

Some Notes on Eliot's Conversion to Anglo-Catholicism

Naoko Morita

I

In November 1925 Eliot left the bank and joined the new publishing firm of Faber and Gwyer (later, in 1929, Faber and Faber) as a director at a much better salary. *The Criterion*, his own periodical, which he had started in October 1922, was well established and he was once again able to contribute to other journals regularly. In fact, between 1926 and 1928 he had written approximately fifty review-articles. From among them he selected eight essays for a new collection of prose which was published as *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* in November 1928 by Faber and Gwyer.

Several months before that, he had been preparing a new edition of *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (1920). He said in his preface to the 1928 edition of *The Sacred Wood* that "he had intended, when the time came to prepare a second edition of this book, to revise some of the essays." However, he had found the task impossible, and perhaps even undesirable. For he discovered that what had happened in his own mind, in eight years, was not so much a change or reversal of opinions, as an expansion or development of interests."¹ As a result, the essays in *The Sacred Wood* were reprinted unrevised. And several months later *For Lancelot Andrewes* appeared, and he made his position clear.

He stated in his preface to *For Lancelot Andrewes* that he wished to indicate certain lines of development, and to disassociate himself from certain conclusions which had been drawn in his volume of essays, *The Sacred Wood*. He declared his position: "The general point of view may be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion."² As this declaration of his self-definition indicated, what had happened in his mind was his conversion, and moreover it was not only literary and political, but religious. As for his classicism and royalism, Eliot's ardent readers in those days might have noticed, but his religious conversion was probably the least expected of the three. Above all, the way he made his acceptance of Anglo-Catholicism public was rather curt. He did not even attempt to make any explanations in his preface. In fact, Eliot's entry into the Church of England astonished many friends and readers, and for some it was almost scandalous and treasonable.

In this paper I am going to concentrate on Eliot's conversion to Anglo-Catholicism, to seek what brought Eliot to Christianity, and to investigate in

what way Eliot's conversion to Anglo-Catholicism was implicitly and explicitly reflected in *For Lancelot Andrewes*. For one thing, Stephen Spender gave me a clue in saying that "The change that his conversion brought about in his prose writing is apparent in *For Lancelot Andrewes*, volume of essays which show his interest in Christian Orthodoxy."³ For another, as early as 1935, F. O. Matthiessen stressed repeatedly Eliot's growth and he also pointed out that *For Lancelot Andrewes* (1928) had marked a different orientation from *Homage to John Dryden* (1924), Eliot's second volume of essays.⁴ It is important to note here that though *Homage to John Dryden* was published in 1924 all the three essays were written before the publication of *The Waste Land* (1922). It would be impossible to understand Eliot without taking into consideration his conversion to Anglo-Catholicism. It is an integral part of his intellectual and spiritual development.

II

First, we must consider Eliot's religious background. Eliot had been brought up as a Unitarian. His family were Unitarians. His paternal grandfather, William Greenleaf Eliot (1811-87) had graduated from the Harvard Divinity School in 1834, had gone to St. Louis and had established the first Unitarian Church there. Eliot said: "I never knew my grandfather: he died a year before my birth. But I was brought up to be very much aware of him: so much so, that as a child I thought of him as still head of the family.... The standard of conduct was that which my grandfather had set; our moral judgments, our decisions between duty and self-indulgence, were taken as if like Moses, he had brought down the tables of the Law, any deviation from which would be sinful.... I think it is a very good beginning for any child ... to be taught that personai and selfish aims should be subordinated to the general good which these Laws represent."⁵ He also said that his parents did not talk of good and evil, but of what was done and not done. He wrote later in "Baudelaire" that "So far as we are human, what we do must be either evil or good."⁶ In Gordon's words, as Eliot grew up, he had to face the most important of his grandfather's laws, the subordination of selfish interests to the good of Community and Church.⁷ By the time he entered Harvard in 1906 he had become completely indifferent to the Church. Eliot once wrote that he disliked "the intellectual and puritanical rationalism of his early environment."⁸

What was Unitarianism that Eliot disliked it so as to abandon it? In 1925 Eliot had written to Murry: "It seems to me that one must either ignore the Church, or reform it from within, or transcend it, but never attack it.... You see I happened to be brought up in the most 'liberal' of 'Christian creeds Unitarianism: I may therefore be excused for seeing the dangers what you propose, more clearly than I see the vices of what you attack. If one discards dogma, it should be for a more celestial garment, not for nakedness".⁹

American Unitarianism¹⁰ arose in the mid-eighteenth century in opposition to the old Puritanical conviction of man's innate sinfulness. It developed out of the

Congregational churches of eastern Massachusetts. In 1825, the American Unitarian Association was founded, with headquarters in Boston. There was a theological crisis about 1840. William E. Channing of Boston challenged the orthodox doctrine of the atonement and taught the loving fatherhood of God. Sparked by the "Divinity School Address" (1838) of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the Transcendentalist Movement, the so-called flowering of New England, shook American Unitarianism. It shattered rationalist, biblical Unitarianism and replaced it intuitional religion and social idealism. When unitarianism spread to the newly opened Middle West, its religious fundamentals changed to human aspiration and scientific truth, rather than Christianity and the Bible.

Thus in America there was a development from liberal Congregationalism to Channing's optimism, and on to Transcendentalism, to the Unitarianism of the Middle West, based on moral idealism rather than only upon the Bible, and then to humanism. A great change came in 19th century when Unitarians came to see God "not as First Cause prefixed to the scheme of things, but as Indwelling Life pervading it"; one result of this view is the Unitarian concept of humanism, which is agnostic about God and emphasizes the human condition and scientific progress. Unitarians vary from liberal-traditional to extreme modernist. However, generally speaking, all have inherited Protestant (Calvinist and Anglican) forms of worship.

Of the Christian sacraments, Baptism is usually practiced as a simple dedication of infants, and the Lord's Supper is celebrated by the more traditional Unitarians as a memorial. Preaching is especially important, and in some groups, a lecture is the dominant part of the meeting. Unitarians believe that God is One, but they deny the deity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. This statement is extremely important in relation to Eliot's religious conversion. That is, Unitarianism denied the Godhead of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. As a Unitarian Eliot had not been baptized in the name of the Trinity: "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In November 1926 Eliot wrote a letter to William Force Stead who was once an American consul, resigned from the consular service, was ordained in the Church of England, and was Chaplain at Worcester College, Oxford, and asked him if he could be "confirmed in the Church of England".¹¹ Stead had to explain to Eliot that it was a question of first receiving the Sacrament of Baptism. Finally Eliot said that he wanted "to be baptized into the one true fold of Christ."¹² Stead arranged for Eliot to be baptized in his own village of Finstock, in the Cotswolds in Oxfordshire.

On the afternoon of 29 June 1927, St. Peter's Day, the doors of the little village church at Finstock were firmly locked against idle spectators, for Eliot wished for absolute secrecy. Stead poured the water of regeneration over Eliot's head. The next morning Eliot was taken to the Bishop of Oxford, Thomas Banks Strong, at Cuddesdon. He had been Dean of Christ Church when Eliot had been a research student at Merton College, Oxford. The Bishop laid his hands on Eliot's head and said: "Defend, O Lord, this thy Servant with thy

heavenly grace, that he may continue thine for ever; and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come unto thy everlasting kingdom."¹³ Thus, Eliot was confirmed.

According to Sencourt,¹⁴ Eliot was asked by Unitarians in Massachusetts why he had left for the Anglo-Catholic Church, he replied that he had done nothing of the kind. From Unitarianism he lapsed into agnosticism, and out of agnosticism, found his way ... to the Catholic idea which he preferred in its Anglican form. He said another time that he was driven to belief by seeing agnosticism pushed to its limits by Bertrand Russell who, though a good friend, was never his guide as a metaphysician.

Thus we knew that Eliot was converted from Unitarianism via agnosticism to Anglo-Catholicism. Discussing Eliot's conversion, various expressions have been used such as Eliot's conversion to Christianity, Anglicanism, Anglo-Catholicism, and Eliot's entry into Church of England. Do all these terms have the same meaning? What is the relationship between Anglo-Catholicism and the Church of England?

The Anglican Communion,¹⁵ descendant of the Church of England, separated from the jurisdictional and doctrinal control of the papacy in the 16th century Reformation. It is united by a common loyalty to the archbishop of Canterbury in England as its titular leader and by an agreement with the doctrine and practices defined in The Book of Common Prayer, a 16th century liturgical book whose roots lie in the early history of the Christian Church in England.

The Anglican Communion is often said to be the middle way between Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. It asserts the importance of the apostolic succession of bishops and The Book of Common Prayer, nevertheless, allows a considerable degree of flexibility in most doctrinal and liturgical matters. Thus, within the communion there are several schools of thoughts and practice, including High Church, Anglo-Catholic, Low Church, Evangelical, and others. The various churches of the Anglican Communion are bound together by a common heritage and common doctrinal and liturgical concerns. The Church of England is the mother church of the Anglican communion, in which Anglo-Catholic is included together with High Church, Low Church, and so on.

The Church of England has had a long history. The early history of the Catholic Church in England was represented by three strains – Roman British, Celtic, and Roman. By the 16th century it was called the Church of England. However, during the Reformation, under the initial leadership of King Henry VIII, the Church of England broke with the pope, but not with the Catholic faith. After the death of Henry VIII, in 1547, reform and reversion to Roman Catholicism took place; Edward VI, his son, encouraged reform and after Edward died six years later, Mary, Edward's half-sister, restored relations with the papacy. When Mary died in 1558, Elizabeth I, once again, restored independence from Rome.

As for the essence of Anglicanism the Lambeth Conference of 1930 described the Anglican Communion as follows: "a fellowship within the One Holy Catholic

and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which uphold and propagate the ... faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer ... ; promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship. Thus the Anglican Communion holds to the Catholic faith as expounded by the Holy Scriptures and by the early Church Fathers. The sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion are held to be most important in the Anglican Communion.

III

Eliot once wrote of Charles Maurras as a kind of Virgil who had led him to the doors of the temple. Paul Elmer More who had been a close confidante of Eliot's, suggested that Charles Maurras had a central role in Eliot's conversion to Anglo-Catholicism. He wrote that "Sometime between *The Waste Land* and *For Lancelot Andrewes* Eliot underwent a kind of conversion, due largely I believe to the influence of Maurras and the Action Francaise."¹⁶ More was a theologian who had abandoned his family's Calvinism and embraced Anglo-Catholicism. They had corresponded with each other for more than nine years until More's death in 1937. More believed that Eliot's conversion had been profoundly affected by Charles Maurras and the Action Francaise.

It seems that Maurras had been extremely influential in Eliot's intellectual and spiritual development. Maurras was a poet, critic, and writer of philosophical fiction, and leader of the controversial French political movement, the Action Francaise. Eliot recalled later that he had purchased his copy of Maurras's *L'Avenir de l'Intelligence* when he was studying in Paris in 1911. As Herbert Howarth pointed out,¹⁷ the announcement of Eliot's "general point of view" as "classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion" was directly derived from a Maurrasian formula: an editorial note in the *Nouvelle Revue Francaise* in 1913 which had been described Maurras's 'three traditions' as *classique, catholique, monarchique*. As a man of letters Maurras upheld an ideal of classicism that could be much more readily perceived in the French literary tradition than in the English. As a politician and leader of the Action Francaise movement, Maurras believed in an absolute monarchy as against parliamentary democracy, and strongly supported the Catholic church as an embodiment of the virtues of order, authority, and tradition, while rejecting the so-called Jewish or mystical elements in Christianity. Maurras himself was an atheist.

Though the church hierarchy was sympathetic to the movement of the anti-modernism of the Action Francaise at first, they became worried about the use of the church by the non-believer who led the movement. Many prominent Catholic lay persons were anxious about the relation of the movement to the church. Among them was Jacques Maritain who according to Eliot was "the most conspicuous figure and probably the most powerful force in contemporary French

philosophy."¹⁷ Maritain proposed that the youth movement of the Action Francaise should be replaced by a group of Catholic clubs led by priests who would work to see that spiritual values were not neglected. However, the Church would not accept such a compromise.

In the fall of 1926 the Archbishop of Bordeaux, took the first step towards a formal condemnation of Maurras's movement. He wrote to the youth of his diocese: "Catholics by calculation, not by conviction, the men who lead the Action Francaise use the church, or hope at least to use it; but they do not serve it, since they reject the divine message which it is the church's mission to propagate."¹⁸ And in December of that year the Vatican issued the Church's formal condemnation: "Catholics are not permitted to adhere to the school of those who place the interests of parties above religion and make religion the servant of those interests."¹⁹

Consequently seven books by Maurras and the newspaper *Action Francaise* were placed on the Index. Laymen who disobeyed the prohibition would be denied the sacraments; seminary students would be dismissed from school; and people in holy orders would be deprived of their titles if they defied the Holy Office. It was inevitable that Maurras and his movement lost the favor of many French Catholic followers.

Maurras was a contributor to *The Criterion* and Eliot had great respect for him. Eliot described Maurras's development quite sympathetically: "His attitude is that of an unbeliever who cannot believe, and who is too honest to pretend to himself or to others that he does believe; if others can believe, so much the better not only for them but for the world at large. The peculiarity of Maurras's agnosticism is that he recognizes that he has much in common, in the temporal sphere with Catholics than Protestants or atheists."²⁰ Therefore Eliot was shocked deeply by the charge that Maurras had been a pernicious influence on the spirituality of French youth. Eliot said that what shocked him most was the charge that "the influence of Maurras, indeed the intention of Maurras, is to prevent his disciples and students away from Christianity." He continued: "I have been a reader of the work of Maurras for eighteen years. Upon me he has had exactly the opposite effect."²¹

In 1940 looking back on the affair of the Action Francaise Eliot said: "The attitude of Maurras towards the Church was simple. He made no pretence of Christian belief, but supported the Church as a social institution making for stability.... I defended the *Action Francaise* when it was put on the Index. My *particular* defence may or may not stand; but I believe now that the Pope understood its tendencies better."²² Maurras would have been important in Eliot's intellectual development not in an affirmative way but a negative way. Eliot learned lessons from Maurras's mistakes. In 1955 Eliot spoke of him as follows: "I have sometimes thought that if Charles Maurras had confined himself to literature of political theory, and had never attempted to found a political party, a *movement* ... then those of his ideas which were sound and strong might have spread more

widely, and penetrated more deeply, and affected more sensibly the contemporary mind."²³

Lyndall Gordon suggested that Eliot might have become a Christian in 1914. She said that "The turning point in Eliot's life came not at the time of his baptism in 1927, but in 1914 when he was circling, in moments of agitation, on the edge of conversion."²⁴ This supposition was based on a group of intensely religious poems written during this period, but never published. During Eliot's last years at Harvard it was said that he made a study of the lives of saints and mystics, St. Theresa, Dame Julian of Norwich, Mme Guyon, Walter Hilton, St. John of the Cross, Jacob Bohme, and St. Bernard. However, he did not make any serious religious commitment in 1914. He continued to brood over Christianity, its dogma and institutions. Christian dogma, he realized, was not subject to logic, but could not be skipped over. 'Philosophy may show, if it can, the meaning of the statement that Jesus was the son of God. But Christianity — orthodox Christianity — must base itself upon a unique fact : that Jesus was born of a virgin : a proposition which is either true or false, its terms having a fixed meaning',²⁵ he wrote in 1917. At any rate, Eliot's preoccupation with questions of Christianity remained unresolved and he remained in doubt.

IV

In April 1915 Eliot met an English woman, Vivienne Haigh-Wood. Two months later on 26 June 1915 they were married at a registry office near her home in Hampstead. They were twenty-six. Eliot married so suddenly that there had been no time to inform his parents. As soon as his parents were told of their son's marriage, they insisted on his return to America. To them it was scandalous for their son to rush to a registry office not follow the formal procedure of the Church. However Eliot had given up his family's religion. Father and son parted bitterly. His father refused to continue giving him an allowance. He was never to see his father again during his life time. His father died on 8 January 1919.

Eliot had to earn his living in various ways. At first he took up a teaching position at a Grammar School. Bertrand Russell suggested that they should move into his flat. Russell wrote that "It is quite funny how I have come to love him, as if he were my son. He is becoming much more of a man. He has a profound and quite unselfish devotion to his wife, and she is really fond of him."²⁷ Vivienne told Russell that she had married her husband to stimulate him, but found she could not do it.²⁸ Soon after their marriage, Vivienne became ill and almost died. According to Gordon,²⁹ this remained the pattern for the rest of her life, a pattern of illness, crisis, convalescence, and relapse. Eliot told Conrad Aiken that he had been so taken up with worries of finance, and Vivienne's health, that he had written nothing lately.

After a year, Eliot wrote to his brother, Henry, that he had been through

"the most awful nightmare of anxiety that the mind of man could conceive; but at least it had not been dull."³¹ Gordon suggested that Eliot's disillusion with his marriage was associated with sexual failures, and it preceded his discovery of his wife's chronic illness. Eliot's friends remembered a chic and literate woman who became through illness too hysterical and bothersome to be endured. It was clear to his friends who knew them early that Eliot felt ashamed of her. In 1917 Eliot took up work with the Colonial and Foreign Department of Llyod Bank where he would stay for nine years. Life was hard for him during the first few years at the bank. His daily routine was to get up at about five in the morning and work at his writing in the early hours of the day, and then go to the bank. Sometimes he found himself working fourteen to fifteen hours a day. Gordon pointed out that "It was during this period of financial hardship and disillusionment with his marriage ... that he accumulated in their first sharpness the impressions of London and the distraught wife that formed the basis of the urban sections of *The Waste Land*."³²

In 1922 Pound wrote: "Eliot produced a fine poem (*The Waste Land*) during his enforced vacation, but has since relapsed. I wish something could be found for him, to get him out of Llyod's bank." or "Eliot, in bank, makes 500 pound. Too tired, to write, broke down; during convalescence in Switzerland did *Waste Land*, a masterpiece; one of the most important 19 pages in English." He also wrote: "Rightly or wrongly some of us consider Eliot's employment in a bank the worst waste in complete physical breakdown he produced a very important sequence of poem, one of the few things in contemporary literature to which one can ascribe permanent value."³³ *The Waste Land* appeared in the first issue of Eliot's new periodical, *The Criterion*, in October 1922. In America *The Waste Land* appeared in the first issue of Eliot's in *the Dial* and won a prize of two thousand dollars. Eliot wrote to his mother and confided that so much of his inner life had been in the poem.

On the surface Eliot seemed to be in the limelight after he won the *Dial* prize for *The Waste Land*. Additionally he had his own magazine, *The Criterion*. However it was about this time that Vivienne's health had deteriorated still further. She suffered a relapse, indeed nearly died. She left London to convalesce in the country, and remained there for at least six months. Eliot, from 1923 to 1925, was in a state of turmoil. Close friends saw him as "a man constantly on the verge of a breakdown, peevish and complaining, oppressed by self-pity, weakened by weariness, and preoccupied with fears of poverty."³⁴ Once Virginia Woolf, her sister, and her husband found him in a state of collapse in his flat. His eyes were blurred, his face ashen, and he could barely stand up to see them out. Eliot's letter itself described the situation best in which he found himself at that time: "I am now in the midst of a terrific crisis. I wish to heaven that I had never taken up *the Criterion*. It seemed a good thing, and it is a good thing, but although it is a pity to drop such a promising beginning I may very soon have to drop it and I am quite sincere when I wish that I had never undertaken it.

It has been an evergrowing responsibility ... a great expense to me and I have not got a penny out of it : there is not enough money to run it and pay me too. I hoped that it would be a solid thing for me, but there is no longer time to wait for that. I think the work and worry have taken 10 years off my life. I have sunk the whole of my strength for the past 18 months into this confounded paper, when I ought to have been minding my business and doing my own writing. The paper has therefore done me more harm than good. The present situation is this : that I must either give up the bank at once and find some work which would take less of my time thereby sacrificing part of an income every penny of which I need or also I must give up *the Criterion* before my health crashes and I am no longer able to perform my bank work. I am now offered the post of literary editor of *the Nation*, at 200 pounds a year less than my present salary and with no assurance that the job will last longer than six months, and if I take that I shall have to go straight into new work, which for the first six months will be very difficult and worrying, at a moment when I feel much more like going into a sanatorium. In order to carry on *the Criterion* I have had to neglect not only the writing I ought to be doing but my private affairs of every description which for me some time past I have not had a moment to deal with. I have not even time to go to a dentist or to have my hair cut, and at the same time I see *the Criterion* full of most glaring defects which I could only avoid by having still more time for it to devour, and at the same time I am simply unfit to take risks which in any case I should not be justified in taking." In ink was written 'I am worn out, I cannot go on.'³⁵

Eliot felt he was no longer able to do his bank work. He wanted to leave the bank and find work which would enable him to concentrate on his writing. Vivienne was unwilling for him to do so. Eliot had considered leaving the bank without an alternative post. Vivienne had been close to death seven or eight times, and Eliot was so distressed that he gave up his plan and continued on at the bank. Lyndall Gordon suggested that "The first serious impetus towards the Church of England seemed to coincide with the crisis in 1923."³⁶ It was around this time that Eliot was introduced to William Force Stead. Stead remembered Eliot in this period : "Even in 1923 he had an air of weariness, like a man who worked and carried his burdens patiently with only a small vitality.... He was never the man to accept life with a carefree enjoyment."³⁷

Though Gordon pointed out that it was Stead who drew Eliot's attention to the writings of seventeenth century anglicans, in particular those of the Bishop of Winchester, Lancelot Andrewes, in 1919 Eliot had had a chance to read the sermons of John Donne and Lancelot Andrewes but at that stage he had been rather fascinated by John Donne. Eliot read the sermons on the Incarnation by Lancelot Andrewes and he came to like the pure medieval temper of Andrewes.

In 1925 Eliot wrote to Bertrand Russell that Vivienne's health had deteriorated and that the obvious alternative to their present life was that they should part if only Vivienne could manage to live on her own. He did not complain of her illnesses

but of the damaging relationship. He blamed partly himself "... living with me has done so much damage and partly her emotional immaturity. I find her still perpetually baffling and deceptive", he wrote. "She seems to me like a child of 6 with an immensely clever and precocious mind.... And I can never escape from the spell of her persuasive gift of argument."³³ Eliot also wrote to Leonard Woolf that he wished to close an unhappy period of his life and make a new beginning. In 1927 Vivienne's health deteriorated again. She was no longer quite normal. Eliot went with her to a centre for nervous disorders near Geneva.

V

Another step towards his conversion may have been prompted by I. A. Richards. In a note published in *the Criterion* in 1925 Richards took up Eliot as an example to illustrate his argument that poetry's power to console could and should exist in complete separation from any set of particular beliefs about the world. Eliot's great virtue, observed Richards, was that he "by effecting a complete separation between his poetry and all beliefs, and this without any weakening of the poetry, has realized what might otherwise have remained largely a speculative possibility."³⁹ It was a view widely held in the twenties, when Eliot's poetry seemed most remarkable for its cynicism and even nihilism. This was not Eliot's opinion. Eliot replied in "A Note on Poetry and Belief," published in January 1927 in the first number of Wyndham Lewis's magazine, *The Enemy*.

Eliot's note clearly indicated the way in which his religious attitudes were developing, and how he related belief to his own poetry. Eliot said of Richards's comments on *The Waste Land*: "As for the poem of my own in question, I cannot for the life of me see the 'complete separation' from all belief or it is something no more complete than the separation of Christina Rossetti from Dante. A 'sense of desolation,' etc. (if it is there) is not a separation from belief; it is nothing so pleasant. In fact, doubt, uncertainty, futility, etc., would seem to me to prove anything except this agreeable partition; for doubt and uncertainty are merely a variety of belief."⁴⁰ Eliot did not discuss his own work in detail, for he was more concerned with Richards's general position about the separation of poetry and belief, and he denied that any such separation could be made: "I cannot see that poetry can ever separate from something which I should call belief, and to which I cannot see any reason for refusing the name of belief, unless we are to reshuffle names altogether. It should hardly be needful to say that it will not inevitably be orthodox Christian belief, although that possibility can be entertained, since Christianity will probably continue to modify itself, as in the past, into something that can be believed in...."⁴¹ Eliot had come to the conclusion that Christianity had modified itself into something that could be believed in. Soon afterward he was baptized and confirmed in the Church of England.

This change was not for a time known except for a few close friends. Herbert Read⁴² would sometimes spend the night at Eliot's flat. On one such occasion he

noticed that Eliot went out a little before seven o'clock in the morning to attend an early communion service. That was the first intimation Read had of Eliot's conversion to Christianity. On another occasion, I. A. Richards,⁴³ noticed that Eliot had carried "a large, new, and to us awe-inspiring Prayer Book" along with other things.

What was the reaction of the Bloomsbury Group? Leonard and Virginia Woolf were very devoted to Eliot and it was they who published the first edition of *The Waste Land* in 1922. Virginia Woolf wrote to her sister Vanessa, February 11, 1928: "... I have had a most shameful and distressing interview with poor dear Tom Eliot, who may be called dead to us all from this day forward.... He has become an Anglo-Catholic, believes in God and immortality, and goes to church. I was really shocked. A corpse would seem to me more credible than he is."⁴⁴ The shock was indeed real, however, they continued to see Eliot. R. P. Blackmur summed up the general reaction when he said that Eliot's mind "is the last mind which, in this century, one would have expected to enter the Church in a lay capacity ... however that may be, within the church or not, Mr. Eliot's mind has preserved its worldly qualities."⁴⁵

Soon after the publication of *For Lancelot Andrewes*, published on November 20, 1928 the *Times Literary Supplement* ran an article on "Mr. Eliot's New Essays," in which the reviewer regarded Eliot's conversion as nothing but a betrayal: "By accepting a higher spiritual authority based not upon the deepest personal experience (for that we must still turn to the poems), but upon the anterior and exterior authority of revealed religion, he had abdicated from high position. Specifically he rejects modernism for medievalism."⁴⁶ (6 December 1928).

In America Edmund Wilson deplored Eliot's religious position saying that "It seems to me that the objection to Eliot's position is simply that the Church is now practically impossible as a solution to our present difficulties because it is so difficult to get educated people to believe in its fundamental doctrines.... I agree that without a church you cannot have anything properly describable as religion; and I sympathize with Mr. Eliot's criticism of certain substitute religious.... You cannot have real Christianity without a cult of Christ as the son of God. But since it is plainly becoming more and more difficult to accept Christ in this role, it seems that we must do without both the Church and religion.... Nothing seems to me more sadly symptomatic of the feeble condition of modern literary people, of their unwillingness or incapacity to confront the realities about them, than the movement back to Thomas Aquinas or, as in Eliot's case, back to Bishop Andrewes."⁴⁷ Eliot's conversion to Christianity had provoked and disconcerted many of his contemporaries. There was the reason behind this public announcement.

Soon after Eliot's entry into the Church of England his Harvard teacher, Irving Babbitt, passed through London on the way back to America from France with his wife. While they were dining, the conversation happened upon Eliot's conversion. Recalling the conversation Eliot described the situation as follows: "Anxious though I was to avoid such a painful subject, I found myself obliged to expose and briefly

to account for my own position. I imagine that, in view of some of my previous eccentricities in print, this was only a minor shock to him. He took the matter seriously, however, and managed to convince me that it was my duty, in his own words, to 'come out into the open.' I had not been conscious of skulking, having been more concerned with making up my own mind than with making any public use of it when made. But Babbitt's words gnawed on my conscience, and provoked, for my next volume of essays, a preface that perhaps went to the opposite extreme from that of which I had felt myself accused."⁴⁸ As we have seen above, it was Babbitt who had urged Eliot to make a public announcement of his acceptance of Anglo-Catholicism.

VI

When *For Lancelot Andrewes* was first published in November 1928 by Faber and Gwyer, there was the following statement on the front of the book's dust jacket: "This is Mr. Eliot's first volume of collected essays since his *Homage to John Dryden* (1924), and he considers it his most important prose since *The Sacred Wood* (1920). *For Lancelot Andrewes* consists of seven essays which are selected from Mr. Eliot's work of the last two or three years, and which he believes show some consistency. The subjects cover a wide range of literature, theology and philosophy; but taken together they have a unity of their own."⁴⁹

The essays contained in *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* were taken from *The Times Literary Supplement*, *Theology*, *The Dial* (New York), and *The Forum* (New York). The eight essays on style and order Eliot has chosen for *For Lancelot Andrewes* were as follows: "Lancelot Andrewes," "Niccolo Machiavelli," "Francis Herbert Bradley," "Bradley," "Baudelaire on Our Time," "Thomas Middleton," "A Note on Richard Crashaw," and "Humanism of Irving Babbitt." These essays give an example of the general views of Eliot the classicist, royalist, and anglo-catholic. However, Eliot would become dissatisfied with two essays on Machiavelli and on Grashaw and later omitted them.

The title essay on Bishop Andrewes which was written in 1926 before his conversion to Christianity, suggested some of the influences that drew Eliot to the Church of England. Eliot said: "To the ordinary observer the English Church in history means Hooker and Jeremy Taylor – and should mean Andrewes also ... a Church is to be judged by its intellectual fruits, by its influence on the sensibility of the most sensitive and on the intellect of the most intelligent, and it must be made real to the eye by monuments of artistic merit."⁵⁰ To Eliot's eye, Hooker and Andrewes were such intellectual monuments. Eliot stated: "The English Church has no literary monument equal to that of Dante, no intellectual monument equal to that of St. Thomas, no devotional monument equal to that of St. John of the Cross, no building so beautiful as the Cathedral of Modena or the basilica of St. Zeno in Verona. ... The intellectual achievement and the prose style of Hooker and Andrewes came to complete the structure of the English Church as

the philosophy of the thirteenth century crowns the Catholic Church."⁵¹

Eliot recognized an intellectual satisfaction in the writings of Hooker and Andrewes in particular : "... the achievement of Hooker and Andrewes was to make the English Church more worthy of intellectual assent. No religion can survive the judgment of history unless the best minds of its time have collaborated in its construction ; if the Church of Elizabeth is worthy of the age of Shakespeare and Jonson, that is because of the work of Hooker and Andrewes."⁵² Eliot regarded Bishop Andrewes as an important figure in the development of Anglicanism and as an influential figure in the formation of the Church of England. Along with Hooker, Andrewes made the English Church "more worthy of intellectual assent."

Eliot called Andrewes "the first great preacher of the English Catholic Church."⁵³ As the subtitle indicated, Eliot regarded Andrewes as a model prose stylist. Eliot stated : "The most conspicuous qualities of the style are three : ordonnance, or arrangement and structure, precision in the use of words, and relevant intensity."⁵⁴ He found these qualities in the sermons of Andrewes and commended his style at the expense of John Donne. Eliot thought that Andrewes spoke not only from the intellectual power of an individual mind, but also from the tradition and doctrine of an established institution : "the voice of Andrewes is the voice of a man who has a formed visible Church behind him, who speaks with the old authority and the new culture."⁵⁵

As we have seen, Eliot regarded Andrewes as the model of Christian orthodoxy, whereas he said that John Donne lacked spiritual discipline. He once praised John Donne saying that he had 'a direct sensuous apprehension of thought, or a recreation of thought, into feeling' in "Metaphysical Poets" (1921). Eliot noted that in his sermons Andrewes attempted to concentrate on the elucidation of the Incarnation which he considered an essential dogma. Eliot continued : "Andrewes's emotion is purely contemplative, it is not personal, it is wholly evoked by the objects of contemplation to which it is adequate ; his emotion is wholly contained in and explained by its object."⁵⁶ Eliot had come to the conclusion that Andrewes's bond was with the Church, with the tradition, and when compared with Donne, Andrewes was the more medieval. For Eliot, Andrewes was more pure, and because his bond was with the Church, and with tradition. Andrewes's intellect was satisfied by theology and his sensibility by prayer and liturgy. Eliot regarded Andrewes as one of the community of the born spiritual. He saw in Andrewes the harmony between intellect and sensibility. Consequently Andrewes had what Eliot had been seeking.

In the second essay on John Bramhall Eliot was interested in Bramhall as a leading figure in the early history of the English Church and in the history of England under Charles I and Charles II. Eliot contrasted Bishop Bramhall with Hobbes. Eliot pointed out that Bramhall's controversy with Hobbs illuminated the condition of philosophy and theology at that time : "The most important of the questions at issue are two : the freedom of the will and the relation between

Church and State.”⁵⁷ Eliot attempted to analyze Bramhall’s point of view as an opponent of Hobbes. Eliot regarded Hobbes as representative of materialistic determinism. Eliot said that Bramhall’s thinking was “a perfect example of the pursuit of the *via media*, and *via media* is of all ways the most difficult to follow. It requires both imagination and hold on reality.”⁵⁸ In the essay on Andrewes Eliot started that “The Church of England is the creation ... of the reign of Elizabeth. The *via media* which is the spirit of Anglicanism.”⁵⁹ In prose style as well as in theology, Eliot considered Bramhall to be “A link between the generation of Andrewes and the generation of Jeremy Taylor.”⁶⁰

In the essay on Machiavelli, Eliot stated that “His message has been falsified by persistent romanticism ever since his death. To the humbug of every century Machiavelli has contributed. And yet no great man has been so completely misunderstood.”⁶¹ Eliot discovered that Machiavelli was a patriot and he was wholly devoted to his state. Although Machiavelli saw quite clearly the corruption of the Church and the baseness of the eminent ecclesiastics, he was neither opposed to religion nor to the Catholic Church. He maintained steadfastly that an established Church was of the greatest value to a State. He thought that religion produced good order. He said, still more positively, that “The rulers of all States, whether Kingdoms or Commonwealths, who would preserve their governments firm and entire, ought above all things to take care that Religion is held in the highest veneration, and its ceremonies at all times uncorrupted and inviolable: for there is no surer prognostic of impending ruin to any State, than to see Divine worship neglected or despised.”⁶² Eliot made a comment on it: “It is quite possible that an established National Church such as the Church of England, might have seemed to Machiavelli the best established for a Christian Commonwealth; but that a religious establishment of some kind is necessary to a nation he is quite sure.”⁶³

As for style, Eliot said that “Machiavelli is a master of prose style of any age; his prose is mature.”⁶⁴ Eliot agreed with his view of human nature. He came to the conclusion that “Machiavelli ... merely told the truth about humanity. The world of human motives which he depicts is true – that is to say, it is humanity without the addition of superhuman Grace. It is therefore tolerable only to persons who have also a definite religious belief; to the effort of the last three centuries to supply religious belief by belief in Humanity the creed of Machiavelli is insupportable.”⁶⁵

In the essay on Bradley Eliot’s first consideration was to question “the nature of Bradley’s influence and why his writings and his personality fascinate those whom they do fascinate.”⁶⁶ Eliot had once been fascinated by Bradley and wrote a Ph. D. dissertation on his work which was originally titled *Experience and Objects of Knowledge in the Philosophy of F. H. Bradley* (1916). This essay was a review of Bradley’s *Ethical Studies* in which Eliot was evaluating the nature of Bradley’s influence on him. It leads us, in short, to see the necessity of a religious point of view. However, in Eliot’s opinion, “Morality and religion

are not the same thing, but they cannot beyond a certain point be treated separately. A system of ethics, if thorough, is explicitly or implicitly a system of theology; and to attempt to erect a complete theory of ethics without a religion is none the less to adopt some particular attitude towards religion."⁶⁷ Eliot said that "Bradley is thoroughly empirical.... He wished only to determine how much of morality could be founded securely without entering into the religious questions at all."⁶⁸ Eliot did not think that Bradley had exercised a direct religious influence. Eliot said that "Of wisdom Bradley had a large share; wisdom consists largely of scepticism and uncynical disillusion; and of these Bradley had a large share. And scepticism and disillusion are a useful equipment for religious understanding; and of that Bradley had a share."⁶⁹ It was clear in his early poetry and prose that Eliot had absorbed Bradley's skepticism and disillusion. Eliot said somewhere that "In fact, doubt and uncertainty are merely a variety of belief." It was clear that Eliot used Bradley's scepticism and uncynical disillusion.

The essay "Baudelaire in Our Time" was written in 1927. It seems to have been intended as a demonstration of what Eliot meant by "the relation of poetry to the spiritual and social life of its time and of other times."⁷⁰ It was written as a review of a translation by Arthur Symons. Eliot called the translation of Symons "a good translation." Eliot considered Baudelaire in the 'nineties, and in the nineteen-twenties because Baudelaire became a poet of the 'nineties in the translation of Symons, and in the nineteen-twenties in Eliot's own time. Eliot said that Symons was partly right and partly wrong. "What is right in Mr. Symon's account is the impression it gives that Baudelaire was primarily occupied with religious values. What is wrong is the childish attitude of the 'nineties towards religion, the belief which is no more than the game of children dressing up and playing at being grown-ups that there is a religion of Evil, or Vice, or Sin."⁷¹ Eliot came to the conclusion that "The important fact about Baudelaire is that he was essentially a Christian, born out of his due time, and a classic, born out of his due time." Eliot continued: "And being the kind of Christian that he was, born when he was, he had to discover Christianity for himself. In this pursuit he was alone in the solitude which is only known to saints. To him the notion of Original Sin came spontaneously, and the need for prayer."⁷² And Eliot concluded that "Baudelaire came to attain the greatest, the most difficult, of the Christian virtues, the virtue of humility."⁷³

As early as 1922 Eliot, in his essay on the French Poet, wrote that "All first-rate poetry is occupied with morality. That is the lesson of Baudelaire. As for English verse of the present time, the lack of curiosity in technical matters of the academic poets of today is only an indication of their lack of curiosity in moral matters."⁷⁴ It had been said that Eliot was the first person in England to have appreciated the spiritual aspect of Baudelaire's work. In France it was barely noticed at that time.

In the Bradley essay Eliot referred to his Harvard teacher Irving Babbitt as "one of the most remarkable of our critics, one who is fundamentally on most

questions in the right, and very often right quite alone."⁷⁵ Soon after that in this concluding essay Eliot wrote further about him. Eliot sought to "indicate certain lines of development" in the essays of *For Lancelot Andrewes*, above all this last essay "The Humanism of Irving Babbitt" seems to be the most important essay in relation to his recent conversion to Christianity. Eliot wrote that "The centre of Mr. Babbitt's philosophy is the doctrine of humanism."⁷⁶ It was obvious to Eliot that "The problem of humanism is undoubtedly related to the problem of religion."⁷⁷ But Eliot found in Babbitt's latest book, *Democracy and Leadership*, that Babbitt had not been able to take the religious view, that is to say, that he could not accept any dogma or revelation; and that "humanism is the alternative to religion."⁷⁸

As Babbitt knew, "the Christian religion is an essential part of the history of our race,"⁷⁹ so Eliot insisted that "Humanism and religion are thus, as historical facts, by no means parallel; humanism has been sporadic, but Christianity continuous."⁸⁰ To Eliot it is irrelevant to think that a tradition of humanism is equivalent to the actual tradition of Christianity. Eliot believed that for humanism to exist at all "it is dependent upon some other attitude, for it is essentially critical — I would even say parasitical."⁸¹ Needless to say, Eliot found the Christian attitude most dependent. It seemed to Eliot that Babbitt was trying to make humanism work without religion. Eliot referred to Babbitt's humanism as something "alarmingly like the very liberal Protestant theology of the nineteenth century: it is, in fact, a product — a by-product — of Protestant theology in its last agonies."⁸²

Next Eliot examined the idea of civilization. Eliot said that "... unless by civilization you mean material progress, cleanliness, etc. — which is not what Mr. Babbitt means; if you mean a spiritual and intellectual coordination on a high level, then it is doubtful whether civilization can endure without religion, and religion without a church."⁸³ Finally Eliot came to the conclusion that "the humanistic point of view is auxiliary to and dependent upon the religious point of view. For us, religion is of course Christianity; and Christianity implies, I think, the conception of the Church."⁸⁴ Eliot, himself, had come to that conclusion. Here Eliot announced his new religious position more clearly than in any of the previous essays, and more clearly than in the preface.

Thus, we have examined the essays in *For Lancelot Andrewes* in relation to Eliot's conversion to Christianity. We have found that most of the essays in it demonstrated his growing interest in Christianity. On the whole his Christianity had been implicit in the earlier essays, but in the last essay "Humanism of Irving Babbitt" his Christianity became explicit. Eliot recognized some of the weaknesses in Babbitt's humanism and insisted that humanism was insufficient without religion. For Eliot religion was Christianity. Looking back on the title essay on Bishop Andrewes we now realize that it was implicitly confessional, and that it suggested one of the forces that had brought Eliot to the English Church.

"Humanism of Irving Babbitt" also indicated something of the forces which

had led Eliot to Anglo-Catholicism. Unfortunately, this essay was interpreted as an attack on humanism and Babbitt himself. It was said that Eliot had misstated Babbitt's views. Babbitt reacted right away and wrote : "As an exposition and critique of the position I am attempting to develop, Mr. Eliot's article, 'Humanism of Irving Babbitt,' strikes me as confused and sophistical and in certain important respects positively inaccurate. It is not without interest, however, for the light it throws on Eliot's own perplexities and also no doubt on those of a portion at least of his numerous following of young intellectuals in England and America" (Forum 80 1928, 638).⁸⁵

VII

The following year (1929) Eliot wrote "Second Thoughts about Humanism" in which he clarified his position clearer. At the end of the essay there was a passage in which Eliot touched on T. E. Hulme's humanism, and he remarked on it as follows : "Most people suppose that some people, because they enjoy the luxury of Christian sentiments and excitement of Christian ritual, swallow or pretend to swallow incredible dogma. For some the process is exactly opposite. Rational assent may arrive late, intellectual conviction may come slowly, but they come inevitably without violence to honesty and nature. To put the sentiments in order is a later, and an immensely difficult task : intellectual freedom is earlier and easier than complete spiritual freedom."⁸⁶ This statement described the process of Eliot's own conversion.

At this time the three Ariel Poems, 'Journey of the Magi' (1927), 'A song for Simeon' (1928) and 'Animula' (1929) were written. They were the first poems written after Eliot's conversion and they reflected something of his religious conversion. 'Journey of the Magi' begins with a quotation from a Nativity sermon of Bishop Andrewes. 'A song of Simeon' used the story of Simeon from Luke's Gospel. "Animula" is Latin which stands for "little soul." Compared with his prose, his poetry expressed something more personal and confessional. They all reflected something of his spiritual struggle, and expressed something of a religious faith newly acquired. It has now been accepted that Eliot's poetry was rooted in private aspects of his life.

In his essay on Pascal, published in 1931, Eliot gave us an important description of the "Christian thinker" which indicated his motives for the acceptance of Christianity and which also explained the process of conversion : "The Christian thinker – I mean the man who is trying consciously and conscientiously to explain to himself the sequence which culminates in faith, rather than the public apologist proceeds by rejection and elimination. He finds the world to be so and so ; he finds its character implicable by any non-religious theory : among religions he finds Christianity, and Catholic Christianity, to account most satisfactorily for the world and especially for the moral world within ; and thus, by what Newman calls 'powerful and concurrent' reasons, he finds himself inexorably committed to

the dogma of the Incarnation.”⁸⁷

The statement which I have just quoted helps us to understand Eliot's intellectual and spiritual development which led to faith, and to understand why his acceptance of Christianity was not a sudden change but a long process which culminated in faith. Discussing some of the forces that had influenced, his conversion, he spoke of it as a process that occurred “perhaps insensibly, over a long period of time.” Several years later, in 1932, Eliot gave us some explanation about his conversion : “Towards any profound conviction one is borne ... by what Newman called ‘powerful and concurrent reasons.’ ... In my own case, I believe that one of the reasons was that the Christian scheme seemed to me the only one which would work.... The Christian scheme seemed the only possible scheme which found a place for values which I must maintain or perish ..., the belief, for instance, in holy living and holy dying, in sanctity, chastity, humility, austerity.”⁸⁸

In this paper I haven't touched on Dante. When we consider that Eliot had constantly studied Dante since his early days at Harvard, it is not too much to say that the Christian faith might have been with him, at the back of his mind, for at least ten years prior to his conversion. Dante might have played an important role in Eliot's religious development. That possibility has been left for further study regarding Eliot's conversion.

NOTES

1. T. S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood : Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (London : Methuen & Co Ltd. , 1920), vii.
2. T. S. Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes : Essays on Style and Order* (London : Faber and Faber, 1928), p. 7.
3. Stephen Spender, *Eliot* (Fontana Modern Masters). Ed. by Frank Kermode (Glasgow : William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd. , 1975), p. 138.
4. F.O. Matthiessen, *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot : An Essay on the Nature of Poetry*. Third edition with a chapter by C. L. Barber (New York : Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 153. It was important to note that though *Homage to John Dryden* was published in 1924 all the three essays were written before the publication of *The Waste Land*. In fact, the essays, “John Dryden,” “The Metaphysical Poets,” and “Andrew Marvell” had first appeared in *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1921.
5. Vinnie-Marie D'Ambrosio, *Eliot Possessed : T. S. Eliot and FitzGerald's RUBÁIYÁT* (New York and London : New York University Press, 1989), p. 64.
6. T. S. Eliot, “Baudelaire,” *Selected Essays* (London : Faber and Faber, 1986), p. 429. Eliot continues : “ ... so far as we do evil or good, we are human ; and it is better, in a paradoxical way, to do evil than to do nothing ; at least we exist. ”
7. Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years* (Oxford and New York : Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 9.
8. Quoted in Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 12. A *Serman* preached at Magdalene Chapel (Cambridge, England, 1948), p. 5.
9. Quoted in John D. Margolis, *T. S. Eliot's Intellectual Development 1922-1939* (Chicago and London : The University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 62. This article was written

after Eliot had read the article "Christ or Christianity," *Adelphi* 3 1925, 233, 238 which went as follows: "I am fully conscious of the debt that I owe the Church," he said. But he insisted that "the finer conscience of mankind has now passed definitely outside the Church. ... A drunken tramp who pads the highways unknowing whence his next meal will come is nearer to following Christ than the whole bench of English bishops. ... This modern world does not believe in God the Father; and the modern Church does not either. It puts its faith in pensions, and endowments, and 5 to 15 percent"

10. For the description of American Unitarianism here, see "Unitarians and Universalists." *Encyclopaedia Britannica: Macropaedia*, 1980 ed. Vol. XVIII, pp. 859-862.
11. Robert Sencourt, *T. S. Eliot: A Memoir* (London: Garnstone Press, 1971), p. 108.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
15. For the description of the Church of England and Anglo-Catholicism, see "Anglican Communion," *Encyclopaedia Britannica: Macropaedia*, 1980 ed. Vol. I, pp. 886-890.
16. John D. Margolis, *T. S. Eliot's Intellectual Development 1922-1939* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 96.
17. Quoted in Margolis, *T. S. Eliot's Intellectual Development*, p. 92.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 97.
24. Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 58.
25. Quoted in Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, pp. 69-70. Review, *International Journal of Ethics*, 27 (July 1917), 543.
26. According to Robert Sencourt, *T. S. Eliot: A Memoir*, Russell (with Wittgenstein, the most brilliant philosopher of his generation) came over to Harvard. ... Eliot attended some of his seminars. It has been asserted that Russell found Eliot the most promising of his American students (p. 40). We have already seen how Tom and Bertrand Russell first had occasion to meet at Harvard in the previous year. As chance would have it, Tom soon ran into him again within a month of his arrival in London from Marburg. Russell relates how one day in October 1914 he met Eliot in New Oxford Street (p. 54.). ... within a fortnight of the Eliots' wedding-day the eminent mathematician had been invited to dine with the young couple. Russell informs us that that, from the secretive way in which Eliot had divulged his marriage, he expected the bride to be "terrible", but it turned out that she was quite different from the woman he imagined: lighthearted, animated, vivacious, a perfect contrast (so he thought) to Tom, with his listless refinement (p. 54.).
27. Sencourt, *T. S. Eliot*, p. 56.
28. Quoted in Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 74.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
30. T. S. Eliot, *The Waste Land: A Facsimile and Transcript of The Original Drafts Including The Annotations of Ezra Pound*. Ed. by Valerie Eliot (London: Faber and Faber, 1971), p. x.
31. *Ibid.*, p. xi.

32. Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 95.
33. Jay Martin, "T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*," *A Collection of Critical Essays on "The Waste Land"*, ed. Jay Martin (Englewood Cliff, New Jersey : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 4.
34. Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 123.
35. *The Waste Land : A Facsimile*, pp. xxvi-xxvii.
36. Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 125. Gordon continues : "It was then that Richard Cobden-Sanderson introduced Eliot to a fellow-American, William Force Stead, who had himself ordained in the Church of England. Stead drew Eliot's attention to the writings of seveneenth-century Anglicans, in particular those of the Bishop of Winchester, Lancelot Andrewes. Eliot read the sermons on the Incarnation (a notion his Unitarian family would not have stressed).
37. Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot* (London : Hamish Hamilton, 1984), p. 137.
38. Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years*, p. 129.
39. Quoted in Bernard Bergonzi, *T. S. Eliot* (New York : Macmillan, 1972), p. 110.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
41. *Ibid.*
42. See Herbert Read, "T. S. E. — A Memoir," *T. S. Eliot : The Man and His Work*, ed. Allen Tate (New York : the University of the South Delta, 1966), p. 22.
43. I. A. Richards, "On TSE," *T. S. Eliot : The Man and His work*, p. 5.
44. Quoted in Burton Raffel, *T. S. Eliot* (New York : Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1982), p. 110.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
46. Margolis, *T. S. Eliot's Intellectual Development*, p. 114.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
50. T. S. Eliot, "Lancelot Andrewes," *For Lancelot Andrewes : Essays on Style and Order* (London : Faber and Faber, 1928), pp. 12-13.
50. T. S. Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes : Essays on Style and Order* (London : Faber and Faber, 1928), pp. 12-13.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
54. *Ibid.*
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
57. Eliot, "John Bramhall," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 29.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
59. Eliot, "Lancelot Andrewes," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 12.
60. Eliot, "John Bramhall," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 38.
61. Eliot, "Niccolo Machivelli," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 39
62. *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

66. Eliot, "Francis Herbert Bradley," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 54.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
68. *Ibid.*
69. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
70. T. S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood : Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (London : Methuen & Co Ltd., p. viii.
70. T. S. Eliot, "Preface to the 1928 Edition," *The Sacred Wood : Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (London : Mrthuen, 1920), p. viii.
71. Eliot, "Baudelaire In Our Time," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 72.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
74. Quoted in Enid Starkie, *From Gautier to Eliot : The Influence of France on English Literature 1851-1936* (London : Hutchinson of London, 1960), p. 167.
75. Eliot, "Francis Herbert Bradley," *For Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 63.
76. Eliot, "The Humanism of Irving Babbitt," *For Lacelot Andrewes*, p. 100.
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Ibid.*
79. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
80. *Ibid.*
81. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
85. Quoted in Margolis, *T. S. Eliot's Intelectual Develonment*, p. 115.
86. T. S. Eliot, "Second Thoughts About Humanism," *Selected Essays* (London : Faber and Faber, 1932), p. 491.
87. Eliot, "The 'Pensees' of Pascal," *Selected Essays*, p. 408.
88. Quoted in Margolis, *T. S. Eliot's Intellectual Development*, pp. 105-106.