliot knows very well Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, where all sacrificial rites, including the crucifixion of Christ, are seen as mere superstitions.

The strain of fear and skepticism resurfaces in The Cocktail Party, where the distancing strategy used by the writer is accompanied by a suggestion of brutality in Celia's manner of death. But just as Celia's crucifixion helps to highlight the emptiness of the life of the partygoers, the pain and fear in Eliot's treatment of sacrifice help to make the martyrdom in *Murder in the Cathedral* deeply moving for the readers of his works.

David Chinitz, *Loyola University Chicago*
"In The Shadows: Some Songs behind *The Waste Land*"

This lecture-demonstration involving a number of popular songs connected with *The Waste Land* focused on several of the songs to which Eliot alludes on the deleted first page of the poem's manuscript. While these tunes do not appear in the familiar, published form of the poem, they contributed

to its genesis and, I argued, left important traces in its final version. In addition to introducing the individual songs and discussing their origins, their cultural context, and their place in *The Waste Land*, I traced a particular thread through a number of them that reveals a significant pattern in Eliot's selection of popular tunes: repeated references in the lyrics to romantic assignations invited or held "in the shadows." This popular motif runs into and through much of Eliot's poetry, where it is always tainted with failure and regret. The shadows in Eliot's poetry, I suggested, are a purposeful distortion of a topos drawn most immediately from popular culture.

The "shadow" in *The Hollow Men* that falls "Between the emotion / And the response / ... Between the desire / And the spasm" has plenty of company in Eliot's work. Much earlier, the offensive waiter in "Dans le Restaurant" recalls his sexual awakening with a young girl with whom he came in under a tree from the rain. He gives her flowers, but the rendezvous is spoiled, in this case, by the arrival of a large dog. The girl reappears in all her wetness and vitality as the "hyacinth girl" in *The Waste Land*, where she is followed shortly by the interfering dog. As Eliot's deleted allusions to popular songs like "My Evaline" and "By the Watermelon Vine" hint, these poetic situations are a deliberate inversion of the innocent, happy trysts in the sheltering shadows that are common in turn-of-the-century popular song. Other allusions in and related to the *Waste Land* manuscript invoke additional popular lyrics concerning similar amorous meetings in the shadows—suggesting a quite different provenance than is usually acknowledged for the famous invitation to "Come in under the shadow of this red rock." The assignation songs, in effect, were to have introduced and highlighted *The Waste Land's* central conjunction of memory and desire.

Again, this presentation was a lecture-demonstration in which I spoke about the songs in question and their function in *The Waste Land*, and also accompanied singer Cate Ramsden, who performed the songs.

Nancy D. Hargrove, *Missisippi State University*
"T.S. Eliot and Popular Entertainment in Paris, 1910-1911: Melodramas, Cafés-Artistiques, Dance-Halls, and Cinema"

When Eliot spent the academic year 1910-1911 in Paris, he surely took advantage of being far from the watchful eye of his mother and in a less restrictive environment than those of St. Louis and Boston to indulge his love of popular entertainment by frequenting its famous (or infamous) lowbrow forms of this genre. Indeed, I suggest that, despite the absence of hard evidence, he owes a great deal to the Parisian as well as the long-acknowledged British and American venues, although there has been little exploration of this French influence in Eliot scholarship. This paper focused on four types of popular entertainment—melodramas, cafés-artistiques, dance-halls, and cinema—and indicated ways in which their influence seems to be reflected in his works.

Melodramas, which were musical pieces featuring dancing and spectacle similar to today's Broadway shows, were very popular at the time, and just after Eliot's arrival in Paris he may have gone to see the amusing "Arsène Lupin Contre Herlock Sholmès," a detective play which may have appealed to him because of his love of detective fiction, especially that involving Sherlock Holmes. Cafés-artistiques, featuring songs, skits, and revues filled with caustic wit and satire and frequented by artists and intellectuals, would have been a particularly apt venue for the young Eliot, while his well-known love of dancing would no doubt have drawn him to Parisian dance-halls, in which the clientele performed such daring dances as the Grizzly Bear. Finally, the newest form of popular entertainment, the cinema, could be viewed in several establishments offering a variety of entertainments.

Eliot seems to have viewed early cinema, which at the time focused on spectacular current events, sports, and dances, for his adaptation of cinematic techniques in *The Waste Land* in particular suggests an interest in and knowledge of cinema.

The contributions of this magical, dazzling world of popular entertainment are far-reaching and add to our understanding of how Eliot incorporated into his theoretical views and his works materials drawn not only from the most intellectual and esoteric sources but also from the most frivolous and ordinary ones.

Rev. Andrew Hawthorne, *University of London*
"He Do the Hegel in Different Voices: Hegelian Philosophy and the Work of T. S. Eliot"

It has long been seen that Eliot's early poetry was influenced by F. H. Bradley. But another strand of Idealism, that of Hegel, is also present in Eliot's work and has gone unrecognised. (This may be because of Eliot's own attitude to Hegel, whose work he dismissed as "grotesque".) In 1911 Eliot annotated a copy of Sibree's translation of Hegel's *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*. By an examination of these notes, and other Hegel texts, it can be demonstrated that Eliot adopted ideas from Hegel, and these emerge in later work.

Eliot's Hegelianism appears to be of two kinds. The first occurs when he openly uses Hegelian words, phrases and arguments, but without acknowledging sources ("mature poets steal"!). This "open" Hegelianism emerges with *For Lancelot Andrewes*. In *Nicolo Machiavelli*, Eliot reproduces Hegelian ideas, as with the phrase "[Machiavelli's] attitude is that of a statesman, and is as noble as that of any statesman", which is from *On the German Constitution*. (It

is only by comparing Hegel and Eliot on Machiavelli that Eliot's eccentric view makes any sense.) Eliot's later poetry has many Hegelian references. *Burnt Norton's* "being and unbeing," *East Coker's* "living with the living seasons," *The Dry Salvages'* "chthonic powers" and *Little Gidding's* "history is now and England" are Hegelian in origin.

The second kind of Hegelianism we encounter is what we might term "hidden"—there are Hegelian ideas but no terminology. For example the concepts of idea, mind, and tradition are common to both authors. Eliot's Tradition, and "mind of Europe," can be likened to Hegel's concept of the World Mind, unfolding throughout history. And it was *The Idea of a Christian Society* that Eliot chose to consider, using "idea" in a way that marks him as an Idealist.

My studies have concentrated on this 1939 book. Many of Eliot's key points are Hegelian. For example, both authors conceive an organic society. Eliot saw society made of "small and mostly self-contained group[s] attached to the soil"; Hegel's "has its resources in the natural products of the soil which it cultivates." Society is also rational—in Hegel, the State embodies reason; in Eliot, it is based on Christian doctrine. Hegel conceived a system which was hierarchical—individuals were members of families, then Corporations (roughly a trade guild, but much broader), and this process "educated" a minority of its members for full State citizenship. Eliot's structure is similar, with parishes corresponding to Corporations and "the Community of Christians" at the pinnacle. Neither author has any time for democracy; both believed in the religious basis for society; religious equality is espoused by each but actually denied in their systems.

What do we learn from this? We may discover a new source for Eliot's key ideas. We can also see how Eliot's mind uses authors whom he encountered in his early years, while apparently rejecting them. It is my argument that the Idealist philosophy he studied in his student days remained an influence throughout his life.

David Huisman, *Grand Valley State University*
"'Who Goes There?': Hypothermic Hallucination or Delusional Daemon on the Journey to Stromness?"

The recent surge of interest in Sir Ernest Shackleton's nearly disastrous Endurance expedition to Antarctica (1914-16) has brought to popular attention Shackleton's account of crossing South Georgia Island to safety at Stromness, and to T. S. Eliot's use of the account in the Emmaus section of Part V of *The Waste Land*: "Who is the third who walks always beside you?" etc. In his note to line 360, Eliot says that "the following lines were stimulated by the account of one of the Antarctic expeditions (I forget which, but I think one of Shackleton's): it was related that the party of explorers, at the extremity of their strength, had the constant delusion that there was one more member than could actually be counted." Eliot scholarship has largely ignored or glanced skeptically at Eliot's allusion, regarding it as, at best, an "irrelevance" and "certainly not necessary" (F. R. Leavis), or as not cogent, "fit[ting] Eliot's stated interpretation better than the poetry fits it" (Grover Smith).

That Eliot was absorbed in the heroic age of Antarctic exploration is evident in both pre- and post-1922 writings. In "Goldfish: Essence of Summer Magazines" (1910), he referred to "the news from either Pole." In his 1927 essay on Wilkie Collins and Charles Dickens, he commented on their collaborative melodrama about the lost Franklin expedition to the Northwest Passage, *The Frozen Deep*. From Dickens's verse Prologue he borrowed a key line (363) of the Emmaus/Shackleton passage. And in 1929, his BBC talk on "Elizabethan Travellers' Tales" praised Scott's modern account of the heroic death of Titus Oates, who walked away from the doomed polar party into British mythology—an episode probably known by Eliot in 1918-19, when his Southall Tutorial Class included a lecture on Elizabethan travel literature.

Moreover, the cancelled portion of "Death by Water" depicted a Gloucester schooner's fatal encounter with ice. This section was inspired, on the one hand, by Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, with its literary precursors of Shackleton's mysterious "fourth person"—the South Polar Spirit and its fellow daemons—and, on the other, by one of Eliot's most frequently cited passages from Dante, Canto 26 of the *Inferno*, in which the shade of Ulysses recounts the sinking of his ship by the will of God: "as pleased Another." When Eliot regretfully (and, as he come to see, unwisely) yielded to Pound's insistence that the Grand Banks voyage be cut, a vital link with Part V was lost: Eliot's fusion of Dante's "Another" and "another one walking beside you" in the Shackleton-inspired Emmaus passage.

Thus truncated, the Phlebas lyric might well be read as an "epitaph" and the hooded figure of line 363 as "a set of bones," as in a Buddhist poem (Smith). But seen in their original relation they are parts of a complex of allusions to arctic and Antarctic disasters at sea, some of which are survived—most pointedly by the historical Shackleton and his entire crew. Shackleton's *South*, containing the famous "fourth person" incident, was published in late 1919, just two years before Eliot composed Part V in Lausanne in a trance-like moment of inspiration which accompanied his "aboulie"—"a temporary crystallization of the mind" similar to that of mystical illumination (as he later, in his Pascal essay, recalled experiencing in his illness).

When seen against this background, Eliot's characterization of the Shackleton party's strange experience as a "constant delusion," rather than being dismissive, is of a piece with his discussion of hallucination in his dissertation, where he insists that an hallucination is "a sphere of reality, . . . a whole world of feeling . . . objectified." The hallucination

of a daemon "wrapt in a brown mantle, hooded" (altered from Dickens's "wrapp'd in mantles of eternal snow") was thus employed by Eliot to figure forth the epiphany of the resurrected Christ to the travelers on the road to Emmaus, a passage which looks forward to "the silent sister veiled in white and blue" of *Ash Wednesday*

> Who moved among the others as they walked,
> Who then made strong the fountains and made
> fresh the springs.

Aaron Jaffe, *Indiana University*
"'Worth Introducing': T.S. Eliot's Prefaces and the Gender Politics of Modernist Promotion"

When T.S. Eliot accepted the Dial Prize, the official announcement noted, among other more solid achievements, his literary altruism, his so-called "service to Letters." Eliot did not rest on these laurels. In fact, when it came to one particular kind of *service to Letters*, prefacing books by other writers, he was among the most prolific modernists. Between 1924 and 1965, the poet whose entire corpus consists of less than four thousand lines of verse published almost fifty introductions, prefaces, forwards, critical notes, and similar documents, thereby interposing his name into the pages of works by almost fifty other writers, onto the spines of their books, and into their bibliographic records. Speaking quantitatively, Eliot's abundant preface writing after *The Waste Land* contrasts sharply with his prudently scarce poetic output. The latter follows, at least in part, from an archly high modernist preoccupation with undersupply, stoking demand by under-stocking the literary market, but what should we make of the former? Eliot prefaces, it seems, remained in high demand *despite* his willingness to supply them for a copious and eclectic assortment of causes, texts, and authors—including his mother Charlotte Eliot's closet drama, *Savonarola* (1926), Kai Friis Møller's *En Engelsk Bog* (1948), and Stanislaus Joyce's *My Brother's Keeper* (1958). The plenitude of these labors suggests that, unlike his solidly "literary" work, the value of an Eliot introduction drew on sources other than its intrinsic potential for scarcity or difficulty. Simply put, while the preface was certainly another vehicle for literary reputation, it was never a means to secure one—at least, not for Eliot. Affixed at one time or another to works by Ezra Pound, Djuna Barnes, Marianne Moore, James Joyce, Wyndham Lewis, Christopher Isherwood, G. Wilson Knight, and David Jones, to name some of the contemporaries and near contemporaries Eliot introduced, Eliot prefaces were prized assets, partly prized for the highbrow cachet of Eliot's name, partly prized for his specific knack for credible prologizing, for his ability to make obvious propaganda seem suitably critical and disinterested.

As a matter of course, modernist prefaces and introductions link collaborative working relationships between modernist authors (or intimations of collaboration, at any rate) to the documentary transmission of literary work. Unlike the apocryphal stories originating in private narratives, conversation, letters, and memoirs, which only become public *after* the figures involved became well-known, prefaces and introductions always already re-make working relationships as public domain. To complicate matters further, as numerous readers and critics have observed, the work of modernist collaboration and promotion tends to be gendered feminine. These points lead to the broader question addressed by my paper: Do female modernists get prefaced any differently from male modernists? The passive construction is intentional, for my hypothesis is that literary reputation is in the introducing rather than in the being introduced. Introducing, particularly when it involves modernist contemporaries, reflexively subordinates literary reputations. Before a book is even opened, the mere presence of an introduction by another author imputes a working relationship, one which hierarchizes comparative stature. With an introduction, another author sets up shop in the book's front-matter, effectively the default position of framing and enunciation. What is the pretext for the introduction? Is it a service to letters or a service to something less disinterested? In either case, the questions are posed by the introducer not the introduced.

It is a critical commonplace that mechanisms of modernist promotion were not particularly kind to the reputations of modernist women. Yet, we find Eliot—the very archetype of male modernist success—actively, and indeed textually, engaged in the promotion of literary careers of two women modernists, namely Marianne Moore and Djuna Barnes. Considering the entire corpus of Eliot's preface writing activities—with particular emphasis on his prefaces for Moore's *Selected Poems* (1935) and Barnes's *Nightwood* (1937)—my paper proposes that we may better understand the gender politics of modernist reputation and promotion by examining the precarious rhetorical and ontological positioning of the prefaced. The capacity of modernists like Eliot to frame work against contemporaries—a scenario documented above all in modernist preface writing—calls for a revised interpretation of the gendering of literary collaboration in modernist idioms.

Rebecca Sutton Koeser, *Emory University*
"Nonlinearity and *Four Quartets*"

T. S. Eliot once wrote of *Four Quartets* that "my ideal reader would read the poem spatially." The context and tone of this statement suggest that Eliot considered the existence of such an ideal reader unlikely, if not impossible; and it is very probable that during his life time, it was. To read something spatially, one must of necessity read it nonlinearly,

a task that may be possible only for denizens of the electronic age and those accustomed to hypertext.

Media theory is a natural place to turn when considering how to read a work that demands to be read spatially or nonlinearly. The technology that we use to convey and store our communication has an immense effect on societies and individuals, as Marshall McLuhan and Walter Ong convincingly argue with respect to print, manuscript, and oral cultures. Another vast technological shift began in the twentieth century, and T. S. Eliot's work displays his sensitivity to those changes. Juan Suárez documents Eliot's mimicry of the technologies of radio and gramophone throughout *The Waste Land* in "T. S. Eliot's 'The Waste Land,' the Gramophone, and the Modernist Discourse Network" (2001). In addition, the auditory elements evident throughout Eliot's oeuvre may well be an attempt to reclaim the sensory qualities that poetry lost to newer technologies, as Friedrich Kittler claims. What is distinct about *Four Quartets* is that Eliot relies not only on the sound, but also on the structure of music; here we see a more complicated, sophisticated, and subtle interaction with technological changes.

Where media theory impinges on electronic technologies and nonlinearity, it seems natural to turn to other fields that can give us a framework and vocabulary, specifically to the burgeoning field of nonlinear physics. Included among the other areas of nonlinear physics is the subfield of pattern formation, and we can borrow mathematical ideas about the growth of complicated patterns to understand the patterns at work in *Four Quartets*, patterns that are larger and more complicated than may seem obvious. Many scholars have noted the importance of pattern in *Four Quartets*, and have traced out the many patterns at play here. What seems most significant is that the poem itself enacts what it describes: "the knowledge imposes a pattern, and falsifies, / For the pattern is new in every moment" (*East Coker*).

Each of the quartets works as a series of five "movements" (based upon musical structure); there are resonances between the beginning and ending of each quartet, and the same sections of different quartets (for instance, the Tube stations and railway in section three of *Burnt Norton*, *East Coker*, and *The Dry Salvages*, or the metapoetics of the final section of all four), but the poet is not afraid to bend, or even break, this apparent pattern. At a much finer level of detail, there are words and phrases that echo and resound throughout the poem, like musical motifs which arise when least expected, and these make up yet another part of the complicated, multi-level pattern of *Four Quartets* that unfolds as the poem itself does.

Alexandra Leader, *Princeton University*
"A Duet of Contrary Ends: T.S. Eliot's *Four Quartets* and Pablo Neruda's *Alturas de Macchu Picchu*"

The geographical distance separating Eliot and Neruda during their sequential composition of *Four Quartets* and *Alturas de Macchu Picchu* fails to diminish the poets' lyrical communion, consummated in a poetry borne of similar biographical circumstances and founded upon shared ideas in a unified form. Both poets, inspired by a personal pilgrimage, compose symbolic narratives that trace the conceptual search for a consciousness of timeless perception. *Four Quartets* and *Alturas de Macchu Picchu* describe a profound confrontation with history. Through the rhythms of personal and collective memory — the former with respect to T.S. Eliot's poetry and the latter with respect to that of Pablo Neruda — the poets pursue the transcendence of temporal consciousness and are met with the gathering of past and present in a timeless, eternally present moment. Structurally, the journeys are narrated within analogous poetic landscapes, revealing similar spatial orientation and composed of repeated cycles of like imagery.

However, while Eliot and Neruda use a similar poetic form and system of imagery to communicate the possibility of the transcendence of time and the process of movement that constitutes each poet's encounter with timelessness, their ideal journeys through consciousness reflect powerful distinctions.

In a purely conceptual sense, Neruda's desire to recover the timeless passage that he recalls from an early memory mirrors Eliot's endeavor to return to the "first world" of his consciousness. However, the *nature* of such a recovery for each poet is contrary to that of the other. Neruda seeks the eternal current of man's existence in order to *escape* and overcome the personal isolation of utter temporality, while Eliot's attainment of an eternal present is contingent upon strictly individual contemplation and memory, and, more importantly, is based on the desertion of the "world of fancy" in order to *enter* the "world of perpetual solitude." Neruda's vision of timeless bliss is predicated on a recovery of a sense of human community, while Eliot's is formed by a view of the timeless rapture of his permanent isolation from community. This descrepancy between the nature of the quests undertaken by Eliot and Neruda, one more personally-oriented than the other, is immediately made evident and proves to become the pivotal grounding for the distinctly different meanings of discovery understood by the poets in the culmination of each work.

Ultimately, T.S. Eliot narrates an intensely personal journey in *Four Quartets*. Eliot's pilgrimage is one of contemplative spirituality, wholly non-sensual despite its symbolic exploration of a physical place in time. In a moment of timeless consciousness, derived from the union of man and divine light and reached through personal spirituality, Eliot illuminates his own place in a particular history, and hence his connection to other inward-looking individuals of the past. Neruda's mission, however, is an active journey of sensual discovery in the site of a collective pre-history.

In a moment of transcendent consciousness, the union of past and present is consummated through the poet as Neruda restores the muted speech of time past with his own voice. Eliot's is an intellectually spiritual quest, concerned with the past and its consequence for his own present moment, while Neruda's journey is a sensual, secular experience, concerned with the movement of a unified past and present into the future.

The poems present similar methods of encountering timelessness, through kindred imagery. However, Eliot seeks a meditative "stillness" in which to contemplate personal experience and find his own place in time while Neruda contemplates the experience of a Latin American people and then actively strives to break the silence of its forgotten collective history. Eliot, at most, speaks *to* the past, while Neruda speaks *for* it. Neruda essentially composes a textual variation on the formal journey of *Four Quartets*, replacing Eliot's acutely personal lyric with the intention of an ardently collective pronunciation.

Kinereth Meyer, *Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel*
"The Hermeneutical Task: Reading Eliot's Post-Conversion Poetry"

My point of departure in this paper is Hans-Georg Gadamer's conception of how "the hermeneutical task becomes of itself a questioning of things:..." In calling for the "hermeneutically trained consciousness" to be sensitive to textual alterity, Gadamer rejects the possibility of either "neutrality" or "the extinction of one's own self." The text "can present itself in all its otherness," argues Gadamer, only when one "foregrounds" one's own position, when one remains "aware of one's own bias."

The aim of this paper is to examine the positive contributions of alterity—how cultural distance functions as a generative impetus in interpretation. T.S. Eliot's post-conversion poetry provides my experimental field: I explore what a reading of this poetry can contribute to a Jewish reader who resists, indeed rejects, its theological premises. Conversely, and at the same time, I explore how traditional Jewish modes of reading may contribute to an understanding of Christian religious poetry. According to Eliot, in reading poetry that is "other," the reader practices a "systole and diastole" of "approach and withdrawal" or "identification and distinction."

"A Song for Simeon" (1928) was written shortly after Eliot's conversion. Usually placed within a clear referential framework (the poet's recent conversion, the New Testament source), the poem is read as a rather straightforward mimetic account. Read through the praxis of rabbinic hermeneutics, however, one discovers that "A Song for Simeon" gradually undermines its own referentiality; instead of opening itself to recovery by the reader, the poem engages the reader in the act of interpretation, which itself becomes a spiritual exercise. Beneath the incarnational aesthetics at work in Eliot's post-conversion poetry (most strikingly in "Ash Wednesday"), a still vibrant but what Judith Lupton calls a "radically repressed" hermeneutic can be discerned. Dialogical, polysemous, and interactive, this hermeneutic denies a linguistics of adequation, insisting on the open-endedness of all interpretation. In a performative textual tradition of this kind, the function of interpretation is not to force the text to yield its definitive meaning, but to engage the reader's attention to ultimate questions.

Finally, a reading of "A Song for Simeon" may also provide some understanding of the negative references to Jews in Eliot's poetry and prose, which, I argue, are integrally connected to the anxiety he experiences (especially in the post-conversion poetry) regarding "the intolerable wrestle/ With words and meanings."

Russell Elliott Murphy, *University of Arkansas at Little Rock*
"Eliot in the Middle: Surviving Critical Theory"

If there has been a virtually cataclysmic shift in literary studies, it is a shift from treating a literature text as one that speaks directly to each of us about experiences and issues thought of as common to our humanity, to treating any text, including the literature text, as one that speaks about us in the abstracts of categorical rather than particular motivations and that speaks about itself not in the traditionally direct way of authorial intention and generic conventions but by the indirection of unconscious linguistic and other cultural clues related to class, gender, economics, and politics, all elements related to the maintenance and wielding of power and hierarchy.

Some of the blame for this effort to codify literary studies into the terminological superstructure called critical theory has to be laid on T.S. Eliot. In such a still remarkable essay as "Tradition and the Individual Talent," for example, wherein virtually every other sentence summarizes some critical touchstone that, at the very least, provokes one into thought if not necessarily agreement, the elegance of the observations rests in their quality of a pragmatic common sense that overturns accepted wisdom in a pen stroke. His coinages—the objective correlative, the dissociation of sensibility — gave impetus as well to the idea that even applied, practical criticism required more than just a nod to the principles with which our applications were being made.

Ultimately, however, it is the kind of poetry which Eliot wrote that allows us to see a virtually direct route from Eliot to the present state of literary criticism, with its emphasis upon matters external to both the text and to aesthetic experience. Beginning with *Prufrock*, Eliot virtually invented

intertextuality, compelling subsequent generations of readers and critics to account for what by now is obvious—that the literary experience does not, because it cannot, exist in a cultural vacuum. It was, indeed, Eliot's kind of poetry that made the text centrifugal, sending both the casual and the professional reader off into the world of information beyond the text, and ultimately to the extraliterary entirely, in the quest for meaning and coherence.

While there may be nothing new in arguing that the Modernist text precipitated our current devotion to theory, we must nevertheless recognize that Eliot also has provided us with the necessary tethers for keeping the beast of criticism for criticism's sake at bay. What is missing from much of the critical landscape nowadays is its ability to describe, let alone account for, the experience of poetry, of the poem qua poetry.

Eliot is there to warn us that, unlike poetry, criticism is not autotelic; that indeed its sole purpose is to serve, and define, the cause of poetry, not to supplant it. That criticism is both primarily and ultimately, for him, a means of setting the record straight, whereas now we seem to be far more interested in the record only. He would tell us that a poem can communicate before it is understood; that the best audience for poetry is one that can neither read nor write; that this yen for discovering context and meaning in poetry is rather like the bit of meat the burglar puts out for the watchdog, distracting us so that the poem might then be able to do its real work upon us.

Just what is this real work the poem might do, is the question that should shape all criticism, yet that kind of a critical apparatus is nowhere to be found amidst the potpourri of approaches available to us now. It is however a view of criticism, and a criticism of criticism, toward which T.S. Eliot provided guidance virtually his entire critical career. The very careful balance between the vital past and the living present, between the practice and the principle, between the cultural and the individual, between the whole and the part, between common sense and wonder, all of which he maintained throughout; the proper balancing of the personal taste with the judgments of tradition, of a knowledge of conventions with an intuition made wholly accessible to the genuinely novel, the respect, lastly, for humane values, lasting values — these hallmarks of his critical technique should certainly be the foundation of any critical technique, whatever its aims or agenda.

Lee Oser, *College of the Holy Cross*
"Absurdity and Ethics in the Early Eliot"

The question I ask in the paper is this: what can Laforgue and Schopenhauer tell us about Eliot's ethical formation as poet?

Laforgue's negative example, his plangent lack of what he wanted most, takes dramatic shape in his self-mocking clowns and marionettes. Laforgue was tubercular, so was his wife, and the disease had claimed his mother when he was very young. He follows Schopenhauer in seeing the body as a pathetic mechanism, and his lack of a healthy body correlates to the moral disorder and unabated suffering that he experiences.

Laforgue was a charming, sophisticated, erotic man, yet for Eliot he lacked a philosophy to help direct the current of his feeling along a humane and emotionally satisfying course. Eliot came to see Laforgue as failing to make that culminating transition, from sexual love to spiritual love, that Dante makes in the thirtieth Canto of the *Purgatorio*, when he sees Beatrice and says, *Conosco i segni dell'antica fiamma.*

Only to a certain point, then, does Eliot imitate Laforgue by seeing the body as a joke. With the emergence of the robust and muscular Sweeney, Eliot takes us in a direction uncharted by Laforgue. With the Sweeney poems, "Whispers of Immortality," and the thematic appearance of Arnaut Daniel in Eliot's work, we can sense the resolve of a highly intellectual writer to make moral sense of the primitivism that lives in our sexual nature. The times were not propitious for such an attempt.

Jayme Stayer, *Texas A&M University-Commerce*
"Eliot's 'A Dedication to My Wife' and the Rhetoric of Exclusion"

In this paper, I draw an analogy between Eliot's rejection of former intimates—such as Vivien Eliot, Emily Hale, Mary Trevelyan, and John Hayward—and his rejection of his poetry audience in the two versions of his poem to Valerie: "To My Wife," (1959), revised and included in *Collected Poems* (1963) as "A Dedication to My Wife." Attempting a magnanimous love poem that mobilizes a rhetoric of intimacy addressed to his wife, Eliot ends up indulging a rhetoric of exclusion addressed to the audience. In what is admittedly a minor work, I show that the failures of the poem are not merely technical or aesthetic in nature. The lackluster quality of the post-*Quartets* poetry—including "A Dedication"—is often ascribed to various causes: Eliot's waning interest in the insular nature of poetry conflicted with his increased attention to the public forum of drama; his poetic resolution of spiritual turmoil made that genre irrelevant to his artistic development; his happy second marriage cut off the wellspring of anguish which fed much of his great poetry, etc. But I argue something quite different, namely, that the deficiencies of this poem reveal that Eliot's late, evolving relationship to his poetry audience becomes one of rejection and even scorn.

The claim that Eliot was a snob to his readers has been followed up in some detail by such sympathetic critics as

Lyndall Gordon, who has argued that Eliot's plays—with the exception of *Murder in the Cathedral*—betray condescension towards the comprehension-level and values of its audience. Likewise, less sympathetic critics such as Kenneth Asher have argued that all of Eliot's work, including the poetry, reveals a lack of humanistic warmth for its audience. I do not hold the extremes of this position, but I do apply it as a hypothesis to this particular poem. My claim is that Eliot is not merely unintentionally alienating his audience, but making the irrevocable gesture to former intimates (his poetry readers) that they are not wanted inside the rose garden where the poet and wife are quite content by themselves; a rose garden that is, according to a smug and unromantic narrator, "ours and ours only."

I have three subsidiary arguments, each one devoted to a close rhetorical analysis of 1) how the poem fails at evoking intimacy by foolishly trying to polemically assert it; 2) how the poem fails to evoke a poetically convincing portrait of happiness; and 3) how the poem fails—embarrassingly so—at the task of evoking post-coital bliss: with a line so disastrously bad ("Of lovers whose bodies smell of each other") that Eliot suppressed it through ellipses in the 1959 version. My main argument that the poem is addressed less to the "wife" than to the reader—in order to dismiss him/her as unnecessary—is then buttressed with evidence from the flatly propositional endings of both versions.

Ultimately, it is a sad poem for its readers. We are the ones who, along with Eliot, have followed his trail of flowers: the solipsistic madness of the shaken geranium, the desolation of the hyacinth garden, the abdication of opportunity in Burnt Norton's rose garden, and the vision of the rose's promise in *Little Gidding*. Like Vivienne, Hale, Trevelyan, and Hayward, now we know what it's like to be told we have no business in the rose garden of Eliot's happiness.

For all matters regarding the content of the T.S. Eliot Society Newsletter, please contact the Vice-President and editor of the Newsletter:

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

Printing of the *T. S. Eliot Society Newsletter* is sponsored by Grand Valley State University. Production and Design by Ginny Klingenberg.

FOR HELP WITH SOCIETY MATTERS

To submit papers for any reading session sponsored by the Society, or to make suggestions or inquiries regarding the annual meeting or other Society activities, please contact the President:

Shyamal Bagchee
Department of English, University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, CANADA T6G 2E5
PH. (780) 492-3258 FAX: (780) 492-8142
email: shyamal.bagchee@ualberta.ca

To pay dues, inquire about membership, or report a change of address, please contact the Treasurer:

William Charron
709 S. Skinker, #401, St. Louis, MO 63105
Ph: (314) 863-6550;
email: CHARROWC@SLU.EDU

Persons having business with the Secretary are advised to contact him directly:

David Huisman
1134 Giddings SE, Grand Rapids, MI 49506
Ph: (616) 452-0478

T.S. ELIOT SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP LIST
December 2002

Patrons
Rev. Andrew J. Abraham
William Blissett
Charles Crispin
Karen Crispin
Julius M. Cruse, MD
Anthony Fathman, MD
Melanie Fathman
Nancy Hargrove
William Harmon
James Olney
Sandra Perkins
Ronald Schuchard
Isao S. Uemichi
Melinda A. Wynn

Supporting
Shyamal Bagchee
Sumana Sen-Bagchee
Joseph C. Baillargeon
Jewel Spears Brooker
William Burke
Elisabeth Däumer
John Karel
Elizabeth Konnyu
Richard G. Landini
Gail McDonald
Gary L. McDowell
Jeanne Morrel-Franklin
Virginia B. Phelan
Harold W. Shipton
D. Barbara Smith
Michael Smythe
Charles W. Spurgeon
Leon Surette
Mrs. Sakiyo Yamanaka

Regular
Elise B. Aasgaard
Richard Badenhausen
John Boaz
Mildred Boaz
Ann P. Brady
Frank Braio
Brad Bucknell
Chris Buttram
Stefano Maria Casella
Donna Charron
William Charron
Ching, Yeut May
David Chinitz
John Xiros Cooper
Dianne R. Costanzo
Michael Coyle
Virginia Ottley Craighill
Lois A. Cuddy
Jan Curtis
Vinni Marie D'Ambrosio
Thomas Danforth
Clifford Davidson
Brian Dennison
Anne Dewey
Rick K. Dirck
Jacqueline C. DuPont
Christopher Durer
Susan F. Ehrlich
Helen Emmitt
Charles Ernst
Earl Finden
Robert F. Fleissner
Diane J. Forbes
Dr. Armin Paul Frank
Leonore Gerstein
Teresa Gibert
Carol Gilbertson
Nancy Goldfarb
Theodora Rapp Graham
Ransom Griffin III
George G. Harper, Jr.
Warren M. Harris
Harvard College Library
Rev. Andrew Hawthorne
Matthew Hofer
Rev. Earl K. Holt III
Marilyn Holt
David Huisman
Jan Jacobi
Yutaka Koshizawa
Ken Kramer
Rev. Laurence Kriegshauser, OSB
Jenny Ledeen
Literary Classics of the United States
Benjamin G. Lockerd, Jr.
Dominic Manganiello
Rex McGuinn
Shannon McRae
Kinereth Meyer
Anthony R. Moore
Tatsuo Murata
Russell E. Murphy
Atsushi Nakamura
Jonathan Nauman
Keiji Notani
Francis M. Oates
Thomas P. O'Donnell
Lee Oser
David Partenheimer
Jane E. Patrick
R. McNaughton Phillips
Richard J. Pinkowski, Jr.
Charles W. Pollard
Cyrena N. Pondrom
Joseph Preston
Patricia Preston
Peter Puchek
Paul Robichaud
William K. Runyeon, MD
F. Richard Seddon
Murray Sherman
Kathleen Shuken
Pronoti Sinha
Carol H. Smith
Denise J. Stankovics
Jayme C. Stayer
Michael R. Stevens
Ake Strandberg
Richard Sullivan
Rev. Shunichi Takayanagi, SJ
Rev. James Torrens, SJ
Sara van den Berg
Erwin Welsch
Irmgard Werngren
Robert M. West
Christopher Wilkins
George T. Wright
Glenn Patton Wright
Linda Wyman
John Zubizarreta

Student
Katey Kuhns Castellano
Keith Douchant
Mary Grabar
Will Gray
Aaron Jaffe
Marcia Karp
Rebecca Sutton Koeser
Alexandra Leader
Angela Monsam
Brian Quinn
Beth Ann Sweens
Randall J. Woods

Honorary
Mrs. T.S. Eliot
Donald Gallup
Robert Giroux
A.D. Moody
Andrew Osze
Christopher Ricks
Grover Smith
Marianne Thormählen
Leonard H. Unger

T.S. ELIOT SOCIETY

October 2002
Chris Buttram

SECOND PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL FOR SOCIETY'S TRIP TO ENGLAND
REVISED SLIGHTLY AFTER ANNUAL MEETING (SEE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRE)

The main purpose of this trip would be to visit three of the four sites related to *Four Quartets*, though the plan, in its tentative form, would allow also for other TSE activities.

When?
Early or mid-June, 2004.
Rationale:

The trip could not occur during the academic year, and it should not coincide with the height of the tourist season. In late May, some Society members may still have academic obligations; besides, there is a bank holiday on the last Monday in May.

Next June would be too soon, I think, so the following June would be more feasible.

Note: The International James Joyce Symposium will convene in Dublin, 12-19 June 2004. Any conflicts?

For how long?
5 days, excluding travel time to and from England.
Rationale:

Each of the three *Four Quartets* excursions will take one day. One day in London might be spent visiting various TSE sites, while another, less structured day in London might offer several optional TSE activities or a free day to do one's own thing. These five days would also accommodate a few conference sessions, a guest speaker, and a group dinner.

Of course, some members may want to extend their trips.

Note: Quite a few members have expressed interest in adding two days for those interested in further TSE activities.

Basic plan/ 1 week:
1. Travel day to England
2. Settle in London. TSE sites in London. Afternoon session. Evening meeting of Society.
3. Burnt Norton / Afternoon session in Chipping Campden.
4. Little Gidding / Afternoon session at Little Gidding.
5. East Coker / Afternoon session either at East Coker or in Yeovil
6. Free day in London. TSE activities, trips suggested. Afternoon session.
   Evening meeting of Society. Guest speaker.
7. Return travel day for those who are not staying abroad.

{For interested members, two more days may be added. Further sessions or session-like activities may be scheduled so that as many members as possible may receive financial support from their institutions.}

London as our base:

The least chaotic, least restrictive approach to the trip would be, I think, to base ourselves in London: the three *Four Quartets* trips would each be a day-trip from London. Moreover, in London are some fine opportunities for further TSE adventures. Moreover still, being based in London will offer convenience as we hold Society sessions and as we enjoy London in smaller groups.

Another consideration is that our guest speaker may find it relatively easy to get to London.

Question: Should we reserve a block of rooms at a hotel, or should we each find our own accommodations?

The latter would give more flexibility and freedom; the former would give more structure and convenience.

The latter may prove less expensive; the former may provide us readily with a conference room and dining room.

Day-trips to *Four Quartets* sites:

Unfortunately, no train will take us directly to any of these three sites. Although the train lines from London could take us to towns that lie quite close to the sites, the logistics of train travel to our destinations would present some problems. Renting vans to be driven by members would also prove rather troublesome. Therefore, the most feasible plan would be to charter a coach for each of the three traveling days. Does anyone know of a reliable company operating out of London, offering nice coaches, and charging reasonable prices?

The sequence of the day-trips: Tentative

I propose we start with Burnt Norton, then go to Little Gidding, and end with East Coker. However, some flexibility would be nice, for if we want to picnic on the grounds of Burnt Norton, then we want to make sure that we go there on a nice day. The coach company may very well be able to work with this flexibility of schedule.

More details on the *Four Quartets* sites:

1. **Burnt Norton**: As many of you know, access to Burnt Norton is limited.

Query: Are there members who know someone or something that could get us in? Some members at the annual meeting have provided some promising information in this regard, but any other members who may have connections or tips are encouraged to note such on the questionnaire.

It was from Chipping Campden that Eliot himself went to Burnt Norton, which is a couple miles outside of town. If we can get into Burnt Norton, wonderful (maybe we can picnic there), but if we cannot, we may want to get as close as we can, look around a bit, read the poem aloud, and then perhaps go to nearby Hidcote manor and gardens, which may give us some idea of how Burnt Norton looks, or once looked. Back in Chipping Campden, we would have an afternoon snack and hold a short session. Chipping Campden has places where we might do such things.

2. **Little Gidding**: Little Gidding is out of the way, but well worth the trouble.

At Little Gidding there is currently a working farm, a visitors' center, and the old church. After exploring the area and reading the poem in the church, we would have a light meal in the visitors' center, which—depending on our numbers—would be roomy enough to accommodate a session.

3. **East Coker**:

In East Coker we would of course visit the parish church were Eliot's ashes are interred. After reading the poem and paying our respects, we would hold a session either at East Coker or in Yeovil, where we might eat lunch.

Two days in London; frame of the three day-trips:

One day, the day before our *Four Quartets* trips, might entail a walking/Tube tour of TSE sites in London. For example, we would visit locations related to Eliot's life and places pertinent to *The Waste Land.* In the early evening, we would convene as a Society, welcome one another to London, and hold a session. Afterwards, members would make their own dinner arrangements.

The other London day, the day after our *Four Quartets* trips, would be a free day; besides an afternoon session, the only TSE activities planned before dinner would be merely suggested, supplemental things to do. For instance, some members might want to train over to Oxford, visit Merton College, and then look in on Garsington Manor. Others might want to travel south, to Rodmell, where TSE used to visit the Woolfs. Others still might want to take a Thames cruise. Activities such as these would be organized and offered, but some members may prefer simply to do their own things.

On our final evening together, we would convene for a dinner and a guest speaker. We would invite Mrs. Valerie Eliot to join us for dinner, but given her busy schedule, she may desire simply to join us for cocktails before dinner.

It makes sense that our guest speaker be someone from England, does it not? Any suggestions? (I myself was thinking that this would be a nice opportunity for meeting Craig Raine.)

If we are staying in one hotel together, this dinner and presentation may occur there. If, however, we are dispersed across London, we will need to decide where to hold this event, as well as the initial session during our first evening in London. Any ideas?

Some possible subjects for paper sessions:

Four Quartets, especially in relation to the places we will visit.

Eliot in England; Eliot and Englishness; Eliot's London.

Suggestions?

QUESTIONNAIRE (SLIGHTLY REVISED)
T.S. ELIOT SOCIETY: PLANNING THE TRIP TO ENGLAND

If you were not at the meeting, or if you were at the meeting and have not yet submitted this, please respond to the questions below after you have read the preliminary proposal. Then, if you would please, send the completed form by the end of 2002 to Chris Buttram, Department of English, Winona State University, Winona, MN 55987.

1. Are you interested in going on this trip?

NO YES, BUT ONLY VAGUELY YES, DEFINITELY

If you circled "no" above, there is no need for you to continue the questionnaire, but please still submit it. Thanks!

2. What would be the best time for you?

EARLY JUNE MID-JUNE OTHER (explain)

3. Should we get a block of rooms in one hotel in London, or should everyone get his or her own lodgings?

ONE HOTEL INDIVIDUALLY ARRANGED ACCOMMODATIONS

4. If we do stay in the same hotel, would you like to share your room with another member?

NO YES

5. Do you know of a good chartered-coach company operating out of London?

6. Would you like to spend two extra days with some members of the society who want to take additional excursions?

NO YES

7. Can you get us into Burnt Norton?

NO YES PERHAPS

8. During our TSE London day, what sorts of sites would you like the Society to visit? Circle all that apply.

BIOGRAPHICAL SITES *WASTE LAND* SITES OTHER (elaborate)

9. During our free day in London, what TSE activities would you like to have organized and offered?

10. If we do not find ourselves in one hotel, where might we have our two evening events in London?

11. To enhance funding opportunities for members, what session-like activities might we hold in addition to the formal sessions?

12. Who should be our guest speaker?

13. Would you like to participate in any of the readings of *Four Quartets*?

NO YES PERHAPS

14. What would be some apt subjects for our sessions?

15. Would you be willing to help plan the trip as it takes more specific form?

NO YES

16. Would you be bringing friends or family who would want to participate in the TSE events?

NO YES PERHAPS

17. Do you have a disability or special need of which the planners of the trip should be aware?

18. As for food, (circle any that are applicable)

I'LL EAT JUST ABOUT ANY FOOD, AS LONG AS IT'S UNTAINTED AND FAIRLY TASTY
I'M A VEGETARIAN
I'M A VEGAN
I HAVE FOOD ALLERGIES:
OTHER (e.g., religious regime):

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW, IF YOU SO DESIRE, TO ADDRESS ANY MATTERS NOT COVERED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE: