

Eliot as a Christian Critic : In Defence of *After Strange Gods*

Naoko Morita

I

In October 1932 Eliot returned to America for the first time in seventeen years. He had not visited the United States since 1915, when he had gone back home to tell his parents of his marriage and of his decision to settle in England. He accepted Harvard University's invitation to be Charles Eliot Norton Professor of Poetry during the academic year of 1932-33. These Harvard lectures were entitled "Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England", and dealt with the history of the literary criticism of the Elizabethan period, the age of Dryden, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Shelley and Keats, Matthew Arnold, and the Modern mind. These lectures were published in 1933 as *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*. In the autumn of 1933 Eliot paid another visit to America and delivered the Page Barbour Lectures at the University of Virginia at Charlottesville which were published early in 1934 as *After Strange Gods*, subtitled *A Primer of Modern Heresy*.

What is noticeable in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* in connection with *After Strange Gods* is that in the section on "The Modern Mind" Eliot promised to write a book on "the influence of the devil on contemporary literature"¹, which resulted in *After Strange Gods*. Another thing to notice is that Eliot seems to have had criteria of criticism in mind which turned out to be the subject matter in *After Strange Gods*, for Eliot quotes from Maritan, who is a theologian as well as philosopher, and who has a strong conviction that poetry will not save us, 'The unconcealed and palpable influence of the devil in an important part of contemporary literature ... is one of the significant phenomena of the history of our time.'² and states, "I can hardly expect most of my readers to take this remark seriously; those who do will have very different criteria of criticism from those who do not"³ Eliot agrees with Maritan's declaration that "It is a deadly error to expect poetry to provide the super-substantial nourishment of man,"⁴ for Eliot stresses that poetry cannot become a substitute for religion.

F. R. Leavis, who was once so favourable to Eliot's critical attitude, took a critical stance on *After Strange Gods*.⁵ Though three thousand copies of the London edition, and fifteen hundred copies of the New York edition of *After Strange Gods* were printed, Eliot, having given in to hostile criticism, never allowed it to be reprinted after its first publication. Stephen Spender

touched on *After Strange Gods*, saying that "In a letter (May 9, 1935) about my critical volume he is severe with me whilst also being severe with his own *After Strange Gods* (though he also writes that he thinks his criticism in that volume is more interesting than his early work (*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*); later he came to dislike it more than any book he had published). He says that the danger of this kind of criticism is that one reads in order to prove one's point."⁶ Spender asserted even in 1975 that "*After Strange Gods* is certainly in many respects a sick book and Eliot was doubtless justified in withdrawing it."⁷

Although Eliot disavowed *After Strange Gods* and never allowed it to be reissued, there is an undeniable fact that he was not entirely dissatisfied with it at the time. He said in a letter to the *New English Weekly* (14 June, 1934), that he thought "*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* was an attempt to say things which were not on the whole worth saying, *After Strange Gods* was an unsatisfactory attempt to elucidate an important subject."⁸ Another thing which makes me stick to *After Strange Gods* is that at the very outset of *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot* F. O. Matthiessen writes that "In *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy*, T. S. Eliot stated that his aim was to develop further the theme of 'Tradition and the Individual Talent,' which is probably his best-known essay."⁹ It is said that Matthiessen's *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot* grew out of his encounter with Eliot and Eliot's work when Eliot was Norton lecturer at Harvard in 1932-33. Matthiessen pointed out that there was a shift in Eliot's growth during the fourteen years between *The Sacred Wood* (1920) and *After Strange Gods* (1934). Meanwhile he was converted into Anglo-Catholicism in 1927. He became interested in Christian Orthodoxy which is said to be apparent in *For Lancelot Andrewes* (1928), I am particularly interested in the development and growth of the idea of tradition from "Tradition and the Individual Talent" to *After Strange Gods*.

The main purpose of this study is to investigate what he said in *After Strange Gods* and what he wished to do by saying it, in other words, what the ultimate object of his criticism in *After Strange Gods* was. Despite the fact that he was not entirely dissatisfied with it, why did he have to withdraw it? Why was it called a sick book? I should like to see if there is any possibility that *After Strange Gods* could be more sympathetically understood in the late 1980's than it was in the 1930's.

II

Eliot opens the first lecture, on "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1919), by saying that "I do not repudiate what I wrote in that essay". However, things have changed during the fifteen years and "The problem, naturally, does not seem to me so simple as it seemed then, nor could I treat it now as a purely literary one."¹⁰ In other words, he is setting out to rewrite his early important

essay in which he formulated the theory of tradition. It was essentially a literary concept in 1919.

Eliot is addressing an audience at the University of Virginia. Here he is a kind of flatterer his audience by saying that “you have here, I imagine, at least some recollection of a ‘tradition’, such as the influx of foreign populations has almost effaced in some parts of the North, and such as never established itself in the West : though it is hardly to be expected that a tradition here, . . . , should be found in healthy and flourishing growth.”¹¹ He was much interested in the agrarian movement in the South. He was speaking to a Virginia audience as a New Englander. Actually he had become a British subject in 1927. Herbert Read depicted Eliot about that time as “a man who had lost all superficial trace of his American origin and who had already decided that his spiritual home was in England. The complexities involved in this decision were not to be appreciated by a true-born Englishman, but I was aware of the struggle that was going on in Eliot’s mind.”¹² Eliot had written to Herbert Read in 1928, “Some day, I want to write an essay about the point of view of an American who wasn’t an American, because he was born in the South and went to school in New England as a small boy . . . , but who wasn’t a southerner in the South because his people were northerners in a border state and looked down on all southerners and Virginians, and who so was never anything anywhere and who therefore felt himself to be more a Frenchman than an American and more an Englishman than a Frenchman and yet felt that the U. S. A. up to a hundred years ago was a family extension. It is almost too difficult even for H. J. who for that matter wasn’t an American at all, in that sense.”¹³

Eliot went on to explain that “The Civil War was certainly the greatest disaster in the whole of American history ; it is just as certainly a disaster from which the country has never recovered, and perhaps never will : . . . Yet I think that the chances for the re-establishment of a native culture are perhaps better here than in New England.”¹⁴ As a New Englander he lamented that he came from a culture which had once possessed a tradition but which had by now almost entirely lost it in the progress of industrialism. Eliot said that “There are, at the present stage, more serious difficulties in the revival or establishment of a tradition and a way of life, which require immediate consideration.” But Eliot claimed that such a way of life still existed in the South and he had been much impressed by the Agrarian Movement in the South. In the Southern Agrarian’s book, *I’ll Take My Stand*, published in 1930, Eliot found minds akin to his own.

When Eliot uses the term ‘tradition’ in these lectures, it is no longer a word for a literary concept, but he appears to have broadened his concept of tradition. “Tradition is not solely, or even primarily the maintenance of certain dogmatic beliefs.” What he means by tradition ‘involves all those habitual actions, habits and customs, from the most significant religious rite to conventional way of greeting a stranger, which represent the blood kinship of ‘the same people living in the same place’.” He went on to explain that “a tradition without intelligence

is not worth having." In the society Eliot thinks desirable, "Stability is obviously necessary. You are hardly likely to develop tradition except where the bulk of the population is relatively so well off where it is that it has no incentive or pressure to move about. The population should be homogeneous; What is still more important is unity of religious background; and reasons of race and religion combine to make any large number of free-thinking Jews undesirable. And a spirit of excessive tolerance is to be deprecated."¹⁶ It is difficult to understand why Eliot made such an offensive remark. These words are the most damaging of all. That remark resulted in Eliot being called anti-Semitic. It was to stick to his reputation for the rest of his life.

Eliot told newspaper reporters, that he could not be anti-Semitic, because he was a Christian. Eliot said to William Turner Levy, years later, "I am grieved and sometimes angered by this matter.... I am not an anti-Semite and never have been. It seems to me unfortunate that persons give that odious term such a broad and ill-defined definition. American Jews are sensitive in a way you never find is true of their counterparts in England, although I can realize that there are several reasons for this." Those who slandered him, he said, "do not know, as you and I do, that in the eyes of the Church, to be anti-Semite is a sin."¹⁷

Sir Herbert Read who knew Eliot so well over a period of nearly fifty years wrote that "In all the years I knew him I never heard him express any sympathy for either Mussolini or Hitler – from his point of view they were godless men. 'The fundamental objection to fascist doctrine,' he once wrote, 'the one that we conceal from ourselves because it might condemn ourselves, is that it is pagan He believed in 'a community of Christians', ... and above all he believed in tradition. He knew that the values he cherished could not exist in the modern state, democratic or totalitarian". Herbert Read also wrote that "He has been accused of anti-Semitism, but again I never heard such sentiments from his own lips. I know that there are one or two phrases in his writings that lend some substance to this accusation, but all of us, if we are honest with ourselves, must confess to a certain spontaneous xenophobia. It is an instinct that the educated man controls or eradicates, and in that respect Eliot was as controlled as the best of us."¹⁸

George Orwell took up this accusation against Eliot in a letter to Julian Symonds (29 October 1948), when F. R. Fyvel, a friend of Orwell's, and then literary editor of *Tribune*, had revived charges of "anti-Semitism" against Eliot, at a very late date. "It is nonsense that Fyvel said about Eliot being antisemitic," Orwell wrote. "Of course you can find what would now be called antisemitic remarks in his early work, but who didn't say such things at that time? One has to draw a distinction between what was said before and what after 1934. Of course all these nationalistic prejudices are ridiculous, and disliking Jews isn't intrinsically worse than disliking Negroes or Americans or any other block of people. In the early twenties, Eliot's antisemitic remarks were about on a par

with the automatic sneer one casts at Anglo-Indian colonels in boarding houses. On the other hand if they had been written after the persecutions began they would have meant something quite different... Some people go round smelling after antisemitism all the time."¹⁹ At any rate Eliot was very insensitive when he referred to "free-thinking Jews" in *After Strange Gods*. He was attacked for such occasional early expressions. There are several remarks in his early poems which suggest some prejudice against Jews such as *Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a Cigar*. According to Russell Kirk, these allusions in the poems, which employ the Jew as a symptom of a crass commercialism are considered a convention of English literature, from Marlowe to Dickens and later, in many writers of the 1920's and 1930's. Compared with Chesterton and Belloc, anti-Jewish feeling is much less conspicuous in Eliot's work. These allusions are used almost unconsciously even in the correspondence of writers so liberal as Bertland Russell. Russell Kirk stated that "All this would change, especially in Eliot, when the doom of the Jews under the Nazis transformed literary suspicion into horror and compassion." He also stated that "Those who read *After Strange Gods* unaffected by the prejudices of ideology should find this essay courageous and lively."²⁰

We return to the idea of tradition. On that matter Eliot stood firm on the ground that he had taken in "Tradition and the Individual Talent", but now the purely literary principles of "Tradition and the Individual Talent" were not adequate for him any more. He discarded the use of the terms of Classicism and Romanticism, by saying that the relation of the concept of tradition and orthodoxy was more fundamental than the pair Classicism and Romanticism. The concept of orthodoxy is contrasted with heterodoxy / heresy.

In *After Strange Gods* Eliot enlarged the notion of tradition. As the term tradition implies a good deal more than 'traditional religious beliefs', so he is giving the term orthodoxy a similar inclusiveness. He says that "though of course I believe that a right tradition for us must be also a Christian tradition, and that orthodoxy in general implies Christian orthodoxy, I do not propose to lead the present series of lectures to a theological conclusion."²¹

He was talking about the relation between "the Liberalism which attacked the Church and the Liberalism which appeared in politics. He was attacking Liberalism. He stated that his intentions in these lectures was to apply "the standard of orthodoxy to contemporary literature."²² He divided contemporary literature into "orthodoxy" and "heretical." He uses the term heretics in the context that "they have an exceptionally acute perception, or profound insight, of some part of the truth."²³ Moreover he asserts that "an heresy is apt to have a deductive simplicity to make a direct and persuasive appeal to intellect and emotions and to be altogether more plausible than the truth."²⁴

He takes up the contrast of romanticism and classicism again. As for classicism, he quotes from Middleton Murry in "The Function of Criticism", "Catholicism ... stands for the principles of unquestioned spiritual authority

outside the individual; that is also the principle of classicism in literature."²⁵ This is one of the uses of the word classicism, but it is the most important and significant meaning of the word in his writings.

Eliot mentioned several times that the words 'classic' and 'romantic' are controversial. He says that writers should not be too much concerned with romanticism and classicism. "Any poet who has attempted to write as a 'romantic' or as a 'classicist' would not gain anything but harm."²⁶ It is not too much to say that in most contexts Eliot used 'classical' to mean traditional, and 'romantic' to mean individual. Later Eliot dealt with the classic-romantic antithesis in "What Is a Classic" (1944). In "Dante" (1950) he defined classicism as mature literary orthodoxy, and the classical poet as one who serves his language consciously. The words 'classic' and 'romantic' have respectively several meanings. 'Romantic' for example, means imaginative. Another meaning of 'romanticism' is Nineteenth Century Romanticism. We find Eliot's most important criticism of Nineteenth Century Romanticism in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* in the chapters "Wordsworth and Coleridge," "Shelley and Keats," and "Matthew Arnold". We may say that in general the Nineteenth Century Romantics considered emotion to be the true motive and material for art.

In the course of this discussion of the terms Eliot touched on the preface in *For Lancelot Andrews* in which he "made a sort of summary declaration of faith in matters religious, political and literary."²⁷ He made his position clear by saying that "the general point of view may be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion."²⁸ But when he published *For Lancelot Andrewes* as *Essays Ancient and Modern* in 1936, he omitted the preface "which has more than served its turn."²⁹

He explained in *After Strange Gods*: "the facility with which this statement has been quoted has helped to reveal to me that as it stands the statement is injudicious. It may suggest that the three subjects are of equal importance to me, which is not so; it may suggest that I accept all three beliefs on the same grounds, which is not so, and it may suggest that I believe that they all hang together or fall together which would be most serious misunderstanding of all. That there are connections for me I of course admit, but these illuminate my own mind rather than the external world; and I now see the danger of suggesting to outsiders that the Faith is a political principle or a literary fashion, and the sum of all a dramatic posture."³⁰ Eliot might have thought that among the three subjects one is "The Faith", whereas the other two are merely a "political principle" and a "literary fashion." Eliot seems to have encountered difficulties in his conversion. However, he has never tried to explain his conversion in his writings, though they say there are some hints in his later poetry. On this matter John Hayward has rightly described as "a triple affirmation of a single belief — belief in the value of Tradition."³¹ Eliot himself remarked about it in 1961 that "Well, my religious beliefs are unchanged, and I am strongly in favour of the maintenance of the monarchy; as for Classicism and Romanticism, I find

that the terms have no longer the importance to me that they once had. But even if my statement of belief needed no qualification at all after the passage of the years, I should not be inclined to express it in quite this way."³²

In relation to the use of the terms, Eliot touched on another matter, the criticism of Paul Elmer More for Eliot's incoherence between his poetry and his criticism. Paul Elmer More's contention is that in Eliot's words, "while I maintain the most correct opinions in my criticism, I do nothing but violate them in my verse; and thus appear in a double, if not double-faced role."³³ In short, More came to the conclusion that although Eliot formulated classical ideas in his criticism, in his poetry which is essentially romantic, he failed to adhere to these ideas.

Eliot answered this criticism in *After Strange Gods* by saying that "in one's prose reflections one may be legitimately occupied with ideas, whereas in the writing of verse one can only deal with actuality."³⁴ However, there are other critics such F. O. Matthiessen, F. R. Leavis, M. C. Bradbrook, Kristian Smidt, and others, who emphasize the essential unity of Eliot's writings. For these critics Eliot's critical writings are a commentary on his poetry. As F. O. Matthiessen has pointed out: "His criticism steadily illuminates the aims of his verse, while his verse illustrates many aspects of his critical theory."³⁵ Eliot seemed to have had this point of view in common with those critics, when he says, "the poetic critic is criticizing poetry in order to create poetry." He also says that his own criticism is "a by-product of his private poetry workshop; or a prolongation of the thinking that went into the formation of his own verse."

Now returning to the relation between tradition and orthodoxy, Eliot defines the concept of orthodoxy along with the concept of tradition: "I hold – in summing up – that a tradition is rather a way of feeling and acting which characterizes a group throughout generations: and that it must largely be, or that many of the elements in it must be unconscious; whereas the maintenance of orthodoxy is a matter which calls for the exercise of all our conscious intelligence. The two will therefore considerably complement each other."³⁶ Eliot continues, "Tradition may be conceived as a by-product of right living, not to be aimed at directly. It is of the blood, so to speak, rather than of brain; it is the means by which the vitality of the past enriches the life of the present. In the co-operation of both is the reconciliation of thought and feeling."³⁷

III

At the outset of the second lecture Eliot is cautious to say that the terms tradition and orthodoxy he is using are different from the same terms in theology. As we have seen, the term tradition has in particular changed. Tradition was enlarged to imply "all those habitual actions, habits and customs." He asserts that he is not concerned with dogmatic theology, but is concerned with the results of the lack of tradition. The one result leads to extreme individualism,

and the other leads to the idea that poetry can replace religion.

Furthermore, Eliot makes a distinction between the usual sense of orthodoxy and the sense of orthodoxy which he is using here. He discovers the concept of orthodoxy in the Church itself. As F. O. Matthiessen has pointed out, what Eliot stresses in his account of the importance of orthodoxy is 'the inherited wisdom of the race.' Eliot says that at the present time what they can try to do is "to develop a more critical spirit, or rather to apply to authors critical standards which are almost in desuetude."³⁸

Eliot proceeds "to apply to authors critical standards which are almost in desuetude", in other words, "to apply the standards of orthodoxy to contemporary literature." For this purpose he chooses two sets of examples: one example is a group of stories, and the other is a number of modern poets. The stories are Katherine Mansfield's *Bliss*, D. H. Lawrence's *The Shadow in the Rose Garden*, and James Joyce's *The Dead*. All three stories centre on the same theme of disillusion. In Mansfield's story a wife is disillusioned about her relations with her husband. In the other two a husband is disillusioned about his relations with his wife. Eliot says that "what is interesting in the three together is the differences of moral implication."³⁹ He concludes that in Mansfield's story "moral implication is negligible: the centre of interest is the wife's feeling, first of ecstatic happiness, and then at the moment of revelation. We are given neither comment nor suggestion of any moral issue of good and evil. The story is limited to this sudden change of feeling, and the moral and social ramifications are outside of the terms of reference."⁴⁰

In Lawrence's story he is concerned with the feelings of both husband and wife. There is no moral or social sense in the relations of Lawrence's men and women. Eliot concludes that in Lawrence's story "the characters themselves, who are supposed to be recognisably human beings, betray no respect for, or even awareness of, moral obligations, and seem to be unfurnished with even the most commonplace kind of conscience."⁴¹

Only in Joyce's story does Eliot find some moral implication. He explains, "we are not concerned with the author's beliefs, but with orthodoxy of sensibility and with the sense of tradition, our degree of approaching, 'that region where dwell the vast hosts of the dead' (this phrase is quoted from Joyce's *The Dead*). And Lawrence is for my purposes, an almost perfect example of the heretic. And the most ethically orthodox of the more eminent writers of my time is Mr. Joyce. I confess that I do not know what to make of a generation which ignores these considerations."⁴²

As we have seen above, only in Joyce does Eliot find "orthodoxy of sensibility", and calls Joyce "the most ethically orthodox of the more eminent writers of my time", and calls Lawrence "an almost perfect example of the heretic". Eliot said that he happened to read these stories at the same time, when he was at Harvard. They have a common theme – the theme of disillusion, in other words, betrayal and suffering in marriage. At the time when Eliot accepted Harvard University's

invitation, life with his wife Vivienne was growing unendurable. He was almost making up his mind to leave his wife. The details of the life may not be important things, but they may give us clues to understanding.

Eliot, in his final lecture at Harvard, ends with these sentences: "If, as James Thomson observed, 'lips only sing when they cannot kiss,' it may be also that poets only talk when they cannot sing. I am content to leave my theorizing about poetry at this point. The sad ghost of Coleridge beckons to me from the shadows."⁴³ It is said that there are some meanings in this evocation of the sad ghost of Coleridge: one of them is that the marriage of Coleridge with Sarah Fricker had been a disaster: they had lived together only fifteen years, and Coleridge had seen as little as he might of his wife after the first nine years; later in life, though nominally they were still man and wife, they never met.

Eliot's marriage, by 1933, had endured for eighteen years, now he was making up his mind to separate from his wife. It does not seem accidental that Eliot chose the theme of disillusion. This theme of disillusion leads us to "*Dante*" (1929) in which Eliot is dealing with the *Vita Nuova*. This philosophy is summed up as follows: "not to expect more from life than it can give or more from human beings than they can give; to look to death for what life cannot give."⁴⁴ This Catholic philosophy of disillusion demands a high degree of resignation, but if one could reach it, it would soften the bitterness of disappointed expectation from life.

Eliot must have been looking for examples of moral implications. But on what grounds did Eliot make such a distinction between Lawrence and Joyce? Eliot's standard of moral implication does not seem clear. He asserts "that chief clue to the understanding of most contemporary Anglo-Saxon literature is to be found in the decay of Protestantism". The "rejection of Christianity – Protestant Christianity – is the rule among the modern writers and "individual writer can be understood and classified according to the type of Protestantism which surrounded their infancy, and the precise state of decay which it had reached."⁴⁵

Eliot says that "nothing could be drearier ... than the vague hymnsinging pietism which seems to have consoled the miseries of Lawrence's mother, and which does not seem to have provided her with any firm principles by which to scrutinize the conduct of her sons."⁴⁶ Does this mean that Eliot is despising and condemning Lawrence because he was brought up by the mother who did not have "any firm principles"? Joyce, on the other hand, was brought up with superior Jesuit education. I am not sure whether Joyce renounced Catholicism or not. At any rate Joyce was dissatisfied with the narrowness of Irish Catholicism.

Now Eliot attacks Irving Babbitt, Ezra Pound, I. A. Richards, W. B. Yeats, G. M. Hopkins one after another. At Harvard Eliot had studied under Babbitt. Although Eliot says he has the highest respect and admiration for the memory of Babbitt, Eliot attacks Babbitt by saying that "his attitude towards Christianity seems to me that of a man who had had no emotional acquaintance with any but

some debased and uncultured form."⁴⁷

Next he turns to Ezra Pound who is a counterpart of Irving Babbitt. Irving Babbitt has been prejudiced against Christianity, whereas Ezra Pound has been prejudiced against post-Protestantism. Eliot says that "he finds Guido much more sympathetic than Dante, namely, that Guido was very likely a heretic. Mr. Pound is an individualist, and still more a libertarian."⁴⁸

Eliot says that Mr. Pound is probably the most important living poet in our language. Before touching on Pound's poetry, Eliot attempts "to generalize, and suggest that with the disappearance of the idea of Original Sin, with the disappearance of the idea of intense moral struggle, the human beings presented to us both in poetry and in prose fiction today, and more patently among the serious writers than in the underworld of letters, tend to become less and less real." Eliot continues, "It is in fact in moments of moral and spiritual struggle depending upon spiritual sanction, rather than in those 'bewildering minutes' in which we are very much alike, that men and women come nearest to being real. If you do away with this struggle, and maintain that by tolerance, benevolence, inoffensiveness and a redistribution or increase of purchasing power, combined with a devotion, on the part of elite, to Art, the world will be as good as anyone could require, then you must expect human beings to become more and more vaporous."⁴⁹ This is exactly what Pound depicts in his *Draft of XXX Cantos: the Hell*. Eliot says that "Mr. Pound's Hell . . . is a perfectly comfortable one for the modern mind to contemplate, and disturbing to no one's complacency: it is a Hell for the other people, the people we read about in the newspapers, not for oneself and one's friends."⁵⁰

William Butler Yeats is treated as another example of the modern mind. Yeats in his earlier stage held the doctrine of Arnold, that poetry can replace religion. He also tended "to fabricate an individual religion". It was made up with "the rationalistic background". What he tried to do was to search for tradition. Yeats also tried to find the religious sources of poetry as D. H. Lawrence tried to seek for myth. Eliot says that "Mr. Yeats's supernatural world was the wrong supernatural world, because it was not a world of spiritual significance, not a world of real Good and Evil, of holiness or sin, but a highly sophisticated lower mythology, summoned like a physician, to supply the fading pulse of poetry with some transient stimulant so that the dying patient may utter his last words."⁵¹

As for Hopkins, a Jesuit priest, Eliot says that "I wish I could call him as the orthodox and traditional poet." "To be converted, in any case, while it is sufficient for entertaining the hope of individual salvation, is not going to do for a man, as a writer," Eliot continues, "Hopkins is not a religious poet in the more important sense in which I have elsewhere maintained Baudelaire to be a religious poet, or in the sense in which I consider Mr. Joyce's work to be penetrated with Christian feeling."⁵² In comparing Hopkins with Meredith, Hopkins has the dignity of the Church behind him, and is consequently in closer contact with

reality. However, in "the struggle of our time to concentrate . . . to renew our association with traditional wisdom; to reestablish a vital connection between the individual and the race; the struggle in a word, against Liberalism, Hopkins has very little aid to offer us."⁵³

IV

In the third lecture, Eliot first of all touches on the problem of blasphemy. It is only a matter of bad form in the modern world. In Eliot's opinion, "blasphemy is not a matter of good form but of right belief". Eliot believes that "first-rate blasphemy is one of the rarest things in literature, for it requires both literary genius and profound faith, joined in a mind in a peculiar and unusual state of spiritual sickness."⁵⁴ He is reproaching a world in which blasphemy is impossible, in other words, a faithless world. Eliot continues, "Where blasphemy might once have been a sign of spiritual corruption, in might now be taken rather as a symptom that the soul is still alive, or even that it is recovering animation; for the perception of Good and Evil – whatever choice we may make – is the first requisite of spiritual life."⁵⁵

Modern novelists are concerned with "their own personal view of life," and "personality". In the age of Jane Austin, Dickens, and Thackeray, their critical standards were not at least of their own making. They criticized their world according to the light of their age.

It was with George Eliot that the first suspicion of heresy creeps in. She, "at her best, had much profounder moral insight and passion . . . but unfortunately combined it with the dreary rationalism of the epoch of which she is one of the most colossal monuments." Eliot respects her for being a serious moralist, but deplores her individualistic morals."⁵⁶

Now Eliot reiterates the proper relation of orthodoxy to tradition: "What I have been leading up to is the following assertion: that when morals cease to be a matter of tradition and orthodoxy – that is, of the habits of the community formulated, corrected, and elevated by the continuous thought and direction of the Church – and when each man is to elaborate his own, then personality becomes a thing of alarming importance."⁵⁷

Eliot said that in the second lecture that he was dealing with "illustrating the limiting and crippling effect of a separation from tradition and orthodoxy upon certain writers." In the third lecture Eliot is concerned with "the intrusion of the diabolic into modern literature."⁵⁸ He gives only the two names of Thomas Hardy and Lawrence as examples of "the intrusion of the diabolic into modern literature". The nature of Eliot's judgment in Hardy's case seems to be described in the following passage: "The work of the late Thomas Hardy represents an interesting example of a powerful personality uncurbed by any institutional attachment or by submission to any objective beliefs; unhampered by any ideas or even by partial restraint upon inferior writers, the desire to please a large

public. He seems to me to have written as merely for the sake of 'self-expression', as a man well can; and the self which, he had to express does not strike me as a particularly wholesome or edifying the matter of communication. He was indifferent, even to the prescripts of good writing: he wrote sometimes overpoweringly well, but always very carelessly; at times his style touches sublimity without ever having passed through the stage of being good.⁵⁹

However, in spite of Eliot's remarks on Hardy which I have just quoted, it seems to me that Hardy did hold objective beliefs, he did desire to please a large audience, he did write for a public. Though Eliot says that Hardy wrote for self-expression, it does not seem that he did write only for self-expression. It does not seem that he was not aware of the prescripts of good writing. Eliot says that he did write well, and he was interested perhaps only in men as vehicles for emotions.

Eliot takes as examples the scene in *The Mayor of Casterbridge* which Eliot calls Hardy's finest novel and the scene in *Far From Madding Crowd*. With them Eliot thinks that "the author seems to be deliberately relieving some emotion of his own at the expense of the reader." Eliot continues, "It is a refined form of torture on the part of the writer, and refined form of self-torture on the part of the reader."⁶⁰ Hardy's short stories are some of the most significant of his texts, for example, *A Group of Noble Dames* from which Eliot says we can get essential Hardy without the Wessex staging. Eliot chooses *Barbara of the House of Crebe* which is he thinks the best for his purpose. *Barbara of the House of Crebe* is, as Hardy put it in the category of "romance and fantasy" in which we are introduced into a world of pure Evil, in contrast with Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and James's *Turn of Screw* which are "tales of horror" and a world of Good and Evil. The story seems to have written "solely to provide a satisfaction for some morbid emotion."⁶¹

Next example is D. H. Lawrence on whose morbidity Eliot has already touched in the second lecture. He regards Lawrence as "a very much greater genius, if not a greater artist, than Hardy." Eliot says that, in order to criticize Lawrence fairly, it is necessary to keep in mind the three aspects of Lawrence. The first aspect is "his lack of sense of humour," and "an incapacity for what we ordinarily call thinking." The second is "the extraordinarily keen sensibility and capacity for profound intuition." The third is "a distinct sexual morbidity."⁶² Eliot has already touched on the religious upbringing of Lawrence with "his lust for intellectual independence." Moreover, Lawrence hated orthodoxy. Lawrence has "the insensibility to ordinary social morality," which is so alien to Eliot's mind that he is baffled by it as "a monstrosity."

D. H. Lawrence, having started life "wholly free from any restriction of tradition or institution,...had no guidance except the Inner Light, the most untrustworthy and deceitful guide that ever offered itself to wandering humanity."

He had no faculty of self-criticism. Therefore, Lawrence, with "his acute sensibility, violent prejudices and passion, and lack of intellectual and social training, is admirably fitted to be an instrument for forces of good or for forces of evil".⁶³ Lawrence is contrasted with Joyce who is called "a trained mind", whereas Lawrence is called "an untrained mind", and "a soul destitute of humility and filled with self-righteousness", "a blind servant and a fatal leader". As far as Lawrence was concerned, any spiritual force was good, and evil existed only in the lack of spirituality. In other words, Lawrence was unable to distinguish spiritual forces for good from spiritual forces for evil. Most people are not awakened to the spiritual, but "Lawrence lived all his life... on the spiritual level." Lawrence spoke frequently against "the living death of modern material civilization." Eliot concludes that "The man's vision is spiritual, but spiritually sick."⁶⁵

The demonic powers found an instrument of far greater range, delicacy and power in the author of *The Prussian Officer* (Lawrence) than in the author of *A Group of Noble Dames* (Hardy). Writing of Lady Chatterley's lover, Eliot says that "Our old acquaintance, the game-keeper, turns up again: the social obsession which makes his well-born – or almost well-born – ladies offer themselves to – or make use of – plebeians springs from the same morbidity which makes other of his female characters bestow their favours upon savages. The author of that book seems to me to have been a very sick man indeed."⁶⁶ Lawrence tells us not to reconcile ourselves to Liberalism, Progress and Modern Civilization, and Eliot holds the same conviction. But Eliot is obsessed with the fear that "Lawrence's work may appeal, not to those who are well and able to discriminate, but to the sick and debile and confused; and will appeal not to what remains of health in them, but to their sickness."⁶⁷

As Eliot expressed in his preface that "I am uncertain of my ability to criticize my contemporaries as artists; I ascended the platform of these lectures only in the role of moralist.",⁶⁸ it is primarily in the role of a moralist that Eliot came to the conclusion that "Tradition by itself is not enough; it must be perpetually criticized and brought up to date under the supervision of what I call orthodoxy; and for the lack of this supervision it is now the sentimental tenuity that we find it. Most 'defenders of tradition' are mere conservatives, unable to distinguish between the permanent and the temporary, the essential and the accidental. But I left this theory as a bare outline to serve as a background for my illustration of the dangers of authorship today. Where there is no external test of the validity of a writer's work, we fail to distinguish between the truth of his view of life and the personality which makes it plausible".⁶⁹

The last of Eliot's Virginia lectures ends this way: "All that I have been able to do here is to suggest that there are standards of criticism not ordinarily in use, which we may apply to whatever is offered to us as works of philosophy or of art, which might help to render them safer and more profitable for us."⁷⁰

V

Thus Eliot attempted to demonstrate what those standards of criticism are, and how they should be applied to literature. He explained in the lectures that he would be “applying the standards of orthodoxy to contemporary literature”, “illustrating the limiting and crippling effect of a separation from tradition and orthodoxy upon certain writer”, and demonstrating “the intrusion of the diabolic into modern literature”. Nevertheless, at first, it was very abstruse, almost impossible to make out what Eliot meant by standards of criticism, and what the ultimate object of his criticism was.

F. R. Leavis was very helpful in saying that “Mr. Eliot’s stress in the book falls upon the religious needs of the age.”⁷¹ Leavis also pointed out that “Mr. Eliot has no need to talk hesitantly about the need for a religious sense; he adheres to a religion, and can point to his Church and recite its dogmas.”⁷² At the very beginning of the preface to *After Strange Gods* Eliot wrote: “Le monde moderne avilit”, the modern world is degrading. And the epigraph Eliot chose for the book is from the German critic Theodor Haecker, “Das Chaos in der Literatur”, the chaos in modern literature. To Eliot the modern world is becoming degraded, and is “an age of unsettled beliefs and enfeebled tradition”, and contemporary literature as a whole tends to be becoming degraded.

What he has been doing in these lectures is also described as his “... illustration of the dangers of the authorship today”.⁷³ In other words, *After Strange Gods*, subtitled *A Primer of Modern Heresy*, is a discussion of modern literary heretics. The dangers Eliot is referring to are not those for the author, but those for the reader. Eliot’s critical ideas in his later phase are influenced by T. E. Hulme. Hulme wrote in *Speculations* that “In the light of these absolute values (of religious ethics) man himself is judged to be essentially limited and imperfect. He is endowed with Original Sin.” Hulme continued, “A man is essentially bad, he can only accomplish anything of value by discipline, ethical and political.”⁷⁴ Eliot’s doctrine of human nature is much different from the Rousseau’s notion of man’s essential goodness. We should keep in mind that Hulme’s general attitude greatly influenced Eliot.

To be concrete, Eliot affirms that “the whole of modern literature is corrupted by what I call Secularism”. The literature we read “for amusement or purely for pleasure affects us as entire human beings; it affects moral and religious existence”. He goes on to say that “It is the literature which we read with the least effort that can have the easiest and most insidious influence upon us. Hence it is that the influence of popular novelists, and of popular plays of contemporary life, requires to be scrutinized most closely.”⁷⁵ That is why there should be standards of criticism. Eliot believes that “the weakness of modern literature, indicative of the weakness of the modern world in general, is a religious weakness, and ... all our social problems, including those of literature

and criticism, begin and end in a religious problem.”⁷⁶ The ultimate object of his criticism in *After Strange Gods* is a kind of Christian criticism, as F. R. Leavis pointed out, Eliot was concerned with “the religious need of the age”. For that purpose he applied his religion, the doctrine of Christian orthodoxy to contemporary literature. Stephen Spender has rightly said that “without Dante, as the supreme example of an orthodox writer, *After Strange Gods* could hardly have been written.”⁷⁷

Eliot described his intentions for *After Strange Gods* in a letter to Paul Elmer More of November 7th, 1933; “I have had to turn to the revision of my Virginia lectures which have to be published in the spring. Again, an unsatisfactory piece of work. A good subject, I think: fundamentally a criticism of the lack of moral criteria – at bottom of course, religious criteria – in the criticism of modern literature. But the treatment is very sketchy, and I cannot do anything satisfactory to myself in the time. I hope that the book (it is only three lectures) will not let me in for a great deal of controversy – not merely that Hardy is condemned – or that Lawrence appears as a *suppot de Satan* – but that on a fundamental matter like this I seem to take up an isolated position, and dissociate myself from most of my contemporaries, including Pound, Yeats, Richards, and Read.”⁷⁸

As we have seen above, Eliot was concerned with a criticism of the lack of moral and religious criteria in the criticism of modern literature in *After Strange Gods*, which he called “a good subject”. Therefore when Ezra Pound suggested in a review that “of the two books *The Use of Poetry* was the better”,⁷⁹ Eliot protested by saying that “Mr. Pound has done your readers a disservice in suggesting that a book of mine, which is an unsatisfactory attempt to say something worth saying, is more negligible than another book of mine which is an unsatisfactory attempt to say a variety of things most of which are not worth saying.”⁸⁰ As we can see from what I have just quoted above, Eliot was eager to defend *After Strange Gods* against its critics.

Eliot had set as his intentions back in the preface to the 1928 edition of *The Sacred Wood*, to leave “the domain of criticism of poetry” and “to touch on another problem of the relation of poetry to the spiritual and social life of its time and of other times”, because he had come to think that “poetry ... has something to do with morals, and with the religion, and even with politics perhaps”.⁸¹ Eliot was not satisfied with his Harvard lectures, as he called it “another unnecessary book”.⁸² He explained in a letter to More: “The subject of *The Use of Poetry* was undertaken merely because it seemed the one on which I could write with the minimum of new reading and thinking; the field of *After Strange Gods* was one to which my real interest had turned. I therefore feel more regret at the inadequacy of the latter than of the former. I am painfully aware that I need a much more extensive and profound knowledge of theology, for the sort of prose work that I should like to do – for pure literary criticism has ceased to interest me.”⁸³

Eliot seems to have lost interest for a time in literary criticism as a subject matter for primary concern. That is why he expressed his inability "to criticize my contemporaries as artists; I ascended the platform of these lectures only in the role of moralist." F. R. Leavis criticizes Eliot's *After Strange Gods*, where Eliot had professed to speak as a moralist and not as a literary critic: "I think he would have done well to remind himself that one cannot apply moral principles to literature without being a literary critic and engaging in literary criticism."⁸⁴ In other words, Leavis insists that moral or religious criticism cannot be a substitute for literary criticism. Eliot, distinguishing several categories of modern critics, in "To Criticise the Critic", called Leavis "the Critic as Moralist?" This implies that Leavis's work is not literary criticism in a strict sense, but at least it can be said that Leavis attempted to distinguish literary criticism from moral criticism. Leavis also criticizes Eliot saying, "And it has, more generally, to be said that since the religious preoccupation has become insistent in them Mr. Eliot's critical writings have been notable for showing less discipline of thought and emotion, less purity of interest, less power of sustained devotion and less courage than before."⁸⁵ Whereas F. O. Matthiessen stresses that "In the co-operation between tradition and orthodoxy 'is the reconciliation of thought and feeling.' And that brings us once more to the very heart of Eliot's most fundamental belief as an artist: the necessary union of intellect and emotion."⁸⁶ Stephen Spender points out that "After *For Lancelot Andrewes* literary criticism became an activity of whose limitation he was very aware and which interested him less than either theology or politics."⁸⁷

Eliot made his position more explicit in "Religion and Literature", published in 1935, which was also the year for the publication of *Murder in the Cathedral* and "Burnt Norton". Eliot explained how "Burnt Norton" began "with bits that had to be cut out of *Murder in the Cathedral*. Both of them deal with the religious theme. "Religion and Literature" is written from the religious point of view. Right at the beginning of the essay Eliot writes: "Literary criticism should be completed by criticism from a definite ethical and theological standpoint. ... The greatness of literature cannot be determined solely by literary standards; though we must remember that whether it is literature or not can be determined only by literary standards."⁸⁸ This indicates that he had already begun to look upon works of literature from a definitely theological point of view. Although he stresses that the greatness of literature can be judged only by theological and moral standards, what is important to notice here is that "we must remember that whether it is literature or not can be determined only by literary standards."⁸⁹ If we fail to observe this, we will be going amiss.

It is generally agreed that Eliot's best criticism is his early work, and that his decline as a critic dates from the time of *For Lancelot Andrewes*, that is, from the time of his conversion. In his later writings he stresses the importance of moral and religious standards in literary estimation. In *After Strange Gods* in particular Eliot chose to sacrifice literary criticism for theological or religious

requisites. The standards and criteria of criticism in *After Strange Gods* are specifically Christian, that is, Christian orthodoxy.

VI

Before we conclude, there still remains a very important point which has to be touched upon; that Eliot never allowed *After Strange Gods* to be reprinted. Two things have to be taken into consideration. One is the accusation of Eliot's anti-semitism, and the other is his treatment of Hardy and Lawrence in particular, as Eliot had foreseen a great deal of controversy when he had written to More that "Hardy is condemned or that Lawrence appears as a *suppôt de Satan*."

As for the accusation of Eliot's anti-semitism, as I have already mentioned, in the course of the first lecture there was the remark which was evidently regarded as anti-semitic: "... any large number of free-thinking Jews" is "undesirable". There is a very judicious and detailed explanation of the problem of Eliot's anti-semitism. A. D. Moody asserts that this notorious remark is not anti-semitic. He explains, "Nevertheless, the remark coincided with the establishment of the dictatorship of Hitler and the Nazi party in Germany – this had been going on throughout 1933, and was completed well before the end of the year – and the persecution of the Jews in Germany had been initiated with the proclamation of a national boycott of Jewish shop on 1st April 1933. Set in that context of political events, Eliot's remark becomes dangerously like Nazi propaganda. There is no reason to suppose that he was thinking of Germany when he made it – but it is precisely that which makes the remark so wrong. Eliot himself realized this, and refused to allow *After Strange Gods* to be reprinted. The reason, as he told J. M. Cameron, according to the latter's letter to the *New Statesman* of 7 October 1966, was that "he regretted the tone and content of the political remarks contained therein." In *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* Eliot returned to the preoccupations of the passage from *After Strange Gods*, and attempted to clear his thought of the accidental taint of anti-semitism.

The preface to that edition (the 1962 edition) speaks of changes in his view on social and political matters, or of 'the way in which I would express my views': 'the changes I have been observing would appear to be of the latter kind.' Clearly he was convinced that the point he wanted to make was not antisemitic, and he didn't mean to retract it; but the expression of it in *After Strange Gods* had been open to misunderstanding in the light of the Nazi persecution of the Jews, and that he tried to atone for by not reprinting that book, and to correct in the more careful formulations of *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. It does seem to me that, whatever else is to be said about it, his thought cannot justly be associated with Hitler's anti-semitism."⁹⁰

As for Eliot's treatment of Lawrence in *After Strange Gods* in which Lawrence was diagnosed as spiritually sick, Helen Gardner writes about *After Strange Gods* that it is "a book that reflects only too painfully the stresses and strains of the

period at which his lectures were delivered. Its harshness of tone is that of a man at odds with his own recent past who, in his wretchedness, is hot for certainties."⁹¹ She also writes that "Eliot's treatment of Hardy and Lawrence in his last lectures has always been held against him. With regard to Lawrence, it should be remembered that he was willing to be called for the defence in the Old Bailey case of the Crown vs. Penguin Books over *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. His brief of evidence, which I saw, made quite clear his repudiation of his attack on Lawrence. He was prepared to say that when he spoke of the author of that book as 'a very sick man indeed', he was very sick himself."⁹² Thus Eliot was willing to give evidence in court on the literary merits of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. And he is reported as having observed that at the period of his life when those lectures were delivered it was he, rather than Lawrence, who was sick.

Despite Eliot's protest to the contrary, We have to examine the relationship between the work and his personal life at the time when *After Strange Gods* was written. Stephen Spender writes that "When I first met him in 1928 Eliot was going through a period of great unhappiness in his private life, before he separated from his wife in 1932."⁹³ As early as 1925 Eliot was confiding to Bertrand Russell, who seems to have foreboded at once that she was mentally ill and should be judged accordingly. She was, he wrote, "a person who lives on a knife-edge".⁹⁴ In ten years since they had been married in 1915, her mental health had gone from bad to worse. Sir Herbert Read who was "a close witness of the tragic progress of his first marriage, whose first marriage was to break up under very similar circumstances, suggested once "the dissolution of the marriage".⁹⁵ Eliot, however, could not accept his drastic solution of the problem. It was about the time when he was coming to his painful decision to leave his wife that he received an invitation to return to his old University, Harvard in the autumn of 1932. Sencourt writes that "the long separation led Tom to a fuller realization of the hopelessness of their marriage. At one point during his stay at Harvard a letter was delivered from Vivienne asking if she might not come over to America and join him. As he read her entreaty, his arm recoiled from it as from an electric shock. His nerves could no longer face the prodigious effort he had made over seventeen years."⁹⁶ Sencourt continues, "It was in February 1933, just as he was occupied with his fifth Charles Eliot Norton lecture, that Tom wrote to his solicitor instructing him to prepare a Deed of Separation and enclosing a letter which the solicitor was to take personally to Vivienne – breaking the news."⁹⁷

Stephen Spender writes, "Eliot clearly felt that his wife's unhappiness and illness were in large measure his fault (though she had a history of nervous illness before she met him)... In the prose as well as the poetry which he wrote at this time he showed a puritan distaste for the pleasure of the senses. It was in this mood that in *After Strange Gods* he attacked Lawrence as spiritually sick and in some of the stories, an instrument of the daemonic powers. Spender

continues, "On one occasion he told me that when he wrote *After Strange Gods* he was in a state of unhappiness which distorted his judgment."⁹ In other words, Eliot came to think that when he condemned Lawrence it was he and not Lawrence who was sick.

William Empson quotes Eliot as saying of some of his prose: "I was very sick in soul when I wrote that passage ... and I wish now that I could rewrite such material entirely! Empson comments: "it seems to me that remarkably little attention has been paid to these reflections of his later years."¹⁰

As we have seen, Eliot was not entirely dissatisfied with *After Strange Gods* at the time. He was convinced that he was concerned with a good subject. Eliot said that *After Strange Gods* was an unsatisfactory attempt to say something worth saying. He declared positively that "the field of *After Strange Gods* was one to which my real interest had turned." Nevertheless, he withdrew it. In that respect to some degree one must agree with Stephen Spender who says, "*After Strange Gods* is certainly in many respects a 'sick' book, and Eliot was doubtless justified in withdrawing it." However to conclude that Eliot failed in his attempt to elucidate an important subject as a moralist critic or a Christian critic is going too far. Perhaps he failed in the attempt to combine literary, religious, social and political criticism to synthesize a critical philosophy and he might have succeeded as a Christian critic if he had made his Christianity invisible. On the contrary Eliot placed special emphasis on the dogma of Original Sin. He attempted to apply the concept of orthodoxy which he discovered in the Church to contemporary literature. In other words, the standards of criticism in *After Strange Gods* are those of Christian orthodoxy. Eliot desired the traditional wisdom of the Church to correct a deterioration in the modern world and it is not too much to say that *After Strange Gods* is a very important book for us who study Eliot in order to have a better understanding of Eliot the man and his work. I believe that Eliot was not a Nazi sympathiser nor an anti-Semite. His "notorious" remarks in the *After Strange Gods* can be forgiven as a momentary lapse by a man under great strain. I also believe that *After Strange Gods* will come to be more sympathetically understood in the future.

NOTES

1. T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London : Faber and Faber, 1933), p. 137.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
5. See F. R. Leavis's "Mr. Eliot, Mr. Wyndham Lewis and Lawrence", *Scrutiny* III (1934-35), pp. 184-191.
6. Stephen Spender, "Remembering Eliot," *T. S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*. Ed. by Allen Tate (New York : Dell Publishing Co., 1966), p. 55.
7. Stephen Spender, *Eliot* (Glasgow : William Collins Sons and Co., 1975), p. 144.
8. Quoted in Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot* (London : Hamish Hamilton, 1984), p. 200.

9. 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. 3.
10. T. S. Eliot, *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy* (London : Faber and, Faber, 1934), p. 15.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
12. Herbert Read, "T. S. E. — A Memoir", *T. S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*, pp. 14-15.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 16.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.
17. Quoted in Russell Kirk's *Eliot and His Age* (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 210.
18. Herbert Read, "T. S. E. — A Memoir," *T. S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*, p. 30.
19. Quoted in Kirk's *Eliot and His Age*, p. 211.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
21. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 21.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
25. T. S. Eliot, "The Function of Criticism," *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, edited with an Introduction by Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975), p. 70.
26. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 25.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
28. T. S. Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* (London: Faber and Faber, 1928), p. 7.
29. See T. S. Eliot's *Essays Ancient and Modern* (London: Faber and Faber, 1936), "... *For Lancelot Andrewes* has gone out of print. ... I have taken the opportunity of changing the title, ... of omitting the preface, ..." — "Preface", p. 5.
30. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 28.
31. John Hayward. Introduction to *T. S. Eliot: Selected Prose* (Harmondworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1953), p. 11.
32. Eliot, *To Criticise the Critic*, p. 15.
33. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 28
34. *Ibid.*
35. F. O. Matthiessen, *The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*, p. 99.
36. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 29.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
43. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, p. 156.
44. T. S. Eliot, "Dante," *Selected Essays* (London : Faber and Faber, 1969), p. 275.
45. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 38.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
47. *Ibid.*

48. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
52. *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
57. *Ibid.*
58. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
62. *Ibid.*
63. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
64. *Ibid.*
65. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
71. Leavis, *Scrutiny* III (1934-35), p. 184.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
73. Eliot, *After Strange Gods*, p. 62.
74. T. E. Hulme, *Speculations: Essays on Humanism and the Philosophy of Art*. Edited by Herbert Read (London : Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1925), p. 47.
75. Eliot, "Religion and Literature," *Selected Essays*, p. 396.
76. Quoted in Samuel Hynes's "The Trials of a Christian Critic," *The Literary Criticism of T. S. Eliot*, ed. by David Newton-De Mollna (University of London : The Athlone Press, 1977), p. 79.
77. Stephen Spender, *The Destructive Element* (London : Jonathan Cape, 1938), p. 154.
78. Quoted in Roger Kojecky's *T. S. Eliot's Social Criticism* (London : Faber and Faber, 1971), p. 77.
79. 'Possum', 'The Use of Poetry', *New English Weekly*, v (14 June 1934), p. 215. This is quoted in Samuel Hynes's "The Trials of a Christian Critic," *The Literary Criticism of T. S. Eliot*, p. 78.
80. *Ibid.*
81. T. S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (London : Methuen & Co Ltd., 1920), viii-x.
82. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, p. 11.
83. Quoted in Kojecky's *T. S. Eliot's Social Criticism*, p. 78.
84. Quoted in R. P. Bilan's *The Literary Criticism of F. R. Leavis* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 69.
85. Leavis, *Scrutiny* III, p. 186.
86. F. O. Matthiessen, *The Achievemend of T. E. Eliot*, p. 149.

87. Stephen Spender, *Eliot*, p. 144.
88. Eliot, *Selected Essays*, p. 388.
89. *Ibid.*
90. A. D. Moody, *Thomas Stearns Eliot: Poet* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 354-355.
91. Helen Gardner, *The Composition of Four Quartets* (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1978), pp. 54-55.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
93. Stephen Spender, *Eliot*, p. 130.
94. Quoted in Robert Sencourt's *T. S. Eliot: A Memoir*, p. 57.
95. Herbert Read, *T. S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*, p. 23.
96. Robert Sencourt, *T. S. Eliot: A Memoir*, p. 122.
97. *Ibid.*
98. Stephen Spender, *Eliot*, pp. 130-131.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

*** I owe particular thanks to Professor K. Honda of Hokkaido University, Languages and Culture Department, under whose guidance a good deal of the work on this paper was done. I am also grateful to my colleague Professor T. Guerin for the aid in the preparation of the manuscript. Last, but not least, I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Professors T. Takemori and H. Mikami whose encouragement has been invaluable.