

- - - . "Lancelot Andrews." *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order*. London: Faber and Faber, 1970. 11-26.
- - - . "A Romantic Aristocrat." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976. 24-32.
- - - . "Ben Jonson." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976. 104-22.
- - - . "The Idea of a Christian Society." *Christianity and Culture: The Idea of a Christian Society and Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1976. 1-77.
- - - . "The Local Flavor." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976. 32-38.
- - - . "The Perfect Critic." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976. 1-16.
- - - . "Tradition and the Individual Talent." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976. 47-59.
- - - . "The Modern Mind." *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism: Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England*. London: Faber and Faber. 1980. 121-42.
- - - . "The Lesson of Baudelaire." *The Annotated Waste Land with Eliot's Contemporary Prose*. Ed. Lawrence Rainey. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006. 144-45.
- - - . *The Letters of T.S. Eliot I: 1898-1922*. Ed. Valerie Eliot, and Hugh Houghton. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.
- English, Daylanne K. *Unnatural Selections: Eugenics in American Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance*. Chapel Hill, and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Holt III, Earl K "St Louis." *T. S. Eliot in Context*, Ed. Jason Harding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 9-16.
- Symons, Arthur. "Maeterlinck as a Mystic." *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*, London: Archibald Constable & CO. Ltd. 153-69.

religion. He even conceptualizes sex and romantic relations as sinful and nasty. Eliot's repulsion for Romanticism is due to his indictment of the feminine and his loathing of emotions not just in art but also in real life.

### Works Cited

- Ackroyd, Peter. *T.S. Eliot*. London: Hamish Hamilton. 1984.
- Bush, Ronald. *T. S. Eliot: A Study in Character and Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Eliot, T. S. *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy*. London: Faber and Faber, 1933.
- - - . *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. London: Faber and Faber, 1948.
- - - . "John Dryden." *Selected Essays*. Ed. 1921. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. [305-16].
- - - . "The Metaphysical Poets." *Selected Essays*. 1921. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. 281-91.
- - - . "Four Elizabethan Dramatists." *Selected Essays*. 1924. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. 109-17.
- - - . "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca." *Selected Essays*, 1927. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. 126-40.
- - - . "Arnold and Pater." *Selected Essays*. 1930. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. 431-43.
- - - . "Baudelaire." *Selected Essays*. 1930. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. 419-30.
- - - . "Thoughts after Lambeth." *Selected Essays*, 1931. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. [363-87].
- - - . "Religion and Literature." *Selected Essays*. 1935. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. 388-401.
- - - . "American Literature and the American Language." *To Criticize the Critic and Other Writings*. 1953. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1965. 43-60.
- - - . "Baudelaire in Our Time." *For Lancelot Andrews: Essays on Style and Order*. London: Faber and Faber, 1970. 68-78.
- - - . "Niccolo Machiavelli." *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order*, London: Faber and Faber, 1970. 39-52.

It was fundamental to Unitarianism that human nature was essentially good and could be perfected through conscious, diligent cultivation; indeed, Unitarians decreed moral self-improvement to be the paramount duty. Unitarians held Christ to be the paradigm, a human being who, by perfecting his moral nature, had become divine. They believed that by lifelong effort, ordinary humans could achieve this perfection (19).

Indeed, Eliot's religious sensibility is very suspicious, because the religious beliefs he endorses are inextricably linked with his personal views. In his study of Eliot's religion, Burry Spurr concludes that Eliot identifies religion "with the impersonal, objective, classical critique of the individualistic, Romantic and Protestant 'inner voice'" ("Religion" 307). Anglo-Catholicism appeals to Eliot due mainly to its universalism, its ties with tradition, and its assertion of an external authority, which is denied by the Romantics. Peter Ackroyd finds Eliot's later conversion as expected for a poet who aspires to extirpate his romantic yearnings. According to Ackroyd,

Peace, stillness, withdrawal: these are some of the characteristic qualities which Eliot associated with the religious life [...] he described, long before his conversion, the necessity for an allegiance to an external order which will silence what he called the 'inner voice', a relic of the Rousseauism or Romanticism which he professed to despise and which he associated with 'vanity and fear of lust' (138).

Eliot's religious sensibility, which is crystal clear in his critical essays and his early poems, is meant to escape from emotions and women.

### **Conclusion**

The paper has shown that T. S. Eliot's version of Modernism is masculine, virile, and conservative. Emotions, for him, are the sworn enemy which constitutes a stumbling block against creative writing. He considers them as defiling, pernicious, and demeaning. Hence, he calls for a complete denial of the self. For Eliot, Romanticism is a sickness. It is considered as heretic, satanic, and feminine. Thus, it needs to be exorcised by dint of

Andrews"25). Eliot finds in religion a way of escape from emotions. In fact, even before his conversion, he had a religious sensibility. One reason why religion appeals to Eliot is that it addresses the mind rather than emotions. He points out that: "The idea of a Christian Society is one which we can accept or reject; but if we are to accept it, we must treat Christianity with a great deal more *intellectual* respect than in our wont; we must treat it as being for the individual a matter primarily of thought and not of feeling"("The Idea"6). The quote is a testimony to the fact that Eliot prioritizes intellect over feeling. His woman hatred elicits his binary thinking and his dualistic categorization of the world into spiritual/physical, intellectual/emotional. Eliot's insistence on the artist's necessary possession of a religious sensibility in the act of writing veils his intent to urge people to submit to an authority, which is likely to silence their inner voice.

In contrast to the belief in the perfection of the human nature promised by the Romantics, Eliot believes in the Original Sin. According to him, "we are all, naturally, impure" (*After Strange* 63). Eliot quotes Baudelaire's view of life, which he considers as an evangel to his time and Eliot's age also. Baudelaire states: "*La vraie civilization n'est pas dans le gaz, ni dans la vapeur, ni dans les tables tournantes. Elle est dans la diminution des traces du péché origine*"("Baudelaire"430). Baudelaire's statement recalls to mind T. E. Hulme's idea of the Original Sin, which considers human beings as essentially bad, limited and imperfect. Hence, they are always in need of an external authority, whether ethical or political, which disciplines them. The importance of the Original Sin lies in restraining the artist from bypassing facts and inclining towards excess. Without the belief in the Original Sin ingrained in his mind, the writer is likely to fall in the trap of stepping beyond facts when representing human beings and their feelings in his art. The benighted artist, who dispenses with moral struggle, creates a fictitious world of human relations which is very far from reality. Eliot rejects Unitarianism because of its optimism and belief in the perfect nature of the individual. Earl K. Holt III points out that:

I never knew my grandfather: he died a year before my birth. But I was brought up to be very much aware of him: so much so, that as a child I thought of him as still the head of the family—a ruler for whom in *absentia* my grandmother stood as vicegerent. The standard of conduct was that which my grandfather had set; our moral judgments, our decisions between duty and self-indulgence, were taken as if, like Moses, he had brought down the tables of the Law, any deviation from which would be sinful (“American Literature” 44).

The teachings of Eliot’s grandfather remain a looming presence in his entire life. They impel him to take conservative views regarding all aspects of his life, including his relationship with women and even his aesthetic views. Since his childhood, Eliot had been instructed to extirpate all what is personal. He states:

Original Law of Public Service operated in three areas: the Church, the City, and the University. The Church means, for us, the Unitarian Church of the Messiah [...] These were the symbols of religion, the Community and Education: and I think it is a very good beginning for any child, to be brought up to reverence and institution, and to be taught that personal and selfish aims should be subordinated to the general good which they represent” (“American Literature” 44).

In the same vein, Eliot’s attacks on Charles Whibley owe to the latter’s lack of puritanical teachings. He assumes that it “is partly that his tastes are not puritanical, that he can talk about Restoration dramatists and others without apologizing for their ‘indecentness’” (“Imperfect Critics” 33).

Thus far, it becomes evident that Eliot’s keen interest in religion lies in the fact that it is a means to mollify one’s intense emotions. In his discussion of John Donne, Eliot posits that the latter “had a genuine taste both for theology and for religious emotion; but he belonged to that class of persons, of which there are always one or two examples in the modern world, who seek refuge in religion from the tumults of a strong emotional temperament which can find no complete satisfaction elsewhere” (“Lancelot

life; of something which I assume to be our primary concern" ("Religion and Literature" 398).

Eliot vehemently reproaches D. H. Lawrence due to the absence of morality in his art. Commenting on the relations between men and women in his writings, Eliot states that what is striking in this aspect is "the absence of any moral and social sense" (*After Strange* 37). Eliot denigrates Lawrence's writings because they are not concerned with moral problems. In his view, Lawrence's flawed upbringing accounts to a great extent for his sexual morbidity. He writes:

[N]othing could be much drearier (so far as one can judge from his own account) than the vague hymn singing 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. But lest I be supposed to be concerned primarily with the decay of morals (and especially sexual morals) (*After Strange* 39).

What leads to Lawrence's sexual morbidity is his lack of a true religious upbringing, which is necessary to provide the individual with principles that are likely to prevent his sexual carnality. In Eliot's view, "the deplorable religious upbringing [...] gave Lawrence his lust for intellectual independence. Like most people who do not know what orthodoxy is, he hated it" (*After Strange* 58). Eliot attributes Lawrence's wanton sexual motives to the absence of a religious background which could have shielded him. So, Eliot's rage is against the absence of religious guidance which could have restrained Lawrence's emotional emancipation. He states that "[a] man like Lawrence[...] with his acute sensibility, violent prejudices and passions, and lack of intellectual and social training, is admirably fitted to be an instrument for forces of good or for forces of evil; or as we might expect, partly for one and partly for the other" (*After Strange* 59). In contrast to Lawrence, Eliot has a religious upbringing that had a great impact on his aesthetic theories and his creative writing. In one of his essays, he makes the following confession:

Similarly, the importance of Machiavelli, for Eliot, is due to his belief in the imperfection of human nature, which is in radical variance with the Romantics who are ardent supporters of the perfection of the individual. According to Eliot, the “utility of Machiavelli is his perpetual summons to examination of the weakness and impurity of the soul. We are not likely to forget his political lessons, but his examination of conscience may be too easily overlooked” (“Niccolo Machiavelli” 52). Like the true Christians, who believe in the idea of the Original Sin, Machiavelli also believes in the limitations of the individual and his impure nature. In the same vein and in his comparison between Lancelot Andrews and Donne, Eliot extolls Andrewes because he is

the more mediaeval [...] the more pure, and because his bond was with the Church, with tradition. His intellect was satisfied by theology and his sensibility by prayer and liturgy. Donne is the more modern [...] Donne is much less the mystic; he is primarily interested in man. He is much less traditional (“Lancelot Andrewes” 25).

For Eliot, to be medieval is virtuous because it encompasses purity, religion, and tradition. Donne is described as a modern, because modernity is marked by an utter lack or a flagrant deviation from religion, which propels Donne to be very much concerned with individuality.

Eliot spells out his scathing indictment of modern literature, which is devoid of morality. In his view, “contemporary literature as a whole tends to be degrading” (“Religion and Literature” 396). This degradation of modern literature is due to the absence of religion in the modern age, which is rendered secular after the ‘Death of God’. The religious crisis is also due to individualism, which views the subject as the centre of the universe, unrestrained by any external authority. Discussing the effects of secularism on modern literature, Eliot affirms that “the whole of modern literature is corrupted by [...] Secularism, that it is simply unaware of, simply cannot understand the meaning of, the primacy of the supernatural over the natural

and art. He writes: "The artistic sensibility is impoverished by its divorce from the religious sensibility" (*Notes Towards* 26). The view that artistic sensibility is incomplete without some deployment of a religious sensibility is due to Eliot's keen interest in the education of people. For him, religion is an important ingredient not just in literary composition; it also plays a very important role in the sanity and flourishing of European civilization. Eliot assumes that it "is in Christianity that our arts have developed" (*Notes Towards* 122). In the modern age, which is deprived of ethical values, it is incumbent upon the author to enlighten his people. Eliot states that "most people are only very little alive, and to awaken them to the spiritual is a very great responsibility" (*After Strange* 60). So, Eliot, whose doctrine of Impersonality calls for severing art from life, believes that the artist should be the prophet and the savior of his people.

Eliot salutes Baudelaire because his poems are preoccupied with moral issues. He maintains that "Baudelaire is concerned, not with demons, black masses, and romantic blasphemy, but with the real problem of good and evil. It is hardly more than an accident of time that he uses the current imagery and vocabulary of blasphemy [For] Baudelaire that what really matters is Sin and Redemption" ("Baudelaire" 424). In an age marked by secularism and immorality, Baudelaire was not writing vicious romantic poetry; he was dealing, instead, with the universal problem of good and evil. This is what makes him an author of the first rank. In another essay on Baudelaire, Eliot points out that: "[a]ll first rate poetry is occupied with morality: this is the lesson of Baudelaire. More than any poet of his time, Baudelaire was aware of what most mattered: the problem of good and evil. What gives the French seventeenth century literature its solidity is the fact that it had its morals, that it had coherent point of view" ("The Lesson of Baudelaire" 144-45). French seventeenth century literature, according to Eliot, is marked by solidity which is a masculine attribute, in contrast to the feminist quality of softness. This solidity emanates from its concern with morality and religion.



RachalPotter reads Eliot's invective against Romanticism, which she views as vicious and spiritually empty, as an attempt to transcend the feminine. She considers "subjectivism and egoism that Eliot associates with romanticism [as] connected with women; and women are agents of excess, both in terms of emotion and in terms of an unreflective physicality"(135). For Eliot, to elevate literature and culture, sexuality and the female body must be shunned. He deems sentimentalism and romanticism, which are associated with women, detrimental to literature and culture. In this respect, the critic Daylanne K. English points out that

modern (white) literary and cultural improvement was carefully disengaged from matters of sexuality, and in particular from the female body [...] Eliot was not alone among male modernist writers in believing that women were not as able as men to produce significant art or culture. Many male modernists consciously and explicitly sought to purge cultural works of the early twentieth century of the sentimentality and femininity they associated with romanticism ( 67).

Eliot's theorization of artistic creation, which he conceives as masculine, is embedded in logocentric thought, which constructs the polarity male/female. While it valorizes the first dichotomy, it relegates the second and puts it under erasure. Eliot's masculine poeticalness is a protective shield against the threat of modernity and feminism.

### **2-T. S. Eliot's Religious Sensibility**

Religion is of pivotal importance in Eliot's critical oeuvre. It is viewed as a means to order emotions, which are sparked in the writing process. In his study of the interrelatedness between religion and art, Eliot approves works of art which deal with morality. In "Thomas Middleton", for instance, he maintains that the best tragedies are those which are concerned with manners and goodness. In his words, the "greatest tragedies are occupied with great and permanent moral conflicts: the great tragedies of Eschylus, of Sophocles, of Corneille, of Racine, of Shakespeare have the same burden"(84). Eliot views an inevitable relationship between religion

between the work of art and myself”( *Four Elizabethan* 114-15). Eliot views Elizabethan art as impure because he fulminates against the emotional intensity and morbidity, which he relentlessly scorns in real life. So, his criticism holds imprints of his personality. That is to say, his hatred of emotions in real life has an impact on his critical theories and aesthetic views. A supporter of this view, Eliot's biographer, Ronald Bush, attributes the emotional drought in Eliot's poems to his personality which distrusts emotions and feelings. Hence, he comes to view emotions in art as repellent. According to Bush, in his early years, Eliot “was determined-even compelled-to acknowledge his inner life, but the most deep-seated of his inhibitions told him that feelings and wishes were not to be trusted [...] Eliot's early work scorns the early expression of sentiment with what can only be called an excessive animus”(6).

Behind Eliot's rallying cry to efface emotions, there lies a hidden fervid desire to cleanse art and culture which are tainted and bedaubed with the traces of female writers and women, who have started to enter the literary and the public spheres. Like the other male Modernist writers, Eliot considers Romanticism, which is feminine, the major enemy of the modern age that has to be overcome. The romantic poets threaten to efface tradition and to accord greater importance to the individual artist. Consequently, Romanticism has resulted in a deep moral chaos and anarchy, because it stretches the individual's imagination and sentimentalism. Colleen Lamos assumes that Eliot's abhorrence of Romanticism is embedded in the culture of his age. In her words, “Eliot's early work participates in the reaction of early twentieth-century male modernist writers against what they viewed as the feminization of Victorian literary culture as well as against the incursions of the feminist New Woman”( 79). Eliot's railings on Romanticism is due to the rise of the so-called New Woman, who strives to be put on equal footings with men. So, his harsh criticism of this literary movement is compatible with the other male writers' rage against the feminist movement, which threatens to destroy the old-established patriarchal order and tear it asunder.

lose their humanity; and unless there is moral resistance and conflict there is no meaning (*After Strange* 55).

Eliot scorns the Romantics' ardent belief in love for love's sake which results in moral degradation. Whatever the intensity of people's emotions, the latter relegate them to a debased state if they lack ethical restraints and intellectual ties. In other words, violent emotion for its own sake does not elevate but rather degrades the individual. These strong emotions without moral guidance are likely to deprive people of their human nature. They turn them into mere sexual engines. Romanticism, as Eliot remarks, is "now expanding to cover almost the whole of the life of a time and of nearly the whole world" ("The Modern Mind" 128). Thus far, it becomes crystal clear that Eliot's railings at Romanticism as a vile form of expression veils his revulsion at emotions and sexuality.

Since debased emotions are detrimental to the individual, there is a need to discipline them especially in the young people whose emotions are eccentric and their outlook on life is too limited. According to Eliot, "[d]iscipline of the emotions is even rarer, and in the modern world still more difficult, than discipline of the mind [...] Thought, study, mortification, and sacrifice: it is such notions as these that should be impressed upon the young" ("Thoughts After" 373). Eliot expresses his trenchant criticism of the garbage of the modern age, which is marked by immorality and vulgarity. For him, emotions might be disciplined by an intense addiction to study, intellectual passion, mortification, and sacrifice. These means are likely to help the person achieve a kind of psychological equilibrium. Eliot avows that his critical views, like his repudiation of Romanticism, emanates from his personal views and his philosophy of life. Concerning his views about the Elizabethan drama, for instance, he considers it as impure: "If it be objected that this is a prejudice of the case, I can only reply that one must criticize from some point of view and that it is better to know what one's point of view is. [...] I rebel against most performances of Shakespeare's plays because I want a direct relationship

which are in the experience which is one's material and the emotion in the writing-the two seem to me very different (*The Letters I* 503).

Thus, artistic creation is unthinkable without emotions which constitute its raw materials. These emotions are disinterred by real life experiences. But as they are deployed in the act of writing, they should be transformed into different emotions which are impersonal.

Indeed, emotional morbidity is repellent for Eliot not just in art but also in real life. In a letter to Henry Eliot, dated 26 March 1920, Eliot complains about the immorality and the garbage of the time. He writes: "Nothing shocks [...] except morbidity, and I know that a morbid relation never becomes a healthy one" (*The Letters I* 458). Eliot seems to be shocked by sexual promiscuity, morbidity and moral decadence that become very rife in the modern age. The individual, at that time, suffers from many depravities owing to the loss of ethical values, which results in unrestrained sexual freedom. The latter is horrific, for Eliot, who has a conservative and religious background. In his discussion of the danger of human love without constraints, Arthur Symons writes: "When the soul gives itself absolutely to love, all the barriers of the world are burnt away. And all its wisdom and subtlety are as incense poured on a flame. Morality, too, is burnt away, no longer exists, any more than it does for children or for God"(157-8). So, a blind submission to love leads inevitably to a crisis of morality. Along similar lines, Eliot makes a forthright attack on the Romantics' despicable excessive emotionalism, which he views as an indication of degeneration. He views their intense sentimentalism as

a symptom of decadence; it is a cardinal point of faith in a romantic age to believe that there is something admirable in violent emotion for its own sake [...] violent physical passions do not in themselves differentiate men from each other, but rather tend to reduce them to the same state [...] those who abandon themselves without resistance to the excitements which tend to deprive them of reason, become merely instruments of feeling and

towards preventing the emotional flow and discharge in the reading process. The aim of poetry, in Eliot's view, is to transcend and escape the feelings and emotions of everyday life, which boost the author's imagination. He writes:

What every poet starts from is his own emotions [...] Dante's railings, his personal spleen [...] his nostalgia, his bitter regrets for past happiness [...] and his brave attempts to fabricate something permanent and holy out of his personal animal feelings-as in the *Vita Nuova*-can all be matched out of Shakespeare. Shakespeare, too, was occupied with the struggle [...] to transmute his personal and private agonies into something rich and strange, something universal and impersonal ("Shakespeare and the Stoicism" 137).

Dante's and Shakespeare's great poetry is ignited by the fire of their encumbering emotional torture. However, as they release their pent-up emotions, they tergiversate them into something which is scarcely pertinent to their personal life. Thus, the business of the artist is not to express his emotions, but rather to transform these emotions and render his personal experience impersonal and universal. In the same vein, Eliot singles Baudelaire as an eminent titan of literature, because he has the power to deter the profusion of his personal feelings in the writing process. He states that "no man was ever less the dupe of passions than Baudelaire; he was engaged in an attempt to explain, to justify, to make something of them, an enterprise which puts him almost on a level with the author of the '*Vita Nuova*'" ("Baudelaire in Our Time" 71). Though Baudelaire seems to galvanise human emotions, he transgresses them by transforming them into something universal and permanent, very much like Dante and Shakespeare. Along similar lines, and in a letter to John Gould Fletcher, dated 23 September 1920, Eliot admits that he does not

deny the importance of emotion [...] One writes about the world one has experienced: and experience without emotion [...] is almost a contradiction [...] there is an important distinction between the emotions

female characters bestow their favours upon savages. The author of that book seems to me to have been a very sick man indeed (*After Strange* 60-1).

Lawrence's excessive and perverse desires make him an unhealthy and debile man. Unlike Lawrence, Eliot loudly applauds Niccolo Machiavelli because of his immunity from deviant passions. In his words, "[w]hat makes him a great writer, and for ever a solitary figure, is the purity and single-mindedness of his passion [...] Only the pure in heart can blow the gaff on human nature as Machiavilli has done" ("Niccolo Machiavelli" 51). So, like in his other essays, Eliot emphasizes the purity of emotions in the act of writing.

As a reaction to sentimentalism, Eliot advocates a kind of art which is hard. In his development as a poet, he was influenced by modern French literature, especially by Charles Baudelaire and Jule Laforgue. The French poets held his attention because the trait of hardness in their poems is sharply opposed to the softness of Romanticism and feminist writings. In a letter to Eleanor Hinkley, dated 1 April 1918, Eliot insists that one "must read French; let there be no nonsense about that; it is the most serious modern literature. Both for prose and poetry. It is hard work" (*The Letters* 260). Artistic creation, for Eliot, is a hard job which demands herculean efforts. In contrast to the Romantics, who defined poetry as the "spontaneous overflow of emotion recollected in tranquility" ("Tradition" 58), Eliot conceives art as a very conscious and hard process which requires strength and even violence. In this respect, Eliot prefers Baudelaire to Dryden because the former "could see profounder possibilities in art, and in violently joined images" ("John Dryden" 314). Eliot also avows a striking appreciation for the metaphysical poets because in their works "the most heterogeneous ideas are yoked by violence together" ("The Metaphysical Poets" 283). Since violence is traditionally conceived as masculine, Eliot adopts the rhetoric of violence to stress the masculinity of artistic creation.

Despite his admission that emotions are driving forces behind all poetry, Eliot insists that the act of writing should be geared

we can suggest that this experience was not perfectly controlled, and that he lacked spiritual discipline (“Lancelot Andrews” 16).

Eliot’s statement pours scorn on Donne due to his blind response to the dreams of his heart. The dozes of his emotional impulses lack a spiritual or religious knowledge, which would have straightened or balanced these intense motives. The same is true of Thomas Hardy. Eliot finds that a kind of sentimental morbidity surges from his short story “Barbara of the House of Grebe”. In his commentary on the story, Eliot writes:

[We] are introduced to a world of pure evil. The tale would seem to have been written solely to provide a satisfaction for some morbid emotion. I find the same strain in the work of a man whose morbidity I have already had occasion to mention, and whom I regard as a very much greater genius, if not a greater artist, than Hardy: D. H. Lawrence (*After Strange* 58).

Hardy’s work depicts a world of evil since, in its writing, the author was seeking sexual gratification. Eliot finds Hardy’s sexual morbidity similar to that of D. H. Lawrence, whose writings Eliot vehemently abhors despite being one of the great authors, who are accorded a prominent place in the Modernist canon. Lawrence’s problem, in writing, is that the emotional side outpaced, nay obliterated the intellectual one, which results in torrid sexuality. In this regard, Eliot claims that Lawrence suffers from “lack not so much of information as of the critical faculties which education should give, and an incapacity for what we ordinarily call thinking” (*After Strange* 58). In Lawrence, Eliot adds, “there is a distinct sexual morbidity” (*After Strange* 58). Due to his emotional carnality, Lawrence is considered as a sick man. Eliot describes the over-sentimentalism he finds in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* as a real malady. In his commentary on the novel, he states:

I cannot see much development in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. Our old acquaintance, the game keeper, sums up again: the social obsession which makes his well-Born-or almost well-born-ladies offer themselves to-or make use of-plebesians springs from the same morbidity which makes other of his

Eliot, here, uses a religious parlance to express his diatribe against William Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe whose misuse and abuse of language leads to an excessive vicious style, which is similar to that of the Romantics. Whereas Marlowe's vice lies in glamorizing things, Shakespeare's rhetoric consists of laying an exaggerated stress on style. Eliot calls for the stripping away of the clothes of rhetoric, because the latter makes the author stray away from reality and facts, depicting, instead, insincere and dishonest experiences.

Along similar lines, Eliot sharply criticizes Arthur Symons, one of the key figures in the aesthetic tendency in art, and he also spells out his violent invective against his predecessors Walter Pater and Algernon Charles Swinburne. In his view, "the phrase 'sick or sorry' is the common property of all three" ("The Perfect Critic" 3). For the champions of Aestheticism, art is an autonomous and self-sufficient entity. It liberates the author from conforming or submitting to any external authority. Eliot vigorously attacks Aestheticism because it breaks from all the ties that would restrain the artist's perverse impulses and instincts. In his criticism of Pater, one of the founders of Aestheticism, Eliot writes: "Pater is inclined to emphasize whatever is morbid or associated with physical malady. His admirable study of Coleridge is charged with this attraction" ("Arnold and Pater" 439). Eliot's criticism of Pater is due to his exuberant emotions and his inclination to morbidity which is, for him, a physical sickness.

Donne falls prey to Eliot's vitriolic criticism on account of his poetry which is stained by his emotional and sexual infection. The latter emanates from the fact that he shakes free from all spiritual ties. Eliot points out that in Donne,

there hangs the shadow of the impure motive [...] He is a little of the religious spellbinder [...], the flesh-creeper, the sorcerer of emotional orgy. We emphasize this aspect to the point of the grotesque. Donne had a trained mind; but without belittling the intensity or the profundity of his experience,



creation. In his vitriolic attack on Romanticism, Eliot asserts that “willful perversity had taken possession of literary men, a new literary disease called Romanticism. That is one of the dangers of expressing one’s meaning in terms of Romanticism”(“Towards a Definition” 256). For Eliot, artists are plagued by a sickness called Romanticism which is deemed a deviance or a perversity from the norm. The Romantics’ major fault is their excessive or extravagant expression of emotion in art by transgressing the real feelings which they experience. So, Modernism comes as a reaction against sentimentalism that had pervaded previous literature. In his sharp criticism of the Romantics’ eccentricity and self-centredness, Eliot maintains that “Romanticism is a short cut to the strangeness without the reality, and it leads its disciples only back upon themselves”(“A Romantic Aristocrat” 31). Romanticism is denounced because it draws a gaily colored and strangely pictured life that is very far from reality. The Romantics construct a very subjective and personal world and dwell in it.

Eliot and many Modernists, who hold a polemical stance regarding the Romantics, employ an artistic form which is fragmented. This formless form reflects the imperfection of the individual and the seamy side of reality. As a reaction to Romanticism, Eliot also becomes very critical of rhetoric, because it stirs emotions. He describes verbiage as “prolixity or redundancy or the other vices in the rhetoric books; there is a definite artistic emotion which demands expression at that length.”(“Ben Jonson” 190). Rhetoric is considered vicious because it affects the reader’s emotions. Eliot vehemently criticizes Marlowe and Shakespeare’s writings on account of their use of a rhetorical and passionate style. He states that the

‘vices of style’ of Marlowe’s and Shakespeare’s age is a convenient name for a number of vices [...] Marlowe’s rhetoric consists in a pretty simple huffe-snuffe bombast, while Shakespeare’s is more exactly a vice of style, a tortured perverse ingenuity of images which dissipates instead of concentrating the imagination, and which may be due in part to influences by which Marlowe was untouched (“Four Elizabethan” 119).

## Religion Versus Emotion in T. S. Eliot's Prose

Dr. Leila Bellour\*

### Abstract

In T. S. Eliot's prose, Romanticism is seen as the sworn enemy which constitutes a stumbling block against creative writing. This poet and critic considers Romanticism and sexuality as sinful, heretic, and feminine; thus, they need to be exorcised by dint of religion. Eliot embraces T. E. Hulme's view of Romanticism as 'spilt religion'. For him, religion is an authority that is likely to silence the inner voice and mollify one's intense emotions. Thus, it helps achieve his literary project of impersonality. Eliot's woman hatred elicits his binary thinking and his dualistic categorization of the world into spiritual/emotional. Religion, for him, is a means of transcending emotions and the feminine.

**Key word:** Romanticism, emotion, religion, misogyny, T. S. Eliot

### الملخص

ينظر ت.س.اليوت إلى التيار الرومانسي في نثره على انه العدو اللدود الذي يشكّل حجر عثرة ضد الكتابة الإبداعية. و يعتبر هذا الشاعر و الناقد الرومانسية والجنس على انها ذنب و كفر وشكل من الأنثوية و بالتالي يجب التخلص منها عن طريق الدين. يتبنى ت.س. اليوت فكرة ت.أ.هيوم القائلة بأن الرومانسية هي 'دين مسكوب'. بالنسبة له فإن الدين هو السلطة التي من المرجح أن تسكت الصوت الذاتي و تخفف من عواطف المرء المكثفة. و بالتالي فإنه يساعد على تحقيق مشروع اللاذاتية الأدبي. إن كراهية اليوت للمرأة قد اثارت تفكيره الثنائي و تصنيفه الازدواجي للعالم إلى الروحية/العاطفية. الدين بالنسبة إليه هو وسيلة لتجاوز العاطفة و الأنثى. الكلمات المفتاحية: الرومانسية، العاطفة، الدين، كراهية المرأة، ت.س. اليوت.

### 1-The Vice of Emotion and Romanticism

Eliot's literary project aspires to distance Modernism from the Romantic tradition. He always considers emotions detrimental to artistic

---

\* Department of Foreign Languages Abdelhafid Boussouf University Center of Mila, Algeria