New Explorations
Studies in Culture and Communications

Robert Crawford's Eliot After "The Waste Land" (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2022)

Thomas J. Farrell

Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2023

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1097593ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1097593ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

New Explorations Association

ISSN

2563-3198 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this review

Farrell, T. (2023). Review of [Robert Crawford's Eliot After "The Waste Land" (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2022)]. *New Explorations*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.7202/1097593ar

Review: Robert Crawford's *Eliot After "The Waste Land"* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2022).

Thomas J. Farrell
University of Minnesota Duluth
tfarrell@d.umn.edu

In Robert Crawford's "Acknowledgements" in his 2015 book *Young Eliot: From St. Louis to "The Waste Land"* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, pp. ix-xii), he says, "I went to Balliol College, Oxford, to write a doctoral thesis on Eliot. Only one supervisor was willing to take me on. To Richard Ellmann [1918-1987], I owe debts that cannot be repaid" (p. ix).

In Crawford's "Introduction" in his 2015 book about Eliot (pp. 1-10),he says, "When I first wrote on Eliot in the 1980s, my doctoral supervisor, Richard Ellmann, told me that Valerie [Fletcher] Eliot [1929-2012; married Eliot in 1957] had discussed the idea of his writing her husband's life. Eventually, Ellmann, a great biographer from a Jewish background, who had already authored a substantial account of Eliot for the *Dictionary of National Biography*, decided he did not want to go ahead. He told me that, though he had huge admiration for Eliot's work, he was put off by an anti-Semitic streak he discerned there" (p. 4).

In Crawford's new 2022 book *Eliot After "The Waste Land"* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux), he lists (pp. 492-493) Valerie Eliot as the senior editor of each of the nine volumes of *The Letters of T. S. Eliot* published in London by Faber & Faber between 2009 and 2021.

In Crawford's new 2022 book, he also lists the online version of the eight volumes of *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot* (pp. 491-492), which were published in print by Johns Hopkins University Press in 2021. Consequently, literary scholars now have extensive Eliot-related sources available to them in print and online to help them advance their studies of Eliot's life and work. Crawford's 2015 and 2022 books now add to the Eliot-related sources available to literary scholars.

In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he says, "Dividing his criticism into three period-based groupings – in essence, early, middle, and late – he dispensed revised versions of earlier pronouncements" 'I am strongly in favor of the maintenance of the monarchy in all countries which have a monarchy; as for Classicism and Romanticism, I find that the terms

have no longer the importance to me that they once had'" (pp. 471-472).

Digression: The recent death and funeral of Queen Elizabeth II (1926-2022; reigned 1952-2022) show that the monarchy persists to this day in the United Kingdom. In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he mentions young Princess Elizabeth (p. 368) and then young Queen Elizabeth (p. 439). End of digression.

In Crawford's "Introduction" in his new 2022 book, he also says, "Like its predecessor, this book presents a close-grained, intimate portrait of a man" (p. 2). Because he is so meticulous in both his 2015 book and his new 2022 book, I should point out that each book comes equipped with a detailed index. In the "Index" of his 2015 book (pp. 479-493), compiled by Marian Aird (p. x), there is a sub-entry under Eliot's name titled "Health" (p. 484). Similarly, in the remarkably detailed "Index" of his new 2022 book (pp. 565-609), compiled by Vicki Robinson (p. 490), there is a sub-entry under Eliot's name titled "health problems" (p. 580). Over the years, Eliot had his fair share of health problems. But these health sub-entries also show the level of meticulous detail that Crawford weaves into these two volumes.

Now, Crawford (born in 1959) first published about Eliot in his 1987 book *The Savage and the City in the Work of T. S. Eliot*. In Crawford's 2015 book about Eliot, he quotes a somewhat lengthy passage from a 1919 review by Eliot of an anthology of Native American chants (p. 338). Crawford says, "More than once in this piece Tom links 'the poet and the anthropologist,' but he also connects poet and 'savage'" (p. 338).

In part of the somewhat lengthy quotation from Eliot's 1919 review, Eliot says, "The maxim, Return to the sources, is a good one. More intelligibly put, it is that the poet should know everything that has been accomplished in poetry (accomplished, not merely produced) since its beginnings – in order to know what he is doing himself. He should be aware of all the metamorphoses of poetry that illustrate the stratifications of history that cover savagery. For the artist is, in an impersonal sense, the most conscious of men; he is therefore the most and the least civilized and civilizable; he is the most competent to understand both civilized and primitive" (quoted on p. 338).

Now, in Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he quotes Eliot in a 1923 piece as saying the following: "'Literature cannot be understood without going to the sources: sources which are often remote, difficult, and unintelligible unless one transcends the prejudices of ordinary literary tastes,' he wrote in an anthropologically review published in October 1923" (pp. 35-36).

Digression: The American Catholic historian John T. McGreevy of the University of Notre Dame writes glowingly in his new 2022 book *Catholicism: A Global History from the French Revolution to Pope Francis* about the various efforts of pioneering Catholic theologians from the 1930s to the 1960s to return to the sources of the Roman Catholic tradition of thought. The efforts of those ressourcement theologians culminated in the landmark documents of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) in the Roman Catholic Church. End of digression.

In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he also quotes Eliot as saying that "poetry comes from 'reading' and 'organization' as well as from any mystical 'inspiration.' His procedure involved fusing all of these. 'The "meaning" of a poem, in the ordinary sense,' he argued, was present just to divert the reader's mind 'while the poem does its work upon him'" (p. 200).

On the next page, Crawford then quotes another somewhat lengthy passage from Eliot: "'What I call the "auditory imagination" is the feeling for syllable and rhythm, penetrating far below the levels of thought and feeling [at the level of the human psyche that C. G. Jung and his followers refer to as the collective unconscious], invigorating every word; sinking to the most primitive and forgotten, returning to the origin and bringing something back, seeking the beginning and the end. It works through meaning, certainly, or not without meanings in the ordinary sense, and fuses the old and obliterated and the trite, the current, and the new and surprising, the most ancient and the most civilized mentality'" (quoted on p. 201).

Elsewhere in Crawford's new 2022 book, he quotes Eliot as saying the following: "'words have associations, and the groups of words *in* association have associations, which is a kind of local self-consciousness, because they are the growth of a *particular* civilization; and the same thing is true of other modern languages. The Italian of Dante, though essentially the Italian of today, is not in this way a modern language. The culture of Dante was not of one European country but of Europe'" (quoted on p. 130; italics here are Eliot's).

Crawford then says, "Tom's interest in Dante was also psychological. Dante possessed a 'visual' imagination 'in the sense that he lived in an age in which men still saw visions. It was a psychological habit, the trick of which we have forgotten,' but which, 'as good as any of our own,' came from a 'disciplined kind of dreaming'" (p. 130).

I have here juxtaposed these quotes from Eliot about the acoustic imagination and the visual imagination to make the point that they are not mutually incompatible with one another, but rather are two psychological sides of the same sensory orientation to life, which the American Jesuit Walter J. Ong refers to as the world-as-event sense of life, which he differentiates from the world-as-view sense of life.

For all practical purposes, what Eliot refers to as "'a manifest fissure between thought and

sensibility' in Donne represents what Ong refers to as the world-as-view sense of life.

See Ong's article "World as View and World as Event" in the *American Anthropologist* (August 1969). It is reprinted in volume three of Ong's *Faith and Contexts*, edited by Thomas J. Farrell and Paul A. Soukup (1995, pp. 69-90).

For an essay of related interest, see the anthropologist David M. Smith's 1997 essay "World as Event: Aspects of Chipewyan Ontology" that is reprinted in *Of Ong and Media Ecology*, edited by Thomas J. Farrell and Paul A. Soukup (2012, pp. 117-141).[1]

Now, the American-born conservative Anglo-Catholic convert Thomas Stearns Eliot (1888-1965) published his famous poem of deep personal desolation *The Waste Land* in 1922 – one hundred years ago – after the devastation of World War I (1914-1918), which understandably filled many people with a similar pervasive sense of personal desolation.[2]

In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he says, "A keen sense of death, the presence of the dead, and of being at once possessed and dispossessed by past voices, haunts not just *The Waste Land* [1922] and 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' [1919]; it also haunted Tom and would continue to do so" (p. 6).

In Crawford's 2015 book about young Eliot, he says, "If *The Waste Land*, with its images of adultery, sex gone wrong and edgy, nervous exchanges, can seem like a pained act of exposure, nonetheless its 'impersonal' allusive technique, its almost infinitely expanding resonances and its arcane use of anthropologically inflected structures prevent it from being reduced to that – and designedly so" (p. 420).

In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he also describes *The Waste Land* in the following ways:

> The waste, the ruin, seems spiritual, not just physical. With its allusions to the Bible, to ancient fertility ceremonies, to the Buddha's Fire Sermon, Sanskrit sacred texts and legends of the Holy Grail, the poem articulates a desperate search for some frame of belief that may order chaos. For all his biting ironic self-consciousness, and indeed because of it, Tom still quested for a system to which he could give spiritual assent. In different guises and voices, *The Waste Land* articulates a ruined self, because no such system seems strong enough to stave off that terrible sense of ruin.
>
> In its allusive method, its ritual repetitions and consecutive patterns, his poem presents a poetics of reincarnation. Much later he remarked that around the time of its

> composition he had considered becoming a Buddhist. After studying Japanese Buddhism at Harvard, he had attended a Buddhist society during his Oxford postgraduate year, so this interest was hardly new. He calls the 'Shantih shantih shantih' which concludes *The Waste Land* 'a formal ending to an Upanishad.' Upanishads are ancient Hindu texts, many of which are revered by Buddhists. For a Buddhist the 'shantih' is the peace that lies in a state beyond all the *samsara* cycles of pain and passion: yet in *The Waste Land* such peace is present less as an achieved condition, more as a maddeningly unattainable possibility. Glossing its meaning in one of the notes he added to bulk out the poem when it became a book, Tom, revealingly, translated 'shantih' into a Christian equivalent. Using a phrase from chapter four of St. Paul's letter to the Philippians in the King James Bible, he wrote that '"The Peace which passeth understanding" is our equivalent to this word.' (p. 15)

In Crawford's 2015 book *Young Eliot: From St. Louis to "The Waste Land,"* he discusses Eliot's relevant studies at Harvard (pp. 168-181) and his 1914-1915 academic year at Oxford (pp. 201-231).

Now, Eliot may have received a measure of deep personal consolation in his life when he subsequently converted to Anglicanism in 1927 (a departure from his and his family's Unitarianism and from his flirtation with becoming a Buddhist, mentioned above). In any event, he lived in London during World War II (1939-1945). On February 12, 1948, King George VI (1895-1952; reigned 1936-1952) "invested him with the Insignia of a Member of the Order of Merit" (p. 404). Later in 1948, T. S. Eliot, O.M., received the Nobel Prize in Literature. In 1957, he married his second wife, his much younger secretary Valerie Fletcher, mentioned above. He died in 1965, childless, but a happily married man – a far cry from the unhappily married man whose deep personal desolation is expressed in *The Waste Land* (1922).

In Crawford's 2015 book *Young Eliot: From St. Louis to "The Waste Land,"* he recounts how young Thomas Stearns Eliot and Vivien Haigh-Wood (1888-1947) were married in June 1915 (pp. 230-231). Crawford says, "Quick-witted and determined, Vivien was on the rebound. So, in a subtler way, was Tom. . . . Marrying Tom, whom she had known for three months, was impulsive, but hardly ridiculous. Becoming his wife, she would rescue him for poetry, for England and, most importantly, for herself. . . . Tom had long been uncertain whether he could put his commitment to poetry before his predicted career as a philosopher; he had wondered about staying in England rather than returning to be immured in American academia. In marrying Vivien, he cut through all his problems at a single stroke" (pp. 230-231). In my judgment, their impulsive marriage should have been annulled. But this did not happen.

Digression: The Canadian convert to Roman Catholicism (in the spring of 1937) Marshall McLuhan (1911-1980; Ph.D. in English, Cambridge University, 1943) taught English from 1937 to 1944 at Saint Louis University, the Jesuit university in St. Louis, Missouri, the city where Thomas Stearns Eliot was born and raised. McLuhan had studied English under I. A. Richards (1893-1979) and F. R. Leavis (1895-1978) in the 1930s at Cambridge University. While McLuhan was living in St. Louis, he became friends with the artist Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957). In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, Richards' name appears repeatedly in various connections (for specific page references, see the "Index" [p. 602]), as does Wyndham Lewis' name (for specific page references, see the "Index" [p. 595]). Ong discusses McLuhan's years at Saint Louis University in his somewhat lengthy 1970 review of the 1969 book *The Interior Landscape: The Literary Criticism of Marshall McLuhan, 1943-1962*, edited by Eugene McNamara, that is reprinted in *An Ong Reader: Challenges for Further Inquiry*, edited by Thomas J. Farrell and Paul A. Soukup (2002, pp. 69-77). In it, Ong mentions that Father Francis J. Yealy, S. J. (1888-1977; Ph.D. in English, Cambridge University, 1929), in English at Saint Louis University had "earned one of the first Ph.D.'s in English ever awarded at Cambridge, where, curiously enough, one of the readers of his dissertation had been a fellow Missourian but non-Cantabrigian, T. S. Eliot" (pp. 76-77). In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he mentions Yealy twice (pp. 76 and 137). Crawford says, "Tom was stringent yet generous towards Missouri-educated Father F. J. Yealy, whose Cambridge thesis on Ralph Waldo Emerson he had examined in 1928" (p. 137). End of digression.

Now, to whatever extent readers of *The Waste Land* may themselves be able to empathize from their own personal experiences of desolation with Eliot's pervasive sense of deep personal desolation, I should point out here that the late Dr. Eric McLuhan (1942-2018; Ph.D. in English, University of Dallas, 1982), the eldest son of Marshall and Corinne McLuhan, lists *The Waste Land* as one example of Menippean satire in his introductory survey book *Cynic Satire* (2015, pp. 196-197). In it, he sets himself the task of operationally defining and explaining his understanding of Menippean satire, which he also refers to interchangeably as cynic satire. I should note here that the name of the English Renaissance writer Thomas Nashe (1567-1601) appears as an example of a Menippean satirist in both the main text of Dr. McLuhan's book and in the texts by other authors that he quotes in his discussion footnotes (pp. 35n47; 85n107; 91; 114; 126; 127; 128; and 129). However, Dr. McLuhan does not

happen to mention that Nashe was the focal point of Marshall McLuhan's 1943 Cambridge University doctoral dissertation, which was published posthumously unrevised, but with an editorial apparatus, as the book *The Classicial Trivium: The Place of Thomas Nashe in the Learning of His Time*, edited by W. Terrence Gordon (2006).

In addition, Dr. McLuhan discusses T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* as an example of Menippean satire (pp. 196-197). Dr. McLuhan says the following about it:

> One poem stands above all others in our time as a candidate for inclusion in the rolls of Menippism: *The Waste Land* by T. S. Eliot (and Ezra Pound). We include Pound as co-author because of his profound [exclusively editorial, not substantive] contributions to the final poem: Eliot sent him a mess of drafts and fragments; he hammered them into shape [but without adding any material of his own]. As to the effect: readers at the time, and for many decades afterward, were horrified, scandalized, thoroughly deranged. The poem was called "the ravings of a madman" and worse, and Eliot vilified. It certainly roused the readers. (And Eliot passed the traditional test of the first-rate poet: all the second-raters ganged up against him.) Eighty years later [now one hundred years later], all (or nearly all) agree that *The Waste Land* is of signal import to poetry – though no one's certain why. Good Menippism, but in some danger of being killed by the poem universal acceptance in the freshman-survey Canon of Great Poems. (pp. 196-197)

In a discussion footnote, Dr. McLuhan says, "A very strong argument may be made (but hasn't, yet) that the poem was written as a test case, to 'prove' the essay [by Eliot] 'Tradition and the Individual Talent.' Eliot and Pound were not, it seems, in sweetly harmonious agreement about the direction that the final poem should take. Pound-the-Rhetor pulled in one direction (a five-part oration) and Eliot-the-Grammarian in another (a two-book epic). Eliot beat Pound by adding the notes. For a brilliant analysis of the collaboration, see 'Pound, Eliot, and the Rhetoric of *The Waste Land*,' by Marshall McLuhan in *New Literary History*, 10 (1978-1979), pp. 557-580. Reprinted in *Theories of Communication*, by Marshall and Eric McLuhan (New York: Peter Lange, 2011, pp. 31-52" (p. 197n202).

I would challenge Dr. McLuhan's word choice here. Even though he sets off the word "prove" in quotations marks, and even though the aim to prove the supposed "very strong argument" strikes him as suitable for an argument, I suspect that we might be better advised to imagine Eliot as illustrating in his 1922 poem one example of his "Tradition and the Individual Talent" might work, at least in his case.[3]

Now, for Dr. McLuhan, Menippean satire is a tradition of satire that includes not only the Greek satirist Menippus (c.300-260 BCE), but also the Roman satirist Horace (65-8 BCE) and the

Roman satirist Juvenal (late first century – early second century CE). Dr. McLuhan also discusses Menippean satire at length in his book *The Role of Thunder in "Finnegans Wake* (1997; for specific pages references, see the various entries on Menippean satire in the "Index" [pp. 337-338]).

In Dr. McLuhan's 1997 book about Joyce, he says, "The Cynics' constantly reiterated message stress three things: [1] To the great and powerful, remember you're human; [2] To the proud, remember you're mortal; [3] To the rest, discard all your pretension and illusions" (p. 7). Now, concerning Eliot's 1922 poem *Waste Land*, I can readily understand that its basic message is "discard all your pretensions and illusions."

Now, in Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he says, "[Samuel Johnson's] *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, Tom wrote, was as superb as Juvenal and 'among the greatest verse satires on the English or any other language.' The 'satirist' was 'a stern moralist.' In *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, Johnson's brief verse biography of a military leader, Sweden's Charles XII, was exemplary 'as poetry.' Excited but disillusioned in private life, and in contemporary politics ('I am terrified of the modern contempt of "democracy." . . . I am scared of the Order as of Disorder'), Tom, who had renewed his subscription to *L'Action Francaise* newspaper in October, now envisaged his own unlikely fusion of satire and military verse-biography" – "[h]is never-to-be-completed 'Coriolan'" (pp. 149-150; ellipsis is Crawford's).

Elsewhere in Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he says that Eliot "realized his own arguments were also 'deeply indebted' to [the French Roman Catholic covert Jacques] Maritain [1882-1973], 'especially [to] his *Humanisme integral* [1936].' Maritain, whose 'philosophical output' Tom found 'astonishing,' had converted to Catholicism after experiencing both intense despair and temporary immersion in Bergsonism" (p. 289). See the 1968 English translation of Maritain's 1936 book in French *Integral Humanism*, translated by Joseph W. Evans. For further discussion of Maritain, see John T. McGreevy's new 2022 book *Catholicism: A Global History from the French Revolution to Pope Francis* (esp. pp. 203-208), mentioned above.

In addition, Crawford says, "Tom's own efforts at a conservative articulation of Christian resistance to liberalism, communism, and fascism, pursued a related, albeit English-inflected, trajectory [similar to the trajectory of Munich-based Catholic philosopher Theodor Haecker]" (p. 294).

Digression: While the generally conservative Eliot was terrified in his day of “the modern contempt of ‘democracy,’” we should note here that in his day the great battle pitted communism on the left and fascism on the right against liberal democracy. Consequently, for the generally conservative Eliot, the generally conservative Irish statesman Edmund Burke (1729-1797), the author of the classic *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), was, in his day, a friend of democracy. However, in 2022, the battle lines have shifted dramatically with the rise of the populist right exemplified in the United States by the election of Donald Trump in 2016 as the president of the United States. Today, in the United States and elsewhere, what is known as illiberalism has emerged as a political force opposed to liberal democracy. End of digression.

In Dr. McLuhan’s 1997 book *The Role of Thunder in “Finnegans Wake,”* he says, “T. S. Eliot, in *Poetry and Drama* [1951}, was the first in our time to point out the reason for mixing verse and prose. Such a mixture he wrote, ‘in the same play is generally avoided: each transition makes the auditor aware, with a jolt, of the medium.’ Neither of the other forms of satire, Horatian or Juvenalian, aims for this effect; in fact, they shun it. Rather, they attack the private vice or public hypocrite, the moral sham or civic scandal. [But] Menippean satire goes after the reader instead. Urbanity (Horace) and moralism (Juvenal) each demands smooth consistency of attitude and tone if they are to be carried off convincingly. Evenness of style allows the writer to focus attention away from the writing and onto the evil or good; [but] Cynic satire [interchangeable with Menippean satire], perversely, wallows in the macaronic – to focus attention on the satire as an artefact, on the medium, on the language, on the self-conscious reader. The content or ‘meaning’ in the ordinary sense is anything at all as long as it entices the reader into staying with the satire long enough for it to have its effect. And that is the crux of the matter” (pp. 4-5). Subsequently Dr. McLuhan uses Eliot’s term jolt repeatedly to characterize Menippean satire (pp. 11, 13, 14, 16, and 48). So if *The Waste Land* is truly an example of Menippean satire, as Dr. McLuhan himself suggests it is in his 2015 book *Cynic Satire* (pp. 196-197), then readers should expect to be jolted by reading *The Waste Land*, not by its meaning in the ordinary sense, but by its effect of them and their lives.

Now, the supposed jolt that Dr. McLuhan writes about strikes me as essentially equivalent to what the Canadian Jesuit philosopher and theologian Bernard Lonergan (1904-1984) means by the personal existential experience of insight in his 1957 philosophical masterpiece *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (1992). So if the readers of Eliot’s poem *The Waste Land* on some level of their psyches are jolted enough to “discard all your pretenses and illusions,” then they presumably have grasped an insight about their pretenses and illusions. Ah, but what can

we say if the reader of *The Waste Land* is not jolted enough to “discard all your pretenses and illusions”? In such a case, the reading experience has not had the effect that its Menippean satire is designed to have on him or her, for whatever reason(s).

Now, at the time of the publication of *The Waste Land* in 1922, Eliot was employed at Lloyds Bank in London. In Crawford’s new 2022 book about Eliot, he says, “He worked – officially for ‘forty-four hours a week’ – in a small financial intelligence unit, investigating and monitoring settlement of Great War enemy debts in the wake of the Treaty of Versailles. Intellectually demanding this task required reading ‘ten or fifteen papers a day’ to keep up with shifts in ‘foreign budgets, movements of crops, agricultural banks, oil developments’ and other areas. Winning him respect of colleagues, his bank work, like his editorial labors on the *Criterion*, involved writing, printing, and publishing. Circulated through internal bank publications, his regular reports on foreign financial developments informed Lloyds’s legal and commercial operations” (pp. 12-13).

This sounds like the kind of work that the economist John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946), the author of *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1920), might be suited to undertake. In Crawford’s new 2022 book, he reports that Eliot “wrote an obituary for his ‘genius’ friend Keynes who had died ‘suddenly – and unexpectedly’” (p. 387).

In plain English, based on Crawford’s account of the adult Eliot, I would characterize him as a workaholic (but as a Harvard undergraduate, he was not a workaholic; however, he subsequently changed significantly as a Harvard graduate student in philosophy) -- and as a person with an extraordinary capacity for compartmentalization, but also as a person who frequently tended toward burnout, occasionally verging on clinical depression.

Now, even though both Crawford’s 2015 book and his new 2022 book about Eliot are well populated with contemporary and historical persons, I would be remiss here if I did not mention that Crawford does not mention the posthumously published poems of the Victorian Jesuit classicist and poet and convert Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1889). Hopkins’ friend Robert Bridges (1844-1930; Poet Laureate of the United Kingdom, 1913-1930) published a selection of his poems in 1918. Hopkins also wrote some poignant sonnets expressing deep personal desolation – each of which is shorter and more highly focused and certainly far more personal than *The Waste Land* (1922). In terms of juxtaposition of materials, Hopkins’ lengthy deeply Christian late nineteenth-century poem *The Wreck of the Deutschland*, which is not a personal

poem, somewhat anticipates Eliot's juxtaposition of materials in *The Waste Land*. In my estimate, Hopkins various religious poems would have been pertinent reading for the author of *The Waste Land* and of much religious writing after his conversion to Anglicanism.

In Crawford's new 2022 book about Eliot, he mentions a book of poetry "[e]dited by the British Poet Laureate Robert Bridges" (p. 31).[4] In addition, Crawford makes it clear that Eliot studiously read works by the famous convert from Anglicanism to Roman Catholicism John Henry Newman (1801-1890), including Newman's *Grammar of Assent* (1870; see Crawford, pp. 94, 96, 160, 176, and 177).

Digression: In addition, Crawford does not mention the contemporary conservative English academics the Roman Catholic J. R. R. Tolkien (1892-1973) or the Anglican C. S. Lewis (1898-1963), some of whose writings still attract readers. For example, the recently victorious Italian hard-right politician Giorgia Meloni (born in 1977) is a fan of Tolkien's fantasy novels *The Hobbitt* (1937) and *The Lord of the Rings* (1954, 1954, 1955) -- as are many of her supporters. End of digression.

Notes

[1] I have discussed Ong's account of both the world-as-event sense of life and the world-as-view sense of life extensively in my article "Walter Ong and Harold Bloom can help us understand the Hebrew Bible" (2012). What Ong refers to in his 1969 essay as the world-as-event sense of life and the world-as-view sense of life represent a subsequent iteration of what he earlier iterated as the aural-to-visual shift in cognitive processing in Western cultural history, in his massively researched 1958 book *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Harvard University Press; for specific page references to the aural-to-visual shift, see the "Index" [p. 396]).

[2] For the text of *The Waste Land*, and much related material in the back pages, separate from the poem's main text, see *The Poems of T. S. Eliot: Volume I: Collected and Uncollected Poems*, edited by Christopher Ricks and Jim McCue (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015, pp. 53-77).

[3] Eliot's famous 1919 essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent" is reprinted in *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: Volume 2: The Perfect Critic, 1919-1926*, edited by Anthony Cuda and Ronald Schuchard (2021).

[4] Under the general editorship of Lesley Higgins and Michael F. Suarez, S.J., Oxford University Press has recently published seven volumes of the new version of *The Collected Works of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Volume VIII: *The Poems*, edited by Catherine Phillips, remains to be

published. For a perceptive discussion of Hopkins' life and work, see Ong's 1986 book *Hopkins, the Self, and God*, the published version of Ong's 1981 Alexander Lectures at the University of Toronto.

Concerning Hopkins, also see Ong's 1990 essay "Technological Development and Writer-Subject-Reader Immediacies" that is reprinted in *An Ong Reader: Challenges for Further Inquiry*, edited by Thomas J. Farrell and Paul A. Soukup (2002, pp. 497-504). Concerning Eliot, also check out Ong's article "T. S. Eliot and Today's Ecumenism" in *Religion and Literature* (Summer 1989). It is reprinted in volume two of Ong's *Faith and Contexts*, edited by Thomas J. Farrell and Paul A. Soukup (1992b, pp. 211-226).

References

Crawford, R. (1987). *The savage and the city in the work of T. S. Eliot*. Clarendon Press of Oxford University Press.

Crawford, R. (2015). *Young Eliot: From St. Louis to "The waste land."* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Crawford, R. (2022). *Eliot after "The waste land."* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Eliot, T. S. (2015). *The poems of T. S. Eliot: Volume I: Collected and uncollected poems* C. Ricks and J. McCue, Eds.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eliot, T. S. (2021). Tradition and the individual talent (pp. 105-114). *The complete prose of T. S. Eliot: Volume 2: The perfect critic, 1919-1926* (pp. 105-114; A. Cuda and R. Schuchard, Eds.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Farrell, T. J. (2012). Walter Ong and Harold Bloom can help us understand the Hebrew Bible. *Explorations in Media Ecology*, *11*(3&4), pp. 255-272.

Farrell, T. J., and P. A. Soukup, eds. (2012). *Of Ong and media ecology*. Hampton Press.

Lonergan, B. (1992). *Insight: A study of human understanding* (5th ed.; F. E. Crowe and R. M. Doran, Eds.). University of Toronto Press.

Maritain, J. (1968). *Integral humanism: Temporal and spiritual problems of a new Christendom* (J. W. Evans, Trans.). Charles Scribner's Sons. (Original work published 1936)

McGreevy, J. T. (2022). *Catholicism: A global history from the French revolution to Pope Francis*. W. W. Norton.

McLuhan, E. (1997). *The role of thunder in "Finnegans wake."* University of Toronto Press.

McLuhan, E. (2015). *Cynic satire*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

McLuhan, M. (1969). *The interior landscape: The literary criticism of Marshall McLuhan, 1943-1962* (E. McNamara, Ed.). McGraw-Hill.

McLuhan, M. (1978-1979). Pound, Eliot, and the rhetoric of *The waste land*. *New Literary History*, *10*(3), pp. 557-580.

McLuhan, M. (2006). *The classical trivium: The place of Thomas Nashe in the learning of his time* (W. T. Gordon, Ed.). Gingko Press.

McLuhan, M., and E. McLuhan. (2011). *Theories of communication*. Peter Lang.

Ong, W. J. (1958). *Ramus, method, and the decay of dialogue: From the art of discourse to the art of reason*. Harvard University Press.

Ong, W. J. (1969, August). World as view and world as event. *American Anthropologist*, *71*(4), pp. 634-647.

Ong, W. J. (1989, Summer). T. S. Eliot and today's ecumenism. *Religion and Literature* (University of Notre Dame), *21*(2), pp. 1-17.

Ong, W. J. (1986). *Hopkins, the self, and God*. University of Toronto Press.

Ong, W. J. (1992a, 1992b, 1995, 1999). *Faith and contexts* (4 vols.; T. j. Farrell and P. A. Soukup, Eds.). Scholars Press.

Ong, W. J. (2002). *An Ong reader: Challenges for further inquiry* (T. J. Farrell and P. A. Soukup, Eds.). Hampton Press.