

T.S. Eliot's Aesthetic Theories of Tradition and Impersonality: New Perspectives

Leila Bellour

Department of Foreign Languages-Mila University Centre-Algeria

Abstract

This paper is a daring attempt to test the verity and validity of the terms tradition and impersonality, which are central to T.S. Eliot's artistic theories. It demonstrates that despite the fact that Eliot coins a theory of impersonality and divorces the sufferer from the poet by setting emotions at odds, he does not cling to his impersonal stance. In some essays, he proposes the personal aspect as a prerequisite for artistic creation. Eliot pays a great tribute and respect to tradition because it is a framework, which helps him develop his individual talent. Though the poet, according to Eliot, must write 'with his dead ancestors in his bones, in order to recreate monuments of the past', he still adheres to the romantic principle that the poet should strive for originality and individuality. So, as the paper aspires to vindicate, Eliot's theories of impersonality and tradition are difficult to prove right.

المستخلص

يهدف هذا المقال إلى تمحيص حقيقة و مصداقية مصطلحي التقليد و اللاذاتية، اللذان يعتبران محور النظريات الفنية لـ ت.س. اليوت. أن المقال يوضح أنه رغم صياغته لنظرية اللذاتية و فصله للسقيم عن الشاعر بوضع المشاعر جانبا، فإنه لم يتثبت بموقفه. إذ أنه في بعض مقالاته يقرّ بالجانب الشخصي كشرط مسبق للإبداع الفني. لقد أعطى اليوت إجلالا و احتراما كبيرين للتقليد لأنه الركيزة التي ساهمت في تطوير موهبته الفردية. رغم أنه على الشاعر، في نظر اليوت، أن يكتب و أسلافه الموتى في عظامه، من أجل إعادة بعث معالم الماضي، فإنه مازال يلتزم بمبدأ الرومانسية القائل بأنه على الشاعر أن يسعى إلى الجدة و الفردية. إذن فكما يطمح هذا المقال إلى توضيحه، فإنه من الصعب الجزم بصحة نظريتي اللاذاتية و التقليد لـ ت.س. اليوت.

According to Eliot's artistic philosophy, great art can be achieved only through surrender to tradition. But Eliot contradicts himself, in some critical essays, by giving prominence to individuality over tradition. Eliot admits that there is always something unique in each artist who, as a human being, has emotions, passions and impulses that must be satisfied. In "The Humanism of Irving Babbitt", for instance, he points out that:

To be modern has meant practically to be increasingly positive and critical, to refuse to receive anything on an authority 'anterior, exterior, and superior' to the individual. With those who still cling to the principle of outer authority I have no quarrel, I am not primarily concerned with them. I am myself a thoroughgoing individualist, writing for those, like myself, irrevocably committed to the modern experiment.¹

So, Eliot does not reduce the individuality of the borrower. According to him, the poet must actively labour to acquire tradition, but he should also struggle to prove his difference and individuality. Though he was influenced by many authors, Eliot did not imitate them slavishly; his work is earmarked by idiosyncratic traits.

In his essay on Ben Jonson, Eliot calls for the necessity of a personal poetic voice. In his words: "it is in the end of no value to discuss Jonson's theory and practice unless we recognize and seize this point of view, which escapes the formulae, and which is what makes his plays worth reading. Jonson behaved as the great creative mind that he follows: he creates his own world."² So, for Eliot, the artist should find his own point of view. He should escape the oppressive conventions to breathe the fresh air of free thinking.

In another essay, "A Romantic Aristocrat", Eliot makes an explicit declaration that elucidates his real artistic project: "The Arts insist that a man shall dispose of all that he has, even of his family tree, and follow art alone. For they require that a man be not a member of a family or of a caste or of a party or of a coterie, but simply and solely himself."³ In contrast to "Tradition and the Individual Talent", where he states that the artist should plant himself firmly in his tradition, Eliot's declaration, here, calls for a break with the past. For him, the artist should not even address himself to his people. Though he had a very close relationship with his mother, Eliot realized that he could never find a voice of his own unless he broke the bondage with her. This departure is manifested in his critical writings, where he praised so many critics who had nourished his poetic growth; but he makes no mention of his mother, the greatest precursor, who had influenced his talent and intellectual growth. Eliot was eager to step out of the confinement of any external authority, not only his family but also the whole tradition.

The paradox of "Tradition and the Individual Talent" offers Eliot's critics ammunition to explain the notion of tradition in the light of Harold Bloom's theory of the anxiety of influence. According to Bloom, the poet has two basic drives: the first one is to imitate the precursor's poetry, while the second is to strive for originality. For him, the poet should struggle and wrestle with his precursors to realize himself. In Bloom's words, "Poetic strength

comes only from a triumphant wrestling with the greatest of the dead, and from even more triumphant solipsism.”⁴ This antagonistic relationship with the other poets results in a deeper poetic identity. The critic Lee Oser explains the poet’s competition to overcome the influence of the father poet in terms of Freud’s Oedipus complex. According to her, “The period of Freud’s Oedipus complex was the most Oedipal in modern history. Revolution and war dominated politics. Style overthrew style, philosophy philosophy.”⁵ In this light, one might opine that Eliot’s adoration for tradition is a deceptive mask behind which lurks hostility for the father’s authority from which Eliot wants to liberate himself. The veracity of this position is obliquely echoed by Eliot in “The Function of Criticism”, where he confesses that: “A common inheritance and a common cause unite artists consciously or unconsciously: it must be admitted that the union is mostly unconscious. Between the true artists of any time there is, I believe, an unconscious community.”⁶ So, by pretending to revive tradition, the poet is engaging in an unconscious oedipal struggle with his precursors to find his poetic voice and authority. In his essay “Philip Massinger”, Eliot reproaches Massinger for his total adherence to the authority of the forebears. According to him: “He might almost, have been a great realist; he is killed by conventions which were suitable for the preceding literary generation, but not for his.”⁷ Thus, Massinger’s failure to achieve greatness is due to his submission to others’ conventions and his lack of individuality. As Eliot puts it, “at the moment when a new view of life is wanted, he has looked at life through the eyes of his predecessors” (“Philip Massinger” 143).

According to Bloom, poetic influence starts with a deep attraction and love for the precursor, which will soon fade away and turn into repulsion and revisionary strife. A reading of Eliot’s critical essays reveals that he possesses a passionate admiration for the dead poets. This love, if it is a sincere one, is the first step in developing his poetic genius. But it soon turns into a feeling of disavowal and distaste. In his essay “Religion and Literature”, Eliot confesses that: “everyone, I believe, who is at all sensible to the seductions of poetry, can remember some moment in youth when he or she was completely carried away by the work of one poet [...] What happens is a kind of inundation, of invasion of the undeveloped personality by the stronger personality of the poet.”⁸ So, Eliot’s seduction by other poets has pernicious effects; and thus, it should be avoided. For Eliot, blind imitation of the precursor deprives the young poet of his personality, i.e, individuality. To this effect, Eliot, in his book To Criticise the Critic, states that: “the difference between influence and imitation is that influence can fecundate, whereas imitation-especially unconscious imitation-can only sterilize.”⁹

To escape this blind imitation, that kills the poet's individuality, poets repulse against the works of the father poets. This repulsion takes the form of a misreading or misinterpretation of this precursor: "Poetic influence- when it involves two strong, authentic poets-always proceeds by a misreading of the prior poet, an act of creative correction that is actually and necessarily a misinterpretation"¹⁰ Eliot, the forerunner of Bloom's theory, argues, in his essay on Philip Massinger, that: "Immature poets imitate, mature poets steal; bad poets deface what they take, and good poets make into something better, or at least something different. The good poet welds his theft into a whole of feeling which is unique, utterly different from that from which it was torn, the bad poet throws it into something which has no cohesion" ("Philip Massinger" 125). So, the good poet, for Eliot, is the one who struggles to ascertain his identity by unconsciously distorting the message of the precursors, who have influenced him most. Eliot reiterates the same idea as follows: "One author takes complete possession of us for a time, then another; and finally, they begin to affect each other in our mind [...] we begin to be, in fact, critical; and it is our growing critical power which protects us from excessive possession by any one literary personality" ("Religion and Literature" 394-95).

Along similar lines, the critic Colleen Lamos opines that Eliot's allusive method is not an attempt to preserve tradition; it is rather an act of betrayal. As he puts it: "Eliot deftly veils his usurpation in elaborate displays of surrender"¹¹. He informs us that the word "tradition" is etymologically intertwined with "traitor"; it reruns us to its root in Latin, which is "*trader*", meaning "to hand over, to hand on, to deliver." Therefore, it means to traduce or betray. So by this act of alluding to the literary tradition, Eliot aspires to affirm his poetic voice and to free himself from the oppressing authority of the forebears. Though he excessively writes about the authors who influence his poetic talent, his admiration for them is due to their collision head-on with his critical views. This view is defended by Bloom, who states that: "If the poetic self in us loves another, it loves itself in the other" (Poetic Origins and the Final Phases 223)

As opposed to the Romantic tradition, Eliot's theory of impersonality, which is extensively highlighted in his critical essays, bears a corrective force. But Despite his staunch belief in a poetry that is devoid of personality, Eliot does not cleave to this artistic stance. He affirms the personal roots that lie at the foundation of art, and this provides his critics and readers ammunition to suspect his theory of impersonality.

Eliot praises artists, like Jonson and Shakespeare, because they have a personality and because they create a world of their own. In Eliot's words:

Marlowe's and Jonson's comedies were a view of life; they were, as great literature is, the transformation of a personality into a personal work of art, their lifetime's work, long or short. Massinger is not simply a smaller personality: his personality hardly exists. He did not, out of his own personality, build a world of art, as Shakespeare and Marlowe and Jonson built ("Philip Massinger" 139).

According to this view, personality is a pre-requisite for the creation of a great work of art. Hence, Eliot remains faithful to the Romantic attitude that the business of the artist is to express his feelings. In his essay on Ben Jonson, Eliot calls for the necessity of a personal point of view: "and it is in the end of no value to discuss Jonson's theory and practice unless we recognize and seize this point of view, which escapes the formulae, and which is what makes his plays worth reading. Jonson behaved as the great creative mind that he follows: he creates his own world" ("Ben Jonson" 118). Thus, for Eliot, the greatest artist is the one who constructs his own world. Jonson is singled out in this way because the materials of his poetry are drawn from emotional shocks, the experience of passion and real life in general.

In "Tradition and the Individual Talent", Eliot states that "only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want to escape from these things." (58), Escape from emotions and personality might be read as an escape from the painful experiences and emotional shocks. Hence, Eliot's definition of poetry as an escape from personality implies the idea of art as a curative power for the poet, which transforms his psychological state. In "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca", Eliot spells out a very approximate idea as follows:

Poetry is not a substitute for philosophy or theology or religion [...] it has its own function. But as this function is not intellectual but emotional, it cannot be defined adequately in intellectual terms. We can say that it provides 'consolation': strange consolation, which is provided equally by writers so different as Dante and Shakespeare.¹²

The quote throws fresh light on the function of poetry as a therapeutic technique. Poetry, for him, is a means for lifting the burden of anxiety and fear, which press upon one's daily life. It momentarily whisks away some kind of obstruction and burden. Carrying this idea further, Eliot asserts that:

What every poet starts from is his own emotions [...] Dante's railings, his personal spleen [...], his nostalgia, his bitter regrets for past happiness-or for what it seems happiness when it is past-and his brave attempts to fabricate something permanent and holy out of his personal animal feelings [...] Shakespeare, too, was preoccupied with struggle-which alone constitutes life for a poet-to transmute his

personal and private agonies into something rich and strange, something universal and impersonal ("Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca" 137).

Indeed, the quote above is rich with ramifications. First, it evinces that Eliot does not deny or prescribe a lack of emotions in art. The latter, as in the case of Dante and Shakespeare, portrays the warp and weft of the artist's mind. Second, and more importantly, the artist's psychic disposition gives his work root and branch. Hence, reading Eliot's "The Waste Land", in particular, is unthinkable without these personal determinants. Eliot's biographer, Peter Ackroyd, vindicates this view by quoting Eliot's second wife, who contends that "He felt he had paid too high a price to be a poet that he had suffered too much."¹³

Making the same point more explicit, Eliot, in his essay on Matthew Arnold, asserts that artistic creation is a means of self-purgation, a mystical process of stripping and purification. As he puts it, "One feels that the writing of poetry brought him little of that excitement, that joyful loss of self in the workmanship of art, that intense and transitory relief which comes at the moment of completion and is the chief reward of creative work."¹⁴ So, for Eliot, writing is a protective shield or a therapeutic technique, which procures him health by releasing the repressed emotional tensions. Having Eliot in mind, it is possible to draw inferences about him from his poetry, which contains indelible traces of his pleasurable and painful experiences. It follows that a purely aesthetic view of Eliot's poems would seriously neglect their psychological substance and miss much of their intensity and meaning.

The dissociation of sensibility, a theory coined by Eliot in his essay "The metaphysical Poets", further confirms Eliot's admittance of the emotional aspect of art. This dissociation, or the split between the sentimental and the intellectual, is fostered by Milton and Dryden. Tennyson and Browning also exemplify this phenomenon. In contrast to those poets, John Donne is an exemplar of a "unified sensibility" because in his poetry, "there is a direct sensuous apprehension of thought or a recreation of thought into feeling"¹⁵ In other words, John Donne is singled out mainly for his ability to fuse and unify thought and feeling. Such unity was missing in the poetry of the nineteenth century, which became increasingly vague and emotional.

Indeed, Eliot's essay on the metaphysical poets shakes the verity of his theory of impersonality, where he posits that the poet should efface himself completely in the work of art. The essay confirms Eliot's ever-present belief in feeling as a recipe in the creative process. He states:

We say, as in a vague way, that Shakespeare, or Dante, or Lucretus, is a poet who thinks, and that Swinburne is a poet who does not think, even that Tennyson is a poet who does not think. But what we really mean is not a difference in quality of thought, but a difference in quality of emotion. The poet who thinks is 'merely the poet who can express the emotional equivalent of thought. But he is not necessarily interested in thought itself. We talk as if thought was precise and emotion was vague. In reality there is precise emotion and there is vague emotion. To express precise emotion requires as great intellectual power as to express precise thought. (Shakespeare and the stoicism of Seneca 134-35)

This quote highlights the ideal state of a poet, which is to reconcile and to keep a balance between thought and feeling.

Though Eliot tried to articulate a theory, which fulfills the author's need for distance and detachment, and in which emotions, apparently, play no part, the objective correlative is the best way for projecting the interior into the exterior. So, emotions in Eliot's poetry are detached and relocated in the external objects, but they are never erased or denied. The objective correlative does not objectify the author's emotions or baffle his emotional discharge as it has been misunderstood by many readers and critics. On the contrary, it makes them as real and concrete as the poet experiences them. In his discussion of the concept, the critic Russell Elliott Murphy reproaches Eliot for his sharp attack on Shakespeare's play Hamlet. In doing so, he explains Eliot's stance vis-à-vis Hamlet in a tone that brings to mind Bloom's anxiety of influence. In Murphy's words, "Eliot himself wisely avoids suggesting any concrete ways in which Shakespeare might have improved the play. The point is that Eliot takes the opportunity to pontificate on finding a serious flaw in one of the world's greatest tragic plays, and he not only gets away with it but enhances his own reputation and credentials as a critical intellect in the process."¹⁶

Years after writing his essay on Shakespeare's Hamlet, Eliot, in the Preface to Essays on Elizabethan Drama, explains why he excludes some essays from the collection. These essays include "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca", "Hamlet and His Problems", and "Four Elizabethan Dramatists". According to him,

All these three essays on re-examination embarrassed me by their callowness, and by a facility of unqualified assertion which verges, here and there, on impudence. The *Hamlet*, of course, had been kept afloat all these years by the success of the phrases "objective correlative"-a phrases which, I am now told, is not even my own but was first used by Washington Alston.¹⁷

So, Eliot feels an inward shame for formulating a principle, which is misunderstood as a means to objectify art and purge it from the emotional traces of the author. The exclusion of "Hamlet and His Problems" from the book evidences Eliot's wondering about the very utility of the term.

One of the problems, which arise, while discussing Eliot's criticism, is how to explain Eliot's self-contradictory critical views that vacillate mainly between personality and impersonality, tradition and the individual talent? To surmount the paradoxical aspects of his poeticalness and solve them more satisfactorily, Eliot's own view on the subject seems to be the most convenient and necessary point of reference. Commenting on his critical writings, Eliot traces the circumstances under which he came to formulate his theories as follows:

I can never re-read any of my own prose writings without acute embarrassment; I shirk the task, and consequently may not take account of all the assertions to which I have at one time or another committed myself; I may often repeat what I have said before, and I may often contradict myself. But I believe that the critical writings of poets, of which in the past there have been some very distinguished examples, owe a great deal of their interest to the fact that the poet, at the back of his mind, if not as his ostensible purpose, is always trying to defend the kind of poetry he is writing, or to formulate the kind that he wants to write.¹⁸

In fact, two plausible explanations surface in these statements. First, whilst he pretends to approve other poets, Eliot is obliquely defending his own poetry. This idea is in tune with Bloom's self-love in the other. In his essay "To Criticize the Critic", Eliot reiterates the same idea as follows: "I was implicitly defending the kind of poetry me and my friends wrote" ("To Criticize the Critic" 16). The second justification proffered by Eliot in the long aforementioned quote is that some of his early essays were used as a testing ground to develop his poetics. That is, in reproaching other authors, Eliot formulates the poetic qualities he is eager to obtain.

Carrying further the idea of his self-contradiction, Eliot admits the fact that, in his critical theories, he does not express himself properly. Discussing W.B. Yeats' sense of a unique personality, which he highly appreciates, Eliot avows that he has made a mistake in his theory of impersonality; and he asserts his uncertainty about the verity and validity of the concept. In his words:

I have in early essays, extolled what I called impersonality in art, and it may seem that, in giving as a reason for the superiority of Yeats's later work the greatest expression of personality in it, I am contradicting myself. It may be that I expressed myself badly, or that I

had only an adolescent grasp of that idea-as I can never bear to re-read my own prose writings, I am willing to leave the point unsettled-but I think now, at least, that the truth of the matter is as follows. There are two forms of impersonality: that which is natural to the mere skilful craftsman, and that which is more and more achieved by the maturing artist. The first is that of what I have called the "anthology piece" [...]. The second impersonality is that of the poet who, out of intense and personal experience, is able to express, to make of it a general symbol. And the strange thing is that Yeats, having been a great craftsman in the first kind, became a great poet in the second.¹⁹

So, Eliot, who uses impersonality and avows it frankly, seems to be embarrassed by such term. With excruciating explicitness, he expresses his vehement dislike of the theory because he realizes its wrong usage by his critics and readers alike. Indeed, two connotations of the word 'impersonality' are discussed in Eliot's quote. The first one emanates from one's commitment to tradition, to which he refers by "anthology piece". The second, which is practiced only by a mature artist, like Eliot and Yeats, paradoxically, bears the meaning 'personality'. The second sense of impersonality echoes that of his mentor, De Gourmont, whose views on personality and impersonality had a pervasive influence on Eliot's The Sacred Wood. De Gourmont elaborates the idea as follows: "être impersonnel c'est être personnel selon un mode particulier: Voyer Flaubert. On dirait en jargon: l'objectif est une des forme du subjectif."²⁰ The fact that Yeats, according to Eliot, moves from the first to the second type of impersonality recalls Eliot's and Bloom's views on the development of the poet, which starts from an attraction to the father poet, and then turns into a repulsion.

Along similar lines, in "Ulysses, Order, and Myth", Eliot contends that he has made a mistake by his theory of impersonality; because he has never practiced what has been preached. In his words,

It is much easier to be a classicist in literary criticism than in creative art-because in criticism you are responsible only for what you want, and in creation you are responsible for what you can do with material which you must simply accept. And in this material I include the emotions and feelings of the writer himself, which, for that writer, are simply material which he must accept-not virtues to be enlarged or vices to be diminished.²¹

The quote voices D.H Lawrence's famous dictum: "Never trust the artist- Trust the tale."²² In Eliot's case, Eliot's tendency towards emotional expression cannot be escaped. So, despite his theory of impersonality, emotions are, actually, the origin of Eliot's poetry.

If some critics still stick to the view that Eliot's poetry is impersonal; then, the question is: can we believe the artist in all what he says about his art? In "The Music of Poetry", Eliot maintains that:

A poem may appear to mean very different things to different readers, and all of these meanings may be different from what the author thought he meant. For instance, the author may have been writing some peculiar personal experience, which he saw quite unrelated to anything outside; yet for the reader, the poem may become the expression of a general situation, as well as of some private experience of his own. The reader's interpretation may differ from the author's and be equally valid-it may even be better. There may be much more in a poem than the author was aware of ("The Music of Poetry" 111).

Conclusion

The paper has evinced that although he has frequently been linked under the broad rubric of tradition, and though he has been widely considered as an impersonal poet not only by his contemporaries but also by later literary critics, Eliot's theories of tradition and impersonality are difficult to prove right. Eliot, who apparently wants to revive tradition, seems to complain from a literary environment shrouded in conventions. If Eliot dismisses the labels of individuality and personality and displays in his essays his lifelong opposition to these concepts, he often digresses from his position. Hence, we might conclude that Eliot's poetry is not impersonal because one has to commit to the entire doctrine and not merely to bits and pieces of it.

To round off, it could be said that Eliot's poems can be read as intensely subjective and personal. For Eliot, artistic creation can even be a consoling cure or a protective shield for the artist. Despite his condemnation and vehement opposition to some authors, who express themselves in art, emotional self-expression and individuality are major preoccupations and concerns for Eliot. Hence, critics' constant description of his poetry as impersonal veils Eliot's personal experience, which would constitute a great gain for the understanding of his poems. . By applying a reader-response approach, one can not only read Eliot's poems against his rules; one can even contextualize him in any age and century. As Eliot states in his essay "Matthew Arnold", "From time to time, every hundred years or so, it is desirable that some critic shall appear to review the past of our literature, and set the poets and the poems in a new order. This task is not of revolution but of readjustment." (1)

Endnotes

- ¹ T.S. Eliot, "The Humanism of Irving Babbitt," Selected Essays, Ed. T.S. Eliot, 1928 (London: Faber and Faber, 1986): 477.
- ² -----, "Ben Jonson", The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism, Ed. T.S. Eliot (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976):118.
- ³ -----, "A Romantic Aristocrat," The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism, Ed. T.S. Eliot (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976):32.
- ⁴ -----, "Poetic Origins and the Final Phases," Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader, Ed. David Lodge, and Nigel Wood (Harlow: Longman, 2000): 217.
- ⁵ Lee Oser, The Ethics of Modernism :Moral Ideas in Yeats, Eliot, Joyce, Woolf, and Beckett (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2007): 97.
- ⁶ T.S. Eliot, "The Function of Criticism," Selected Essays, Ed. T.S. Eliot, 1923 (London: Faber and Faber, 1986): 24.
- ⁷ -----, "Philip Massinger," The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism, Ed. T.S. Eliot (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976): 142.
- ⁸ -----, "Religion and Literature," Selected Essays, Ed. T.S. Eliot, 1935 (London: Faber and Faber, 1986): 394.
- ⁹ -----, "To criticize the critic," To criticize the critic and Other Writings, Ed. T.S. Eliot (New York: Farrar, Strauss & Ciroux, 1965):18.
- ¹⁰ Harold Bloom, The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997):30
- ¹¹ Colleen Lamos, Deviant Modernism: Sexual and Textual Errancy in T.S.Eliot, James Joyce, and Marcel Proust (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004): 75.
- ¹² -----, "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca," Selected Essays, Ed. T.S. Eliot, 1927 (London: Faber and Faber, 1986): 137-38.
- ¹³ Peter Ackroyd, T.S. Eliot (London: Hamish Hamilton. 1984.): 334.
- ¹⁴ T.S. Eliot, "Matthew Arnold," The Use of Poetry and the use of Criticism (London: Faber and Faber, 1980):108.
- ¹⁵ T.S. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," Selected Essays, Ed. T.S. Eliot, 1921 (London: Faber and Faber, 1986): 286
- ¹⁶ Russell Elliott Murphy, Critical Companion to T.S Eliot: A Literary Reference to his Life and Work (New York: Facts on File, 2007): 283.
- ¹⁷ T.S. Eliot, "Preface", Essays on Elizabethan Drama (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company INC, 1956): vii-viii.
- ¹⁸ T.S. Eliot, "The Music Of Poetry," Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot, Ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975):107.

¹⁹ -----, "Yeats", Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot, Ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975):251.

²⁰ Ezra Pound, "Remy De Gourmont," Literary Essays of Ezra Pound, Ed. T.S. Eliot (London: Faber and Faber, 1974): 353.

²¹ T.S. Eliot, "Ulysses, Order, and Myth," Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot, Ed. Frank Kermode (London: Faber and Faber, 1975):177.

²² D.H. Lawrence, "The Spirit of Place," 20th Century Literary Criticism, Ed. David Lodge (London: Longman Group Ltd, 1972):123.