

Eliot as a Literary Critic: Focused on “To Criticize the Critic”

Naoko Morita

“To Criticize the Critic” is Eliot’s last essay. It was a lecture delivered at the University of Leeds in 1961 in which he looked back over his whole career as a literary critic and attempted to “draw some conclusions, some plausible generalizations of wider validity”¹ about his own criticism. His standpoint was based on the premise that he was a critic of his own criticism. He justified himself by saying that “there is no other critic, living or dead, about whose work I am so well informed as I am about my own. I know more about the genesis of my essays and reviews than about those of any other critic; I know the chronology, the circumstances under which each essay was written and the motive for writing it, and about all those changes of attitude, taste, interest and belief which the years bring to pass.”²

At the outset of “To Criticize the Critic” Eliot distinguished among several types of literary critics. First, the “Professional Critics” such as Sainte-Beuve, Paul Elmer More, Desmond MacCarthy, and Edmund Gosse—writers whose literary criticism is their chief occupation and who are often the official critic for some magazine or newspaper. Second, the “Critics with Gusto” such as George Saintsbury, Charles Whibley, and Quiller-Couch—the critics who call attention to the forgotten or unduly despised writers. Third, the “Academic and the Theoretical Critics” such as W.P. Ker, I.A. Richards, William Empson, L.C. Knights, Wilson Knight, and F.R. Leavis, who range from the purely scholarly to the philosophical. And finally the “Writers” such as Samuel Johnson, Coleridge, Dryden, Racine and Matthew Arnold—whose criticism is a by-product of their creative activity, “Particularly, the critic who is also a poet...the poet who has written some literary criticism”.³ He put himself into the last group. His critical writings are various; they cover a wide range of not only the literary, but also the religious, the political and social criticism. However, it has generally been accepted among the critics that he placed himself into the right group.

Eliot stated in “To Criticize the Critic” that “I find myself constantly irritated by having my words, perhaps written thirty or forty years ago, quoted as if I had uttered them yesterday. One very intelligent expositor of my work, who regarded it, furthermore, with a very favourable eye, discussed my critical writings some years ago as if I had, at the outset of my career as a literary critic, sketched out the design for a massive critical structure, and spent the rest of my life filling in the details.”⁴ Eliot also stated in an unpublished address to The Authors’ Club in 1955 that “I am accustomed to critics tracing the rise and decline of my creative powers from poem to poem and play to play. But when it comes to my critical essays the criticism of them seems to assume that I wrote

them all at once, and that it was designed to take its place in an orderly structure."⁵

As we see from the quotations above, there must have been much misunderstanding and misinterpretation on the part of the critics on Eliot's critical writings compared to the critics on his poetry when they analysed the development of his criticism. It was not that he stated all his major critical ideas in *The Sacred Wood*, his first book of criticism on poetry and criticism, which appeared in 1920. It was not clear in 1920 that Eliot's criticism was a by-product of his private poetry workshop; or a prolongation of the thinking that went into the formation of his own verse nor that he was implicitly defending the sort of poetry that he and his friends wrote.⁶ Moreover, there was a change in Eliot's critical attitude from aesthetics to religion. Most of the critics have marked it around 1928, the year when *For Lancelot Andrewes* was published. From *For Lancelot Andrewes* onward Eliot was concerned with political, philosophical, and theological problems. In short, five of the eight essays in *For Lancelot Andrewes* deal with extra-literary problems. In contrast, *The Sacred Wood* deals primarily with aesthetic or literary problems. For instance, Matthiessen stressed Eliot's growth during the fourteen years between *The Sacred Wood* (1920) and *After Strange Gods* (1934). Matthiessen thought that *For Lancelot Andrewes* (1928) marked a new stage in the development of Eliot's criticism. He wrote that "it was not until he returned to his own particular approach to art and society in *After Strange Gods* that he deepened the contours of his thought beyond *For Lancelot Andrewes*, 1928, as that volume of 'essays on Style and Order' had marked a different orientation from *Homage to John Dryden*, 1924."⁷

Recalling that he had bought the copy of *The Sacred Wood* soon after its publication in 1920, F. R. Leavis wrote that "*The Sacred Wood*, I think, had very little influence or attention before the Hogarth Press brought out *Homage to John Dryden*, the pamphlet in which the title essay was accompanied by 'The Metaphysical Poets' and 'Andrew Marvell'. It was with the publication in this form of those essays that Eliot became an important contemporary critic. It was the impact of this slender new collection that sent one back to *The Sacred Wood* and confirmed with decisive practical effect one's sense of the stimulus to be got from that rare thing, a fine intelligence in literary criticism—the fine intelligence so certainly present in the earlier and larger collection."⁸

One of the critics, F. W. Bateson, who was an Oxford undergraduate at that time, wrote about *The Sacred Wood* that "Until the publication of *The Waste Land* in *The Criterion* (October 1922) we were hardly aware of Eliot the poet, whereas we were very much aware of Eliot the critic. *The Sacred Wood* was almost our sacred book."⁹ Soon after the publication of *The Sacred Wood* by Methuen in December 1920, an American edition was published by Knopf. Eliot's reputation was growing steadily and *The Sacred Wood* (1920) and *Homage to John Dryden* (1924) firmly established Eliot as the most interesting young critic in England and America. In 1925 Eliot was invited to give the Clark Lectures at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in early 1926 he delivered eight lectures on the metaphysical tradition from Dante to Laforgue and Corbiere. He was neither a scholar, nor an academic. He was working in the foreign department at Lloyds Bank in the City of London. A few years later Eliot became institutionalized as a literary

critic.

Returning to "To Criticize the Critic", Eliot also divided his critical writings into three periods. The first period was the period during which he was writing for *The Egoist*, published by Harriet Weaver, Richard Aldington the sub-editor. It was said that Eliot contributed much criticism to *The Egoist*. But unfortunately only one of his essays is well known and this is perhaps the most famous and influential of all his critical writings, "Tradition and the Individual Talent". It appeared late in 1919 but was actually written two years earlier in 1917 when he was not quite thirty. In June 1917 Eliot became assistant editor of *The Egoist*, because when Richard Aldington was called up for military service in the First World War Ezra Pound nominated Eliot to Miss Weaver to fill his place. Eliot mentioned two big influences on his work at this period: "that of Irving Babbitt and that of Ezra Pound."¹⁰ Under the influence of Pound he came to know Remy de Gourmont and Henry James. We can see the influence of Remy de Gourmont in "The Perfect Critic" in which Eliot used a quotation from Gourmont as a preface and in which he also wrote that "Of all modern critics, perhaps Remy de Gourmont had most of the general intelligence of Aristotle."¹¹ Bernard Bergonzi pointed out that "It was from Gourmont that Eliot acquired the ideas of impersonality, and in part at least, of the dissociation of sensibility, though Eliot, having a more powerful mind, was able to do more with these ideas than Gourmont ever could."¹²

As to Irving Babbitt, Eliot wrote that "The influence of Babbitt...is apparent in my recurrent theme of Classicism versus Romanticism."¹³ But he confessed that "as for Classicism and Romanticism, I find that the terms have no longer the importance to me that they once had."¹⁴ From Babbitt, who was his Harvard teacher, Eliot learned the philosophy of Humanism and wrote two essays on it: "The Humanism of Irving Babbitt" which is included in *For Lancelot Andrewes* (1928) and "Second Thoughts about Humanism" (1929). He also learned from Babbitt not only the importance of classicism but also that of tradition, ideas which were later to be reinforced by the influence of T. E. Hulme and Charles Maurras and the French neoclassical movement.

The second period was, from 1918 (the year when *The Egoist* had come to an end) to 1930, when he was primarily writing for two editors: Middleton Murry in *The Athenaeum*, and Bruce Richmond in *The Times Literary Supplement*. In particular, Eliot referred to the years of *The Athenaeum* (1917-1920) in the Preface to the 1928 Edition in *The Sacred Wood* saying, "Those were years in which we were struggling to revive old communications and to create new ones; and I believe that both Mr. Murry and myself are a little more certain of our directions than we were then."¹⁵ The third period was "one of public lectures and addresses rather than of articles and reviews."¹⁶ Thus his later criticism took the form of lectures or addresses which Eliot called "more detached and...more judicial essays."¹⁷ Eliot wrote that his early essays "were all written for money, which I needed, and the occasion was always a new book about an author, a new edition of his works, or an anniversary."¹⁸ It was true that he had to make a small amount of money quickly, but it was not that he wrote his early criticism only for mak-

ing money. He had to face another problem of how to write poetry in the poetic situation. He wrote that "In the first decade of the century the poetic situation was unusual. I cannot think of a single living poet, in either England or America, then at the height of his power, whose work was capable of pointing the way to a young poet conscious of the desire for a new idiom."¹⁹ He was also reacting against the impressionistic criticism which flourished in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

At the outset of "To Criticize the Critic" Eliot proposed to draw some conclusions concerning the field of his own literary criticism. He made a distinction between "the essays of generalization" and "appreciations of individual authors". In short, he believed that there was "an important line of demarcation between the essays of generalization (such as "Tradition and the Individual Talent") and appreciations of individual authors."²⁰ He also believed that the second category was more likely to retain some value for future readers. It is disputable whether he was right in that judgment. However he was right in judging that the most influential of his essays were among the earliest. Especially the works in question are "essays of generalization" such as "Tradition and the Individual Talent," "The Metaphysical Poets," and "Hamlet and His Problems." Frank Kermode pointed out that these essays "have their origins in his own creative reading of past poetry, and in his programme for new poetry, his own and others', about the time of *Gerontion* and *The Waste Land*."²¹ When Eliot was talking about his own criticism, he asserted that "it is a by-product of my private poetry workshop; or a prolongation of the thinking that went into the formation of my own verse," examples of which are quoted above. From this it follows that Eliot's criticism is the formulated expression of his experience as a poet. Most of the critics of Eliot have approached his critical writings as an aid to the understanding of his poetry. F. O. Matthiessen explained Eliot's poetry in the light of his criticism. Matthiessen wrote a chapter on "Tradition and the Individual Talent" in which he expounded Eliot's idea of tradition from his poetry.

In the course of "To Criticize the Critic" Eliot touched on the terms of the "objective correlative" and the "dissociation of sensibility". Eliot's famous concept of the "objective correlative" appeared in his 1919 essay on "Hamlet and His Problems" and is formulated as follows: "The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an 'objective correlative'; in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked."²² The term "dissociation of sensibility" was first used in 1921 in his review of Grierson's *Metaphysical Poetry*. The concept of the "dissociation of sensibility" is formulated in his essay on "The Metaphysical Poets" in *Homage to John Dryden*: "In the seventeenth century a dissociation of sensibility set in, from which we have never recovered; and this dissociation, as is natural, was aggravated by the influence of the two most powerful poets of the century, Milton and Dryden...But while the language became more refined, the feeling became more crude."²³ Whereas in the metaphysical poets such as Chapman and Donne "there is a direct sensuous apprehension of thought, or a recreation

of thought into feeling."²⁴ There is another significant statement on the idea of the "dissociation of sensibility" in "Imperfect Critics" in *The Sacred Wood*: "The quality in question is not peculiar to Donne and Chapman. In common with the greatest—Marlowe, Webster, Tourneur, and Shakespeare—they had a quality of sensuous thought, or of thinking through the senses, or of the senses thinking, of which the exact formula remains to be defined....There is a trace of it only in Keats, and, derived from a different source, in Rossetti."²⁵

In "To Criticize the Critic" Eliot confessed that "the 'objective correlative' in the essay on Hamlet may stand for my bias towards the more mature plays of Shakespeare—Timon, Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus notably."²⁶ "And the 'dissociation of sensibility' may represent my devotion to Donne and the metaphysical poets, and my reaction against Milton."²⁷ F. R. Leavis evaluated highly the theory of the "dissociation of sensibility" and believed that the theory of the "dissociation of sensibility" was, in fact, an attempt to rewrite the history of English poetry.²⁸ Eliot went on to say that "whatever the future of these phrases...I think they have been useful in their time. They have been accepted, they have been rejected, they may soon go out of fashion completely: but they have served their turn as stimuli to the critical thinking of others. And literary criticism...is an instinctive activity of the civilized mind."²⁹ But he predicted that "if my phrases are given consideration, a century hence, it will be only in their historical context, by scholars interested in the mind of my generation."³⁰ In short, Eliot began to see his earlier criticism in a historical context.

Now we come to examine the theme of tradition. Eliot was preoccupied with the theme of tradition from the very beginning of his career. The theme of tradition was central to his poetry and to his criticism. He stated in "To Criticize the Critic" that "the emphasis on tradition came about, I believe, as a result of my reaction against the poetry, in the English language, of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and my passion for the poetry, both dramatic and lyric, of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries."³¹ As we have seen before, Eliot asserted that "something...had happened to the mind of England between the time of Donne or Lord Herbert of Cherbury and the time of Tennyson and Browning; it is the difference between the intellectual poet and the reflective poet. Tennyson and Browning are poets, and they think; but they do not feel their thought as immediately as the odour of a rose."³² The Elizabethan and Jacobean poets and dramatists, and the metaphysical poets "had a quality of sensuous thought, or of thinking through the senses, or of the senses thinking." In his essay on "Andrew Marvell" (1921) Eliot traced a tradition of metaphysical wit whose theme is "one of the great traditional commonplaces of European literature."³³ The "alliance of levity and seriousness (by which the seriousness is intensified)"³⁴ is a characteristic of metaphysical wit. "It is a quality of a sophisticated literature; a quality which expands in English literature just at the moment before the English mind altered."³⁵ This tradition covers Horace, Catullus, Lucretius, Propertius, Ovid, the Elizabethan and Jacobean poets such as Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Donne, Marvell, the French poets of the nineteenth century

such as Gautier, Baudelaire, and Laforgue. In a way, it may be said that this tradition of metaphysical wit makes up Eliot's tradition. If Eliot's beginning as a critic is based on a metaphysical point of view, it is natural to see that his early and most influential criticism is the application of philosophy to literature, for Eliot's doctoral studies were in philosophy. For his doctoral dissertation Eliot dealt with the study of a distinguished English contemporary philosopher, F. H. Bradley. But Eliot proposed halting at the frontier of metaphysics at the end of "Tradition and the Individual Talent."

Eliot formulated his theory of tradition in "Tradition and the Individual Talent." In 1947 F. O. Matthiessen wrote that "'Tradition and the Individual Talent', which is probably his best-known essay, is now as much of a classic as Matthew Arnold's 'The Study of Poetry'."³⁶ As recently as 1984 Alan Weinblatt wrote that "Most recently we esteem Eliot's 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' as among the most enduring of his theoretical essays."³⁷ There was a time when critics such as F. R. Leavis condemned it for "its ambiguities, its logical inconsequences, its pseudo-precision, its fallaciousness, and the aplomb of its equivocations and its specious cogency."³⁸ Nevertheless, the ideas in the essay have become critical commonplaces. Wherever English literature is studied, nobody escapes it.

Hugh Kenner, who called Eliot "the Invisible Poet", wrote in his comment on "Tradition and the Individual Talent" that it "has been investigated with too much solemnity, as though it were Eliot's theory of poetry. It is not that; it is a meditation on how the old is related to the new."³⁹ It is clear that Hugh Kenner did not regard "Tradition and the Individual Talent" as Eliot's theory of poetry. As for the theme of the relation between the old and the new, Eliot pronounced in "The Function of Criticism" (1923) that "Tradition and the Individual Talent" dealt with "the subject of the relation of the new to the old in art."⁴⁰ The truth is, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" is Eliot's theory of poetry and also deals with the theme of the relation between the old and the new. Eliot holds "the conception of poetry as a living whole of all the poetry that has ever been written"⁴¹ in other words, the conception of the integrity of the present with the past.

Eliot wrote in "Tradition and the Individual Talent": "The progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality."⁴² "The business of the poet is not to find new emotions, but to use the ordinary ones and, in working them up into poetry, to express feelings which are not in actual emotions at all."⁴³ "Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality. But, of course, only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want to escape from these things."⁴⁴ It is apparent here that Eliot stressed the importance of impersonality. Eliot asserted that "The emotion of art is impersonal. And the poet cannot reach this impersonality without surrendering himself wholly to the work to be done. And he is not likely to know what is to be done unless he lives in what is not merely the present, but the present moment of the past, unless he is conscious, not of what is dead, but of what is already living."⁴⁵

As we have seen above, Eliot formulated not only the theory of tradition but also the "Impersonal theory of poetry" in "Tradition and the Individual Talent." Eliot formulated the impersonal theory so strongly and repeated it so often, it comes as something of a surprise to find that he did not make any remark on it at all in "To Criticize the Critic." As it has been pointed out, there was a change in the development of Eliot's theory of poetry. Eliot's theory of poetry in his later years is radically different from his impersonal theory of poetry and the theory of the "objective correlative" in his early years. The most revealing essay in this regard is "The Three Voices of Poetry" (1953), in which Eliot expressed the poetic process in detail: "He has something germinating in him for which he must find words; but he cannot know what words he wants until he has found the words; he cannot identify this embryo until it has been transformed into an arrangement of the right words in the right order. When you have the words for it, the 'thing' for which the words had to be found has disappeared, replaced by a poem."⁴⁶ "He does not know what he has to say until he has said it, and in the effort to say it he is not concerned with making other people understand anything. He is not concerned, at this stage, with other people at all: only with finding the right words or, anyhow, the least wrong words. He is not concerned whether anybody else will ever listen to them or not, or whether anybody else will ever understand them if he does. He is oppressed by a burden which he must bring to birth in order to obtain relief. Or, to change the figure of speech, he is haunted by a demon, a demon against which he feels powerless, because in its first manifestation it has no face, no name, nothing; and the words, the poem he makes, are a kind of form of exorcism of this demon. In other words again, he is going to all that trouble, not in order to communicate with anyone, but to gain relief from acute discomfort; and when the words are finally arranged in the right way—or in what he comes to accept as the best arrangement he can find—he may experience a moment of exhaustion, of appeasement, of absolution, and of something very near annihilation, which is in itself indescribable. And then he can say to the poem: 'Go away! Find a place for yourself in a book—and don't expect me to take any further interest in you.'"⁴⁷

Here Eliot does not seem to be interested in abstract theory as he used to have been in his earlier years. Is there a continuity between Eliot's "Impersonal theory of poetry" and his theory of poetry in his later years which he described in "The Three Voices of Poetry"? If there is, in what way is the gap between them bridged? There must have been many causes for the change in the development of his theory of poetry. Eliot did not deny that the critic traced the poem back to its origins, but he asserted that the origins would distract attention to something other than the poem. He wrote: "I don't believe that the relation of a poem to its origins is capable of being more clearly traced.... But if, either on the basis of what poets try to tell you, or by biographical research, with or without the tools of the psychologist, you attempt to explain a poem, you will probably be getting further and further away from the poem without arriving at any other destination. The attempt to explain the poem by tracing it back to its origins will distract attention from the poem, to direct it on to something else which, in the form in which it can be apprehended by the critic and his readers, has no relation to the poem and

throws no light upon it."⁴⁸ Though Eliot denied that a poet's personal experience would throw light upon the poem, we assume that the poet's biographical experience may elucidate the poem. As he wrote in a letter to *The Athenaeum*, published on June 25, 1920, that "the creation of a work of art is like some other forms of creation, a painful and unpleasant business; it is a sacrifice of the man to the work, it is a kind of death,"⁴⁹ Eliot regarded poetic creation very painful. Bernard Bergonzi pointed out that "It is in this context that Eliot's doctrine of 'impersonality' must be understood. To some extent he can be blamed for not making his ideas clearer in 'Tradition and the Individual Talent,' which is indeed an ambiguous document."⁵⁰

Now returning to Eliot's theory of tradition; Eliot wrote in the introduction to *The Sacred Wood* that "It is part of the business of the critic to preserve tradition—where a good tradition exists. It is part of his business to see literature steadily and to see it whole; and this is eminently to see it not as consecrated by time, but to see it beyond time; to see the best work of our time and the best work of twenty-five hundred years ago with the same eyes."⁵¹ Thus Eliot believed that the business of the critic is to preserve tradition. On the other hand, he also believed that a mature poet should be "one who not merely restores a tradition which has been in abeyance, but one who in his poetry re-twines as many straying strands of tradition as possible."⁵²

The idea of tradition which Eliot formulated in "Tradition and the Individual Talent" is described in the following: "Yet if the only form of tradition, of handing down, consisted in following the ways of the immediate generation before us in a blind or timid adherence to its successes, 'tradition' should positively be discouraged. We have seen many such simple currents soon lost in the sand; and novelty is better than repetition. Tradition is a matter of much wider significance. It cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labour. It involves, in the first place, the historical sense, which we may call nearly indispensable to anyone who would continue to be a poet beyond his twenty-fifth year; and the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional. And it is at the same time what makes a writer most acutely conscious of his place in time, of his contemporaneity."⁵³ Eliot emphasized that tradition "cannot be inherited," that it can only be obtained "by great labour." The interaction between the past and the present forms the very foundation of Eliot's theory of tradition. In other words, his theory of tradition is concentrated on the interaction between tradition and the individual talent. In order to reach the interaction between the past and the present, a writer must have the historical sense. It is the historical sense that makes a writer traditional. The relation between tradition and the individual talent is expressed in the following passage: "The existing monuments

form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted; and this is conformity between the old and the new. Whoever has approved this idea of order, of the form of European, of English literature, will not find it preposterous that the past should be altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past. And the poet who is aware of this will be aware of great difficulties and responsibilities."⁵⁴ As to the relation of the poet to the past, what is to be demanded of the poet is that he "must develop or procure the consciousness of the past and that he should continue to develop this consciousness throughout his career."⁵⁵ The only means by which the poet can have access to tradition is by "a continual surrender of himself," "a continual self-sacrifice," and by "a continual extinction of personality." Thus Eliot's "impersonal theory of poetry" is related to the theory of tradition.

I have attempted to explain what Eliot thought he had accomplished as a literary critic and for the purpose of this study I have concentrated primarily on Eliot's last essay, "To Criticize the Critic." To have a better understanding of what he was trying to do in this essay I have also referred to his earlier criticism.

During my research into his criticism I have come to understand what Eliot's major critical ideas are: tradition, impersonality, objective correlative, and dissociation of sensibility. I find that these critical ideas which are originally purely literary in his early criticism take on religious complexion in his later criticism. I have not yet succeeded in tracing the evolution of his major critical ideas, but did end up knowing what is meant by them. In my next study of Eliot's criticism I will confine myself to the theory of tradition and will try to trace in what way a change of emphasis took place in the course of the development of his criticism.

NOTES

1. T. S. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), p. 11.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
5. This is quoted in Rajnath, *T. S. Eliot's Theory of Poetry* (India: Arnold-Heinemann, 1980), p. 13. (Eliot, "Author and Critic." The John Hayward bequest, King's College, Cambridge, pp. 8-9).
6. T. S. Eliot, "The Frontiers of Criticism," *On Poetry and Poets* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1957), p. 117.
7. F. O. Matthiessen, *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*, Third edition with a chapter by C. L. Barber, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 153.
8. F. R. Leavis, "T. S. Eliot as Critic," *Anna Karenina and Other Essays*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1973), p. 177.
9. This is quoted in Bernard Bergonzi, *T. S. Eliot* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), p. 56.
10. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 17.
11. T. S. Eliot, "The Perfect Critic," *The Sacred Wood* (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 13.
A little before in the same essay Eliot wrote that "Aristotle had what is called the scientific mind—a mind which...might better be called the intelligent mind."
12. Bernard Bergonzi, *T. S. Eliot.*, p. 59.
13. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 17.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
15. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood*, p. viii.
16. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 18.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
19. Eliot, "American Literature and the American Language," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 58.
20. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 18.
21. Frank Kermode, Introduction to *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), p. 13.
22. Eliot, "Hamlet and His Problems," *The Sacred Wood*, p. 100.
23. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot.*, p. 64.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
25. Eliot, "The Imperfect Critics," *The Sacred Wood*, p. 23.
26. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 19.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
28. F. R. Leavis, *English Literature in Our Time and the University*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1969), p. 73.
29. Eliot, "To Criticize the Critic," *To Criticize the Critic*, p. 19.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, p. 64.
33. Eliot, "Andrew Marvell," *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, p. 163.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
36. F. O. Matthiessen, *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*, p. 3.
37. Alan Weinblatt, *T. S. Eliot and the Myth of Adequation* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984), p. 37.
38. F. R. Leavis, "T. S. Eliot as Critic," *Anna Karenina and Other Essays*, p. 179.
39. Hugh Kenner, *The Invisible Poet: T. S. Eliot* (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 99.
40. Eliot, "The Function of Criticism," *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, p. 68.
41. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," *The Sacred Wood*, p. 53.
42. *Ibid.*

43. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
46. Eliot, "The Three Voices of Poetry," *On Poetry and Poets*, p. 106.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108.
49. This is quoted in Bergonzi, *T. S. Eliot*, pp. 66-67.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
51. Eliot, Introduction to *The Sacred Wood*, p. xvi.
52. This is quoted in F. O. Matthiessen, *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*, p. 10.
53. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," *The Sacred Wood*, pp. 48-49.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

*** I would like to thank Professor Thomas Guerin for his aid in the preparation of this manuscript.