Article submission for *the D. H. Lawrence Society of Japan*

Dr Sean Matthews

School of English

University of Nottingham

sean.matthews@nottingham.ac.uk

T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, and the Structure of Feeling of Modernism

Eliot and Lawrence have long been considered the opposed critical, social and intellectual poles of Modernism. F. R. Leavis's indignant catalogue of Eliot's attacks on Lawrence established the orthodox position: Eliot was 'the essential opposition in person'. However, more recent research – drawing on the many newly accessible materials by and about Eliot– demonstrates that Eliot's relationship with Lawrence was far more complex, volatile and intriguing than this orthodoxy allows. Not only is the extent, intensity and acuity of Eliot's readings of Lawrence overlooked, so also is the pattern of intertextual echoes and references which mark his work, and the uncanny overlap of the two men's social circles. Bertrand Russell, John Middleton Murry, Richard Aldington and Aldous Huxley were close friends of both men, and they also shared a wide circle of acquaintances which included Ottoline Morrell, Katherine Mansfield, Brigid Patmore, Ezra Pound and others. This essay explores the ways in which Lawrence's example, his life and writing, perplexed and provoked Eliot, revealing new aspects of the emergent modernist structure of feeling.

F. R. Leavis Bertrand Russell Ottoline Morrell John Middleton Murry 1914-18 1920s 1930s

T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, and the Structure of Feeling of Modernism

T.S. Eliot's relationship to D.H. Lawrence was complex, volatile and, for Eliot himself, apparently ultimately unfathomable. Shortly before his death, in 1965, he characterized his lifelong attention to Lawrence as 'a tissue of praise and execration', describing the other writer as the 'one contemporary figure about whom my mind will, I fear, always waver between dislike, exasperation, boredom and admiration.'[1] He confessed to bemusement in the face of what was, for him, such an unusual critical instability and uncertainty: 'I cannot account for such contradictions'. By this time, as he acknowledged, the more negative, or 'vehement', of his assessments of Lawrence had been catalogued by F.R. Leavis as evidence of his critical (and human) deficiencies, but Eliot pointed to several more approving, even celebratory, references to Lawrence's work from across his long career. He also revealed that he had been ready to appear as a witness for the Defence at the 1960 trial of Penguin Books, the 'Chatterley Trial', when it was for the first time possible to defend Lawrence's novel against the charge of obscenity on the grounds of its 'literary merit'. Nevertheless, correspondence in the Penguin archives reveals that it was precisely the requirement that Eliot explain or, ideally, recant his earlier attacks on Lawrence, particularly those in *After Strange Gods* (1934), which made the Defence team so eager for his support.[2] Eliot's antipathy towards Lawrence was by that point a critical commonplace, his criticisms (as compiled by Leavis) an index to negative appraisals of his achievement. The importance of Lawrence to Eliot, as a means of refining his critical vocabulary and priorities, and as a creative example or foil, is nonetheless evident in the force and extent of his engagement, an engagement of a different kind from his appropriation or inhabiting, his use, of 'the tradition' of classic writers, such as Dante, Laforgue, Baudelaire, Elizabethan dramatists, or metaphysical poets, and also distinct from his creative dialogue and exchange to other contemporaries such as Pound, Hulme, Joyce or Woolf. In this essay, I explore the Eliot's engagement with Lawrence, the dynamic tension between the writers, as elements within the wider structure of feeling of modernism, where that term points specifically, in Raymond Williams's coinage, to new, emergent and very often obscure, controversial or contested cultural and social forms.[3] In order to do this, it is necessary to extend our understanding of this unusual relationship, tracking the extensive and often uncanny parallels between the two writers' personal biographies, and their intellectual or artistic trajectories, and mapping the quite remarkable network of shared friendship and acquaintance in which they were embedded.

If Eliot's attacks on Lawrence are a well-known fact of literary history, closer scrutiny of the wealth of new and hitherto inaccessible material by and concerning Eliot which has been published in

recent years reveals a more nuanced and markedly more significant relationship than those more notorious interventions suggest.[4] It is now possible to catalogue not only the many incidental and occasional comments Eliot made about Lawrence, very often appreciative or approving, both in public and private writing, but also the further, more extended, critical attention evident in Eliot's teaching plans and lecture notes, attention which extends our understanding of Lawrence's importance to him. In 1917, in the *Egoist*, for instance, he refers to Lawrence as 'a poet of peculiar genius' albeit with 'peculiar faults'.[5] In 1922, in *The Dial*, Lawrence is 'the most interesting novelist in England', a judgement he reiterates soon afterwards in a letter to his brother, Henry: 'There is very little contemporary writing that affords me any satisfaction whatever; there is certainly no contemporary novelist except D.H. Lawrence and of course Joyce, in his way, whom I care to read.'[6] In 1925, he tells Lawrence's agent, Curtis Brown, 'I shall always be glad to use as much of Mr Lawrence's work as I possibly can' in the pages of *The Criterion*.[7] In addition to the University of Virginia Page-Barbour Lectures, of 1933, containing the discussion of Lawrence as a 'heretic' (published as *After Strange Gods*), Eliot explored Lawrence's work at length in his lecture series, 'English 26: Modern English Literature', delivered at Harvard in the same year. For Eliot, 'The antithesis between Joyce and Lawrence represents the crisis of our time', Lawrence (in *Aaron's Rod*) displays 'great powers of observation […] immense descriptive and evocative powers'. His notes sketch a detailed comparison between Joyce and Lawrence, 'two men who are great men […] to be respected'.[8] The discussion stretched over three lectures, examining a number of Lawrence's short stories and novels, dwelling on the 'greatness' and 'beauty' of *Sons and Lovers*, from which he quotes extensively. Lawrence was also discussed approvingly in his lecture on 'English Poets as Letter Writers', at Yale in February 1933, and in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (1933), drawing on both occasions from Aldous Huxley's only recently published collection of Lawrence's letters, and commenting favourably on Lawrence's account of 'love' (a topic to which he returns in a revealing letter to Geoffrey Faber, in 1935).[9] In 1953, during a lecture at Washington University, he singles out Lawrence's essay on Fenimore Cooper as 'the most brilliant of critical essays'.[10] By the late 1950s and early 1960s, he is engaged in preparing for the Chatterley Trial, entering into correspondence with the Defence team, but also with, amongst others, Helen Gardner and Vivian de Sola Pinto, about Lawrence's work. Martin Jarrett-Kerr reported, 'He [Eliot] told me (I think in 1960) that he hoped to re-read Lawrence, and write afresh about him.'[11] Given Eliot's own fascination with the form and nature of literary influence, it is all the more intriguing to be able now to explore more thoroughly, and to begin to reassess and recontextualize, his own long, if fragmentary and often occluded, engagement with Lawrence.[12]

In studies of Eliot, Lawrence does not figure as a significant influence or figure, other than to confirm and illustrate the opposition and difference between the two.[13] Despite the prodigious volume of critical and biographical attention dedicated to the two writers, there have been only a very few scholarly articles addressed to their relationship. Such studies, necessarily, first acknowledge the tremendous impact of Leavis's work in framing our understanding of them, both singly and together. Leavis was instrumental in establishing the academic literary reputations of both authors ('our time, in Literature, may fairly be called the age of D.H. Lawrence and T.S. Eliot: the two, in creative pre-eminence'), and his eventual categorization of the 'essential opposition' between them in terms of form, outlook and significance is a critical commonplace.[14] Leavis's case was predicated, however, on the defence of Lawrence against Eliot's published criticisms, particularly those from the period 1927-1934, which Leavis argued had prevented proper assessment of Lawrence's achievement. Leavis elided or overlooked what little evidence was then available of any greater sympathy, regard or influence between the two men, taking the examples of Eliot's praise for Lawrence as at best equivocal or as a 'curious sleight by which Mr Eliot surreptitiously takes away while giving'.[15] Lawrence himself, for Leavis, appeared to confirm the existence of a mutual antagonism. In a late (1929) letter to John Middleton Murry, published in the Huxley collection (1932), Lawrence wrote, 'The animal that I am you instinctively dislike – just as all the Lynds and Squires and Eliots and Goulds instinctively dislike it', a phrase which Leavis quotes in the opening chapter of *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (1955).[16] This association of Murry with Eliot is, as I discuss below, far from coincidental (it is one link within the remarkable network of Eliot and Lawrence's shared friends and acquaintances), and it is clear that in many ways Murry's and Eliot's critical attitudes to Lawrence converged. Eliot's early and favourable review of Murry's 'brilliant book' of 'destructive criticism' about Lawrence, *Son of Woman* (1931), certainly confirmed Leavis's sense of Eliot as active in supporting, even orchestrating, the derogation of Lawrence's work after his death.[17] As we have seen, however, even at this period there is evidence that Eliot's attitude was more conflicted that Leavis could have known. In 1960, also unknown to Leavis, Eliot recalled in his 'Brief of Evidence' for the Chatterley Trial a 'particularly unhappy period […] from about 1929-34 […] when I lectured about Lawrence and prepared *After Strange Gods*' and, 'I should have realized that I as well as he should have been described as "a sick soul".'[18] 'I should mention,' Eliot continued, 'that there were circumstances in my private life which I can see in retrospect affected my critical judgment and made me more sweeping and violent in some of my assertions than I now feel'.

The few articles which take the Eliot/Lawrence relationship as their topic explore the relationship from two perspectives. They discuss, like Leavis, Eliot's critical comments on Lawrence, or – more rarely, and often only incidentally – they explore the intertextual relationships between the two

bodies of work. The first example of the latter tendency was published in 1947. Louis L. Martz made the startling observation that patterns of expression relating to 'the image of the rose-garden' in 'Burnt Norton' (published in 1936) and *The Family Reunion* derived 'power and meaning from […] D.H. Lawrence's short story 'The Shadow in the Rose Garden' (in *The Prussian Officer,* 1914), which Eliot praises and discusses at some length in *After Strange Gods*.'[19] This story was also, we now know, explored in detail in the Eliot's 'Modern English Literature' lectures of 1933, along with the notion of the 'moment in time' which Martz sees as a particular preoccupation in Eliot's writing of the period. The writing of 'Burnt Norton', and of the play *Murder in the Cathedral* from which it drew or even emerged, was taking place precisely at the time when Eliot had been most immersed in Lawrence's work. It was to be more than twenty years, however, before Carl Baron, in 'Lawrence's Influence on T.S. Eliot' (1971), took up Martz's example. Baron argues that, 'what Eliot *did* think [about Lawrence]' had not been given full attention (because of the predominance of Leavis's account), and that, 'Lawrence touched on matters Eliot felt he had to handle, and yet which were painful and difficult for him.'[20] Baron tracks a further series of striking echoes and resonances between Lawrence's writing and Eliot's poetry, making the case that there was a much closer creative exchange and interaction between the two than had hitherto been suspected. In a compelling series of readings, Baron reveals prominent similarities, in terms of both imagery and themes between Eliot's *Four Quartets* and Lawrence's 'The Crown', most specifically around religious and spiritual experience and prophecy. 'The Crown' emerged from Lawrence's intense collaboration with Bertrand Russell between February and July, 1915, and was originally published, in November 1915, in the short-lived journal *The Signature* which Lawrence launched with Middleton Murry and Katherine Mansfield (it was republished in a revised version in the United States in 1925, then in the UK in 1934). As Baron records, Eliot and his wife were, from shortly after their marriage in June 1915, living with Russell 'in spare rooms in his London flat' and, 'it seems very probable that they [Eliot and Lawrence] had heard of each other and heard each other spoken of in strong terms.'[21] Baron shows that 'The Crown' was 'rich in interest' for Eliot: 'Did Eliot recognize in Lawrence's writings,' he asks, 'a religious earnestness which presented a challenge which *Four Quartets* is (in part) a specifically Christian attempt to match and surpass?' It is on these grounds, supported by Eliot's 1937 characterization of Lawrence as 'a researcher into religious emotion', that Baron argues we should radically re-evaluate the relation between the two, which would also involve paying renewed attention to the religious or spiritual elements in Lawrence's work.[22] 'Are not Lawrence and Eliot in essentials,' he concludes provocatively, 'much closer than Pound and Joyce were to each other: or Eliot to either of them?'[23]

Roger Kojecky (1998) and Sandra Gilbert (2007) took different approaches to Martz and Baron, confining their discussion to Eliot's explicit comments on Lawrence rather than exploring creative intertexts. Much of Kojecky's piece explores unpublished (and at that time embargoed) materials in Eliot's correspondence in the Penguin archives, and he also rehearses the conduct of the Trial itself.[24] He argues that Eliot's critical judgement on Lawrence was little changed from the Page-Barbour lectures (1933) to the Chatterley Trial 'Brief of Evidence' (1960), and maintains that Eliot's support for Penguin books was rather on the grounds of resistance to censorship than retraction of his earlier, negative views of Lawrence.[25] Gilbert's article is primarily concerned with Lawrence's example and importance as a poet and moralist, exploring only in its final section the question, 'Why did D.H. Lawrence disturb T.S. Eliot so much?' Gilbert points to Eliot's negative views of Lawrence as evidence of Lawrence's status as an outsider both to literary modernism and to emergent academic literary criticism and theory, following Michael Bell's proposition that Lawrence represents 'the repressed conscience of modernism'. At the same time, similarly to Baron (whom she does not cite), Gilbert suggests Eliot's 'intense and conflicted set of comments' on Lawrence were also an indication of profound personal and spiritual preoccupations which were of central importance to Eliot but which he struggled openly to articulate or address.

The remaining substantive discussion of Eliot's relationship to Lawrence, by Brian Crick and Michael DiSanto (2009), is again limited to the evidence of Eliot's explicit critical engagements.[26] Their article is, however, primarily concerned with re-examining Leavis's representation of that relationship. Benefitting from some of the newly available materials (though not, it appears, the lecture notes from the Harvard class of 1933), they too demonstrate that Eliot's view of Lawrence was far from the 'consistent adverse commentary' that Leavis had portrayed. They expose how Eliot's views appear to correlate closely with those of Middleton Murry, and argue that Eliot consistently drew much more closely on Murry's assessments than has previously been recognized: '"The strain of cruelty" Eliot claimed to detect in Lawrence merely reiterates Murry's thesis in an abstract, impersonal manner.'[27] They show that passages which Leavis had represented as Lawrence's attacks on Eliot were, in context, demonstrably Lawrence's criticisms of Murry. Eliot's relationship with Murry was also complex and contradictory, as Crick and DiSanto acknowledge, but it was also often close and productive, and the similarities between the two critics' positions in relation to Lawrence are compelling.[28] However, Crick and DiSanto contentiously conclude that 'it is difficult to tell whether Eliot's [sic] read much of Lawrence at all', and argue that genuine 'evidence from [Lawrence's] texts for Eliot's disdain or dislike is never forthcoming.'[29] If such a conclusion is not convincing, on the grounds particularly of materials which subsequently have become accessible, the article is nonetheless important in its effort to re-contextualize Eliot's attention to Lawrence, shifting

the focus from Eliot as an individual to the network of critical and personal relationships and debates within which such critical positions are formed and articulated.

These few accounts of Eliot's enduring attention to Lawrence in many ways beg as many questions as they answer but taken together they do establish the significance of his response to Lawrence for our understanding of both Eliot's own emergence and the wider cultural formation of modernism, of Eliot and Lawrence's structure of feeling.[30] Crick and DiSanto's elucidation of Murry's influence on Eliot's writing on Lawrence, and Baron's aside concerning Russell's presence in both lives, together point towards this further perspective, a way of thinking about the relationship that complements the discussion of Eliot's explicit commentary on Lawrence and the attention to intertextual evidence of Lawrence's influence. Such a mode of study involves the elucidation of social and cultural networks, what Peter Brooker has characterized as the critical reconstruction of modes of 'companionship, collaboration and friction across artistic debate and social identities'.[31] The following pages take up that project in relation to this curious, compelling relationship.

T.S. Eliot asserted on at least three occasions that he never knew D.H. Lawrence: in the notes to his Harvard lectures of May, 1933, where he states he was a 'friend of Joyce and never knew Lawrence'; in his 'Introduction' to Tiverton's 1951 study ('I never knew him'); and in his correspondence with Helen Gardner following the Chatterley Trial, in 1960, in the course of which he wrote, 'I feel pretty sure I should have disliked Lawrence personally if I had known him!'[32] However, he also wrote to Sidney Schiff, on July 25 1919, that 'from what little I have seen of Lawrence lately he seems rather *degringole* [run down].'[33] Such a statement suggests not only that he had seen Lawrence more than once, and also that by 1919 he 'knew' him well enough, at least by sight, to make an assessment about his state of health or mind. This apparent contradiction – although Eliot does not say he never 'met' Lawrence – might be explained in a number of ways. It may be that Eliot was showing off to his correspondent, the wealthy and well-connected author and patron of the arts, whom he had only recently come to know and now sought to impress with an indication of the breadth of his acquaintance and knowledge of literary London.[34] He may well have heard of Lawrence's condition from a mutual acquaintance, of which there were many, as I discuss below: the shared network was already wide. Perhaps he had indeed seen or encountered Lawrence, maybe at the Café Royal or some other public place, or at the offices of *The Athenaeum* (Murry was editor between 1919 and 1921, and Eliot a regular contributor, having refused the offer to be Assistant Editor). In terms of earlier meetings or sightings, Eliot may have come across Lawrence at H.D's flat in Mecklenburgh Square, which he visited as an Assistant Editor of *The Egoist* from at least May 1917, and in which Lawrence briefly lived having been expelled from Cornwall in November 1917.[35] Still earlier, it is just possible Eliot encountered Lawrence during one of the latter's meetings with Bertrand Russell. It is

also quite feasible, given the circles in which they both moved, that Eliot may simply have seen Lawrence in the street during one of Lawrence's two stays in the capital in July 1919.[36] Certainly Eliot was correct in the account of Lawrence's condition he gave to Schiff. Lawrence was not then in strong health or spirits, and he was in London around that time. Catherine Carswell reported he looked 'delicate', Middleton Murry thought he was 'ill and weary' (28 June), and Lawrence himself wrote, also on 25 July 1919, during a visit of just a few days to the capital, that 'London has rather knocked me up.'[37]

Given the volume of memoirs and letters relating to the two authors it would be surprising if a meeting between them had taken place and no record of it survived. Both were themselves prolific correspondents, yet neither, ever, appears to have mentioned such an encounter. The only evidence we have of direct contact is a brief exchange of letters between November 1924 and January 1925, relating to the publication of Lawrence's work in *The Criterion*.[38] Eliot told Lawrence, 'I like your stories very much […] I like your style and I like your perceptions. I should be glad if at any time you cared to contribute more regularly to the *Criterion*, as one of the half dozen or so writers who contribute to such an extent as to form the character of the paper.' The letter concludes, 'If you are ever in London and care to meet me, I should be glad if you would let me know.' Lawrence reported Eliot's offer to his agent, Curtis Brown, and the *Criterion* published five of his pieces, and the pamphlet 'Pornography and Obscenity'. The correspondence appears to have ended with Lawrence's reply to Eliot, sometime in February 1925, in which he criticized that January's number of the *Criterion*. Nonetheless, Eliot did publish a series of Lawrence's writings, including one of the longest stories to appear in the journal, 'The Woman Who Rode Away'; as well as 'Jimmy and the Desperate Woman', a tale which was commonly felt to contain a satirical portrait of Murry. Ultimately, apart from the pleasures of biographical sleuthing, the question as to whether Lawrence and Eliot met physically is redundant: what is clear is that, on Eliot's part, there was clearly sustained and attentive interest.

One consequence of Leavis's long critical struggle with Eliot and Lawrence is, as we have seen, that the two authors are conventionally taken not only as artistic and critical opposites, but also as political and social antagonists. Eliot's remarks to Gardner quoted above would seem to confirm this position. Leavis's defence of Lawrence as representative of an Englishness grounded in a provincial, non-conformist and working-class identity is at the same time an attack on what he perceived as the dominant, self-serving, metropolitan literary elite. There is some truth in the contrast. Eliot – fastidious, reserved, bookish – was raised in considerable material affluence in urban St. Louis (summers at the family house by the sea built by his businessman father). He was a scion of a famous, long-established, and extended family with deep roots in both St. Louis and Boston (there is

an Eliot House at Harvard, Charles William Eliot was an early President of the university, and Charles Eliot Norton amongst its most distinguished professors). He was expensively and classically educated at Smith Academy and Harvard itself, where he was highly regarded by his Philosophy tutors. Lawrence's background and upbringing could not appear more different. Three years older than Eliot (they were both September babies – Lawrence 11 September 1885, Eliot 26 September 1888), the younger son of a miner, growing up at the intersection of industrial and agricultural labouring communities in Eastwood, subject to significant material constraint, educated first at the local Board School, then through a scholarship to the Nottingham High School, and finally two years' study as a teacher-trainee at the University College, Nottingham (he chose not to study for the BA degree). And yet, there are at the same time a compelling number of parallels between the two writers in terms of their experience and formation. Closer attention to their development reveals they had much in common emotionally, intellectually, and professionally.

In the notes for his lectures on Joyce and Lawrence, 'two men who are great men', in 1933, Eliot sets out a schematic comparison of the two writers.[39] He argues that Lawrence's nonconformist religious formation 'colours [his] whole outlook'. He also emphasizes Lawrence's working-class origins (from which he derived a strong class consciousness), and his status, like Joyce, as an exile. He notes their common experience as 'exceptionally sensitive children in an uncongenial environment', and the importance of 'Relationship towards their parents'. These categories also serve to frame and define Eliot's own biography, not least because they suggest which determinants he considered most important in these writers' emergence. Lawrence and Eliot were both outsiders almost from birth. They were marked, particularly, by fragile health which set them apart from their peers. Eliot suffered a life threatening illness in 1910, Lawrence had severe bouts of pneumonia both as a small child and again in 1911, and both suffered throughout the 1910s and 1920s from sustained ill-health. Lawrence eventually died of the tuberculosis that many assumed he had contracted during the war; Humbert Wolfe remarked, in 1926, that 'He [Eliot] has had pneumonia twice, and my belief is that he has consumption.'[40] Eliot also sought help for what we now think of as mental health issues – Lawrence suffered episodes of intense depression and nervous prostration. Anecdotes abound of how both were distinguished, from an early age, by their evident intelligence, and marked creative and intellectual ambition, which resulted in success at school (often an ambiguous achievement, and certainly not one calculated to endear themselves to their peers). Both were brought up in households and communities strongly conditioned by moral and religious precepts, Lawrence in the Congregationalist tradition and Eliot as a Unitarian: both acknowledged the primary, ambivalent influence of this environment in the formation of their sensibilities. Strikingly, as with Joyce, they had complex and profoundly formative relationships with forceful mothers who fought to protect

and encourage their sons' progress beyond the conventional, expected career trajectories of their time and place. The deaths of Gertrude Lawrence in December, 1910, and Constance Eliot in September, 1929, proved critical moments for each author. On several occasions Eliot praised Lawrence's representation and exploration of mother/son relationships, telling students at Harvard in 1932/3, for instance, that 'what he [Lawrence] says about mother-love in *Fantasia of the Unconscious* is better than all the psychoanalysts.'[41]

Eliot's stress on the condition of exile as a key element of Joyce and Lawrence's experience, and as a major determinant of the distinction of their creative work, reinforces a theme which is consistent throughout Eliot's criticism, and was also, of course, a major fact in his own life. Lawrence and Eliot both broke with their native community and country as a function of professional and creative ambition, and reflected repeatedly in their work on the experience of expatriation – their own, and that of others. Lawrence first left England to live in Germany and Italy between 1912 and 1914, then as soon as he was able to obtain passports after the war, in November 1919, led a life of almost constant movement, spending less than twelve weeks in the country of his birth before his death (at Vence, France), in March, 1930. Eliot left St. Louis, in 1905, for Milton Academy in Boston, then Harvard. He visited Paris and London in 1910, then studied in Paris for the academic year 1912-3, pondering even at that point whether he ought to settle in Paris altogether. Subsequently granted a place as a visiting scholar at Oxford for the academic year 1914-15, he settled in London in June 1915, becoming a naturalized British citizen in 1927. Eliot's adoption of the accent and habits of an English gentleman was a source of bemusement to many of his countrymen, although Ezra Pound's verdict is more telling: 'He has actually trained himself *and* modernized himself *on his own*.'[42] In order, initially, to support themselves in their new lives, each took work as a schoolteacher as he battled to establish himself in the literary world (Lawrence in Croydon; Eliot first in High Wycombe then Highgate). They both found the work distressing, exhausting and disabling, neither appearing suited to the grind of the school regime. They developed not only as creative writers but as distinctive, influential and idiosyncratic, literary critics. Eliot wrote more criticism than Lawrence, but during the years of the 1914-18 War, following the suppression of *The Rainbow*, Lawrence's primary writing income was from his essays and articles, he continued to be in demand as a literary critic and commentator, and from the mid-1920s a considerable part of his income was from journalism. Each also 'created' himself, in the sense of establishing a persona and following a professional path very different from their local peers, one mark of this process of becoming being how Bert Lawrence and Tom Eliot came to present themselves as D. H. Lawrence ('DHL') and T. S. Eliot ('TSE').[43] Both aspired to recognition in the 'literary world', although they remained equally conscious of and insistent on their 'otherness' in that milieu even as they rose within it. Both were characterized, even disdained,

as outsiders, or regarded with suspicion, despite being so closely involved in the overlapping social networks and cliques of literary modernism.

Most striking and startling of all, amongst these biographical parallels and patterns, is the way that for both Lawrence and Eliot the process of self-fashioning involved for each of them, at the age of 27, a sudden, dramatic and passionate commitment which shocked and surprised most who knew them. Lawrence eloped with Frieda Weekley within months of meeting her; Eliot married Vivenne Haigh Wood after knowing her for a similar period. These actions entailed decisive geographical breaks and financial risks, as well as tremendous psychological upheaval. The Lawrences had '23 pounds between us'; Eliot's correspondence returns repeatedly to the refrain 'We are hard up!'[44] Lawrence wrote of 'the end of my youthful period', his biographer John Worthen stresses the impact of Frieda on 'the intensely conscious and detached person he had always been before.'[45] Eliot later wrote that 'I came to persuade myself that I was in love with her simply because I wanted to burn my boats and commit myself to staying in England', Peter Ackroyd describes how 'this virginal, perplexed, intellectually over-refined and emotionally immature young man encountered […] a revelation of sexual and emotional life.'[46] The Lawrences eloped to Germany in May, 1912, then remained largely in Italy for the next year and a half, the country to which they planned to return following their wedding at Kensington Registry Office in July, 1914. With his own marriage, at Hampstead Register Office in June, 1915, Eliot abruptly signalled his decision not to return to an academic position at Harvard by settling definitively if precariously in London. The Lawrence and Eliot marriages represented defining moments in the two authors' development, and the subsequent course of these relationships inevitably and powerfully determined the course of their lives and work. Eliot's readings of Lawrence make explicit his fascination and repulsion with Lawrence's insistent examination of sexual and emotional intimacy, and equally unflinching experimentation with the form and language necessary for such work. Eliot is a remarkable reader of Lawrence, even as he recoils from the material before him. His notorious account of the way Lawrence's writing strips away 'the amenities, refinements and graces which many centuries have built up in order to make love-making tolerable' captures the essence of Lawrence's objectives even as it condemns them. Eliot identifies Lawrence's 'search for an explanation of the civilized by the primitive, of the advanced by the retrograde, of the surface by the "depths"' as 'a modern phenomenon.'[47] In their troubled sexual and emotional development, the two men shared in what Lawrence called 'the tragedy of thousands of young men in England'.[48] Their life and writing is, from this perspective, testimony to a similarly common struggle to move beyond the primary social, psychological and creative pressures of their time.

If the turmoil attendant on Lawrence and Eliot's marriages is the most obvious evidence of common, 'modern' factors in their own, and their generation's sensibility, the impact of the 1914-18 War is beyond doubt the most important external element in their structure of feeling. The outbreak of war in August 1914, caught both men by surprise. Eliot was initially stranded in Marburg (where he was studying prior to his year at Oxford), and only with difficulty made it back to London as hostilities began.[49] Lawrence, by then married to a German national, was himself recently returned from Germany and now found himself unable to travel back to the continent (to Italy) as he and Frieda had intended. The two writers' careers were, in the years that followed, fundamentally conditioned by the conflict. It was at once the major, tragic, awful contemporary fact and subject or theme, and also an overwhelming, determinant feature of their cultural, economic and social conditions. The war was the defining event of their generation, resulting in immense changes to their expectations and direction. Travel, personal relationships, professional opportunity, their relation to the state and to politics, were all dramatically altered. Content, form and readerships for their work were transformed. Both men were subject to financial hardship, depending at times on the generosity of family (Eliot continued to receive money from his parents and brother; Lawrence's stay at Mountain Cottage in 1918/19 was paid for his sister Ada), friends (the Eliots were supported by Bertrand Russell and Sidney Schiff; Lawrence received money from a number of his circle, including Eddie Marsh, Ottoline Morrell, S. S. Koteliansky and Cynthia Asquith), patrons (both benefited from Amy Lowell's munificence; Ezra Pound and Richard Aldington initiated schemes to attract 'subscribers' who might contribute towards Eliot's expenses), and, in Lawrence's case, the Royal Literary Fund and Society of Authors.[50] Both were unfit to serve at the front. Lawrence, who opposed the war, suffered humiliating and traumatic medical board examinations (which he later fictionalized in *Kangaroo*). Eliot, who did offer to serve once the United States joined the fighting, had an equally distressing experience, resigning from his position at Lloyd's Bank only to find that due to administrative and bureaucratic issues there was no position for him in the military, resulting in a period of great frustration and anxiety before he was eventually taken back at the Bank.[51] Lawrence's correspondence refers constantly to the War, he confided to Eddie Marsh, for instance, 'The War is just hell for me […] I can't get away from it for a minute: I live in a sort of coma, like one of those nightmares when you can't move. I hate it – everything.'[52] In 1916, he discussed building an anti-War movement with Bertrand Russell, and many of Lawrence's stories and verses of the period explore the effects of the War on returning soldiers and the civilian population.[53] Eliot was more circumspect, and has been characterized, 'as a citizen of a neutral country' as 'able to benefit from the war.'[54] However, his correspondence also demonstrates an acute awareness of the conflict, and recounts the experiences of men he knew who were at the front – amongst them, notably,

Vivienne's brother Maurice Haigh-Wood and Richard Aldington. Both Lawrence and Eliot chose not to make overt reference to the War in perhaps their most significant works of the period – *Women in Love* and *The Waste Land* – but these texts are nonetheless wholly identified with that context, the writers' sharing a sense that the War itself might not be best represented directly, even as its impact resonates throughout their writing.

If coincidences of biography and experience indicate much about the structure of feeling which Lawrence and Eliot shared, our sense of that formation becomes clearer through elucidation of what we know of their reading in common and, in particular, the quite uncannily similar interests which are evident in their literary critical work during the mid to late 1910s.[55] Clearly they were both attentive to the emergent aesthetic and literary work of their time, just as they shared many of the typical elements of a literary and cultural education during their period. They enjoyed a deep knowledge of the Bible and Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, fascination with French literature, and a broad knowledge of European literary history.[56] Lawrence's interest in German literature and thought pre-dated his relationship with Frieda, but grew rapidly thereafter. Eliot would have studied at Marburg, but for the War. Both were attentive to the vogue for Russian literature, particularly the circulation of Dostoevsky's work (both became friends with S. S. Koteliansky, who translated from Russian). Eliot had begun the study of Sanskrit in order the better to research Hinduism and Eastern religion: Lawrence was also briefly drawn to Hindu writings. Both followed the emergence of Freud's work with strong interest, if also opposition, and Eliot singled out Lawrence's psychoanalytic essays for praise on several occasions. The interest in Myth with was such a feature of modernist literary experiment was certainly shared by both men.[57] During the War, still more distinctive connections occur. Lawrence embarked on a long study of Hardy just as Eliot was engaging with the writer.[58] The work of Heracleitus stimulated an interest and influence which runs through both men's work. Eliot had first discovered the Pre-Socratics, at Harvard in 1911, and returned to the topic with Russell in 1914. Russell himself introduced Lawrence to this school of thought, in 1915, stimulating a major shift in Lawrence's perspective, away from Judeo-Christian philosophical traditions.[59] The development of anthropological study, and attention to primitive communities, also caught the imagination of both men during this period, Eliot remarking that 'it is certain that some study of primitive man furthers our understanding of civilized man, so it is certain that primitive art and poetry help our understanding of civilized art and poetry.'[60] Perhaps the most striking coincidence of all is the turn that both Lawrence and Eliot made towards American writers between 1917 and 1919. Lawrence is celebrated for the sequence of critical essays on Franklin, Crevecoeur, Fenimore Cooper, Hawthorne, Melville and Whitman, published in the *English Review*, which were later reworked and published as the *Studies in Classic American Literature*.[61] Less remarked is the sequence of articles

Eliot produced at around the same time, also reflecting on the significance of Hawthorne, Poe, Whitman and other writers of that same tradition (for Eliot, James was also a key figure).[62] Both Lawrence and Eliot explore the influence of history, place and education in the emergence of a distinctively American sensibility and style, clearly measuring their own position and aspirations in reference to this 'other' tradition of writing in English. Lawrence's fascination is explicitly with a 'new' land and culture to which he is drawn and to which he hoped to emigrate, while Eliot is reflecting more on a heritage he sought to understand in relation to his own development and exile, but their accounts of the 'America' are fascinating because of both the shared impulse, at that moment, to explore much the same material, and for the ways in which their positions and voices gain definition in relation to that work. Many years later, as we have seen, Eliot was to recall Lawrence's essay on Fenimore Cooper with admiration. Such intersections between the two men's readings and criticism remain to be explored fully, but suggest an intriguing further dimension to their common structure of feeling.

Although only three years older, Lawrence was, inevitably, more advanced in the London literary world than Eliot in 1914. When, in September, shortly after his arrival in London, Eliot met Pound, Lawrence (who had met Pound in 1909) was already an established figure, living on the income from his writing and confident of his future. He was the author of three well-regarded novels and several plays, and considered one of the coming men of the new poetry.[63] Until the furore which engulfed *The Rainbow* in November 1915, Lawrence appeared to have a secure and celebrated standing in the literary world. It would have been difficult, indeed, given the extraordinary range and impact of Lawrence's work in 1914/15, for Eliot not to have seen Lawrence as a leading figure of his own generation, and his recorded comments on Lawrence's work are consistently respectful, even complimentary, until the early 1920s. That Eliot also become acquainted with so many of Lawrence's circle, including many of those with whom he was or had been on most intimate terms, can only have confirmed the ways in which Lawrence represented a telling and impressive example, although almost all Lawrence's acquaintances might also have expressed reservations or concerns about his health or conduct (just as many of Eliot's own circle did). It is curious, therefore, that in the histories of modernism, and of the interwoven networks of personal relationships that constituted the world of literary modernism, there is no discussion of the ways in which the groups around the two authors, or to which they belonged, so extensively overlapped.[64] Several of Eliot's most important relationships, during the period of his struggle to establish his place and identity in London literary circles, were with people for whom Lawrence was strikingly, even pre-eminently important, an absolutely determinant presence: most notably Russell, Murry and Aldington. The further list of significant mutual acquaintance reveals the extent to which the two men inhabited much the same

world: Ezra Pound, Mary Hutchinson, Ottoline Morrell, Amy Lowell, H. D., Brigid Patmore, Katherine Mansfield, E. M. Forster, S. S Koteliansky and Aldous Huxley were all at one time or another on close terms with both Lawrence and Eliot, a further circle of looser acquaintance reinforces a sense of quite how peculiar it is that the men never knew each other socially. A further answer to Eliot's question of 1965 – just why was his engagement with Lawrence so volatile and obsessive – thus lies, in addition to the ways in which they shared and in their different ways contested and articulated the distinctive structure of feeling of their time, in the extent to which Eliot's own emergence during those enormously important early years in London was overshadowed by Lawrence's presence and example, and his understanding of Lawrence was unusually mediated by his own closeness to those who were, or had been, Lawrence's intimates. The final section of the essay explores one instance of this, the complex triangle of friendships connecting Eliot, Lawrence and Bertrand Russell.

Russell met Eliot in the Spring of 1914, at Harvard University. Russell was a Visiting Professor from 12 March to 6 June, and Eliot, then a graduate student, attended his seminar and lectures.[65] On 10 May, at the end of Russell's Harvard stay, they met at a garden party hosted by Professor Benjamin Fuller. Eliot's poem 'Mr Apollinax' captures his impression of Russell's 'exuberance, intelligence and fun' as well as an immediate consciousness of his more libidinous ('priapic') qualities. Russell himself was sufficiently struck by Eliot to remark on his intelligence in a letter to his lover, Ottoline Morrell – although, rather less encouragingly, he also described the shy young man as 'lacking in the crude insistent passion that one must have in order to achieve anything.'[66] When Eliot moved to England later that same year to study at Oxford, he appears to have met Russell, quite by chance, in Bloomsbury (Russell's London flat was at Bury Street; Eliot was briefly lodging in Bloomsbury Square). Russell first knew Lawrence through his writing, and through the enthusiasm of Morrell. Following the publication of *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, on 26 November 1914, Russell wrote to Morrell, 'One feels from his writing that he [Lawrence] must be wonderful […] a man with a real fire of imagination. I should like to know him'.[67] Russell then met Lawrence on 8 February 1915, at the cottage in Greatham, Surrey to which the Lawrences had just moved. This first meeting was a revelation for both men, and they soon excitedly began to plot writing and lecturing work in the service of anti-War activism, Russell telling Morrell that Lawrence's 'intuitive perceptiveness is wonderful'. Soon the two were formulating plans: 'We think to have a lecture hall in London in the Autumn […] have meetings, to establish a little society or body around a religious belief, which leads to action.'[68] Russell invited Lawrence to visit him in Cambridge. Staying from 6-8 March, Lawrence dined at Trinity and met several of Russell's colleagues, including John Maynard Keynes. Meanwhile, Russell's relationship with Eliot was also developing. The two had met again over the Christmas vacation, and just a day or so later, on 12 March, at Russell's invitation, Eliot delivered a paper to the

Cambridge Moral Sciences Club, in Russell's rooms ('The Relativity of Moral Judgement'). Lawrence made several trips to London during which he met Russell again in March, May and July, as well as joining Russell and Morrell at Garsington in June. During this time, as Lawrence's letters to Russell, and Russell's to Morrell demonstrate, their relationship was intense, intimate and furiously productive, although also fraught with tensions and disagreement.

Following Eliot's marriage to Vivienne on 26 June, Russell was amongst the first to meet the couple, dining with them after their return from honeymoon on 9 July – and then informing Morrell that there were already problems in the marriage. The previous day, 8 July, Russell had received an excoriating letter from Lawrence, accompanying the very heavily (and irritably) annotated text of Russell's sketch plan for the series of lectures, 'Philosophy of Social Reconstruction'. Lawrence told Russell not to be 'angry that I have scribbled all over your work.'[69] The following day, 10 July, Russell again met with Lawrence, but by now the two were breaking apart, with Russell reporting to Morrell that their meeting was 'horrid' as they argued over their responses to each other's work. On 24 July, Eliot left for the US, to return on 21 August, when the Eliots moved into Russell's flat, an arrangement which continued while Eliot was working (and lodging during the week) at High Wycombe School that Autumn (it is not clear at what point he became Vivien's lover, or when if at all Eliot knew about this). Lawrence became increasingly bitter as the relationship with Russell foundered, complaining to Cynthia Asquith, 'They [Russell and Morrell] say I cannot think.'[70] By September, they had broken with each other, Lawrence now projecting a new magazine with Murry and Katherine Mansfield, Russell making plans for his lecture series alone. For several more years, the lives of the Eliots and Russell continued to be intensely intertwined, taking joint leases on country cottages in first Bosham (1916), then Marlow (1918), and with Russell offering significant financial assistance to the struggling couple, professional guidance and backing to Eliot (particularly through introductions to journal editors and key figures in London literary and intellectual life), as well as moral and emotional support. From early 1916, the Eliots also became, through Russell's initial intervention, regular visitors at Ottoline Morrell's Garsington Hall, and they were to remain a part of her circle for many years.

Even so short a summary reveals how intensely Russell's life was caught up with both Eliot and Lawrence, and how Eliot entered more and more closely into the social circles and relationships Lawrence had known. Harry T. Moore, in his introduction to the edition of Lawrence's letters to Russell (Russell's to Lawrence do not appear to have survived), remarks that 'He [Russell] and Lawrence differed on so many points that it would be interesting to have a record of their conversations, at Garsington, London, Cambridge and Greatham – what they said in the give and take of talk must have been quite as interesting as what they wrote in letters.'[71] What is so telling,

however, is the way in which Eliot's later public views on Lawrence's work reproduce positions which had first been expressed by Russell at this time – expressed, it would seem, in conversation as well as in the letters. In 1932, Eliot charged Lawrence with 'an incapacity for what we ordinarily call thinking', terms very close to Russell's comments to Morrell, comments about which Lawrence was obviously aware. The 'extraordinarily keen sensibility and capacity for profound intuition' which had impressed and affected Russell is also central to the account of Lawrence that Eliot delivered in Virginia. The Page Barbour lectures were, moreover, Eliot's attempt to mark the shift of terrain and priorities of his criticism to take account of religious doctrine and belief, and his discussion of Lawrence is conditioned by that imperative. It is to this context that we might return the composition of 'Burnt Norton', which as we have seen bears the marks of Eliot's engagement with Lawrence's essay cycle, 'The Crown' – the work which itself originally emerged from Lawrence's intense engagement with Russell. Shortly afterwards, in his Introduction to Baillie and Martin's *Revelation* (1937), Eliot was to reiterate his view of Lawrence as 'a researcher into religious emotion'.

In 'The Interpretation of Primitive Ritual' (1915), Eliot remarks that 'what seemed to one generation fact is from the point of view of the next rejected interpretation.'[72] As our knowledge of the structure of feeling of Lawrence and Eliot becomes more extensive and more complex, it is clear that exploration of the relationship between them, is instructive, specifically, about the nature of each of these writer's creative and critical achievement, about their work and their lives, but also begins to reveal something of the contours of the distinctive, emergent structure of feeling of modernism. If evidence for Eliot's having met Lawrence remains elusive, and by his own standards of social exchange Eliot never 'knew' Lawrence, it is clear that there are many other ways in which Eliot did know Lawrence and his work, and knew them well, and felt understood by Lawrence, and in profound ways sympathized with him.

---

[1] T. S. Eliot, 'To Criticize the Critic', in *To Criticize the Critic and Other Writings* (London: Faber, 1965), pp. 1-26 (p. 24).

[2] Sean Matthews, 'The Trial of Lady Chatterley', in *New D. H. Lawrence*, ed. by Howard J. Booth (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), pp. 169-191 (p. 182). See also Eliot's remarkable 'Brief of Evidence', drafted by the lawyer Michael Rubinstein and circulated – without his knowledge or permission – amongst several of the witnesses for the Defence, including Vivian de Sola Pinto, who secured a copy for the Nottingham University archive, T. S. Eliot, 'Typescript statement of evidence prepared by T. S. Eliot in connection with the 'Lady Chatterley's Lover' trial; Nov. 1960', Nottingham, Manuscripts and Special Collections, MS La R 4/5/2.

[3] See Raymond Williams, 'Structure of Feeling', *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 128-135. See also Sean Matthews, 'Change and Theory in Raymond Williams's Structure of Feeling', *Pretexts*, 10.2 (2001), 179-194.

[4] Our understanding of Eliot's life and achievement is being transformed by the republication of anonymous, uncollected and inaccessible materials in the complete edition of his prose, most recently, T. S. Eliot, *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition Volume 7: A European Society 1947-53*, ed. by Iman Javadi and

Ronald Schuchard (Project Muse/Johns Hopkins Press, 2018) < http://muse.jhu.edu/book/63865> [accessed 6 March 2019]); the exhaustive annotated edition of his poetry (T. S. Eliot *The Poems of T. S. Eliot Volume I: Collected and Uncollected Poems*, ed. by Christopher Ricks (London: Faber and Faber, 2015); and the gradual, comprehensive revelation of his voluminous correspondence (most recently, T. S. Eliot, *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 8: 1936-1938* (London: Faber and Faber, 2019), with its continuous accretions in Faber's online supplement to the published volumes (T. S. Eliot, 'Letters' annotated by John Haffenden http://tseliot.com/explore/letters/letters_volume_3_unpublished [accessed 6 March 2019]).

[5] T. S. Eliot, 'Reflections on Contemporary Poetry III', *The Egoist,* 4.10 (November 1917), 35.

[6] T. S. Eliot, 'London Letter', *The Dial*, 73.3 (September 1922), 329-331; T. S. Eliot to Henry Eliot, 31 December 1922, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume I: 1898-1922 Revised Edition*, ed. by Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton (London: Faber and Faber, 2009), p. 816.

[7] T. S. Eliot to Curtis Brown, 25 August 1925, in *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 2: 1923-1925,* ed. by Valerie Eliot and Hugh Haughton (London: Faber and Faber, 2009), pp. 730-731.

[8] T. S. Eliot, 'Lecture Notes for English 26: English Literature from 1890 to the Present Day', in *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition Volume 4: English Lion 1930-1933*, ed. by Jason Harding and Ronald Schuchard (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), pp. 758-793 (p. 783, p. 784).

[9] T. S. Eliot, 'English Letter Writers', *Prose 4*, pp. 846-849. The lecture was first reported, in 1935, by F.W. Matthiesson, *The Achievement of T.S. Eliot,* 3rd Ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 89-90. Also Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1933), p. 97. Eliot found himself scheduled to give the 'Letter Writers' lecture at one week's notice, and the fact that he had material relating to Lawrence as letter writer to hand indicates the extent to which he was, at that time, steeped in the other writer's work. Huxley corresponded with Eliot after Lawrence's death, and discussed the Collected Letters project with him. Eliot to Geoffrey Faber, 10 May 1936, *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 7: 1934-1935* (London: Faber and Faber, 2017).

[10] T.S. Eliot, 'American Literature and Language', lecture delivered at University of Washington, July 1953, *To Criticize*, p.53.

[11] Martin Jarrett-Kerr, '"Of Clerical Cut": Retrospective Reflections on Eliot's Churchmanship', in Graham Martin, ed., *Eliot in Perspective: A Symposium* (London: Palgrave, 1970), pp. 232-251 (p. 244).

[12] In addition to these references, the more well known, negative discussions in 'Le Roman Anglais Contemporain' (1927), *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition Volume 3: Literature, Politics, Belief 1927-1929*, ed. by Frances Dickey, Jennifer Formichelli, Ronald Schuchard (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), pp. 83-94; 'The Victim and the Sacrificial Knife', a review of Murry's *Son of Woman* (1931), *Prose 4*, pp. 313-319, and *After Strange Gods: A Primer in Modern Heresy* (London: Faber and Faber, 1934), also *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition Volume 5: Tradition and Orthodoxy 1934-1939* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), pp. 15-55. There are notably appreciative references and short discussions relating to Lawrence in 'Thoughts After Lambeth' (1931), *Prose 4*, pp. 223-250; 'Introduction' to John Baillie and Hugh Martin, eds., *Revelation* (1937), *Prose 5*, pp. 472-496; *The Idea of a Christian Society* (1939), *Prose 5*, pp. 683-747; the 1944 lecture, 'Whitman and Modern Poetry', *The Complete Prose of T.S. Eliot: The Critical Edition Volume 6: The War Years, 1940-1946*, ed. by David E. Chinitz and Ronald Schuchard (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), pp. 783-78; and the 'Foreword' to Fr. William Tiverton, *D.H. Lawrence and Human Existence* (1951), *Prose 7*, pp. 583-585.

[13] For example, in Jason Harding, ed., *T. S. Eliot in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), Lawrence is barely mentioned, and is certainly not considered a significant element in the writer's context; nor is the topic considered in works' exploring the determinants of Eliot's work such as Herbert Howarth, *Notes on Some Figures behind T.S. Eliot* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), John Margolis, *T.S. Eliot's Intellectual Development 1922-1939* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), Piers Gray, *T. S. Eliot's Intellectual and Poetic Development 1909-1922 (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982),* or Ronald Schuchard, *Eliot's Dark Angel: Intersections of Life and Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[14] F. R. Leavis, 'Mr Eliot and Lawrence', *Scrutiny,* 18.1 (1951), a review of Tiverton, repr. in *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1955), pp. 303-311.

[15] F. R. Leavis, 'Eliot, Wyndham Lewis and Lawrence' (1934), repr. *The Common Pursuit* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1952), pp. 240-247 (p. 244).

[16] D.H. Lawrence to John Middleton Murry, 20 May 1929, in Aldous Huxley, ed., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence* (London: Heinemann, 1932), p. 801. See also Leavis, *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist*, p. 24.

[17] Eliot, 'Victim', *Prose 4,* p. 313. Leavis discusses this article in both 'Mr Eliot and Lawrence' and *D.H. Lawrence: Novelist*, p.24.

[18] Eliot, 'Typescript Statement', p. 5.

[19] Louis L. Martz, 'The Wheel and the Point: Aspects of Imagery and Them in Eliot's Later Poetry', *Sewanee Review*, 55.1 (Jan-Mar., 1947), 131-3. Although Martz is cited, in Eliot, *Poems,* in the notes to 'Burnt Norton' with regard to (p. 909), his suggestion of the connection to Lawrence's short story is overlooked (p. 905). Published on 2 April 1936, 'Burnt Norton' was included in the collection of Eliot's *Poems 1909-1935* (1935) and Eliot himself referred to 1935 as the period of composition, see *Poems,* p. 881. The poem includes lines written earlier but which were cut from *Murder in the Cathedral*, which was performed on 15 June 1935, Eliot having accepted the commission to write the play in October 1934, see Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot: A Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p. 219, pp. 228-229.
[20] Carl Baron, 'Lawrence's Influence on Eliot', *Cambridge Quarterly,* 5.3 (March 1971), 235-248 (237-8).
[21] See also *Young Eliot: From St Louis to* The Waste Land (London: Jonathan Cape, 1915), pp. 231ff, and Ackroyd, pp. 66-8. Ray Monk, *Bertrand Russell: The Spirit of Solitude 1872-1921* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1996), pp. 431ff.
[22] Eliot, 'Introduction', *Prose 5,* p. 475.
[23] Baron, 248.
[24] Roger Kojecky, 'Knowing Good and Evil: T.S. Eliot and *Lady Chatterley'*, *ANQ: A Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews,* 11.3 (1998), 37-50, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957699809601261> accessed [accessed 7 March 2019].
[25] Eliot was consistent in his resistance to censorship. Kojecky does not mention that Eliot had, in 1929, published Lawrence's 'Pornography and Obscenity' as a *Criterion Miscellany* pamphlet.
[26] Brian Crick and Michael DiSanto, 'D.H. Lawrence: "An Opportunity and a Test": The Leavis-Eliot Controversy Revisited', *Cambridge Quarterly*, 38.2 (June 2009), 130-146.
[27] Crick and DiSanto, 143.
[28] See also David Goldie, *A Critical Difference: T.S. Eliot and John Middleton Murry in English Literary Criticism, 1919-1928* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998). Crick and DiSanto do not refer to this account of Eliot and Murry's relationship which, unfortunately, draws to a close before Eliot's more controversial writings on Lawrence.
[29] Crick and DiSanto, 146.
[30] See Raymond Williams, 'The Bloomsbury Fraction' in *Problems in Materialism and Culture* (London: Verso/New Left Books, 1980), pp. 149-169, see also David Peters Corbett and Andrew Thacker, 'Raymond Williams and Cultural Formations: Movements and Magazines', *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism*, 16.2 (1993), 84-106. Instances of this current of work might include, Marc Manganaro, *Culture, 1922: The Emergence of a Concept* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), and Jason Harding, The Criterion*: Cultural Politics and Periodical Networks in Inter-War Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[31] Peter Brooker, 'General Introduction' to *Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines: Volume 1, Britain and Ireland 1880-1955,* ed. by Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 16-21. See also Sydney Janet Kaplan, *Circulating Genius: John Middleton Murry, Katherine Mansfield and D.H. Lawrence* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 7: 'The filaments of intertextuality are finer and more tangled than I once supposed […] a critic's positions are affected not only by ideology and the nuances of personal history and circumstances, but also by a host of contingencies that periodically alter any theoretical surety'.
[32] Eliot, 'Lectures in America, 1932-3', *Prose 4,* p. 783; Eliot, 'Foreword', *Prose 7*, p. 583; unpublished letter to Helen Gardner, 8 December 1960 (Bodleian MS Eng. lett. d. 294 57), in the MSS, the full stop is altered to produce an exclamation mark. Gardner replied, 'I am sure I would have loathed him.' Helen Gardner to T. S. Eliot, 11 December 1960 (Bodleian MS Eng. lett. d. 294 60).
[33] Eliot to Sidney Schiff, 25 July 1919, *Letters 1,* p. 385. Ronald Schuchard, in 'Did Eliot Know Hulme? Final Answer', *Journal of Modern Literature,* 27.1-2 (Fall 2003), 63-69, drew attention to this letter in his exploration of Eliot's (fallacious) denial that he had known Hulme: 'Eliot forgot and denied having known several people, including D.H. Lawrence, which the letters disprove' (69).
[34] See Stephen Klaidman, *Sydney and Violet: Their Life with T.S. Eliot, Proust, Joyce, and the Excruciatingly Irascible Wyndham Lewis* (Doubleday: New York, 2013) for an account of the Schiffs' career at the heart of literary London.
[35] Eliot mentions H.D. and Mecklenburgh Square in a letter to his mother, 20 May 1917, *Letters 1,* p. 181. H.D's relationship with Lawrence was fictionalized in her novel, *Bid Me To Live* (Florida: University of Florida Press, 2015 c.1960).
[36] Given Murry's remark that he did not see Lawrence again following their meeting, in Hermitage, on 28 June 1919, it seems unlikely that Lawrence visited the *Athenaeum* office. The idea of a random sighting may seem farfetched, but no more so than Virginia Woolf's sighting of Lawrence once in a St Ives shop and then on the railway platform at Milan as her train pulled out of the station, see Virginia Woolf, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*

Volume 4, 1929-1931, ed. by Nigel Nicolson (London: Chatto and Windus, 1981), pp. 166-167, and Woolf to Vanessa Bell, 9 April 1927, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf Volume 3 1923-1928,* ed. by Nigel Nicolson (London: Hogarth Press, 1977), p. 161.

[37] D. H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence Volume 3, pt.2*: *1916-21* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 377. Lawrence stayed with S. S. Koteliansky from 23-27 July, his only other visit to London in this period being 3-7 July. On the later visit, Lawrence saw Eddie Marsh, Thomas Moult and Douglas Goldring, none of whom appear to have been acquainted with Eliot by this time. See Mark Kinkead-Weekes, *The Cambridge Biography of D. H. Lawrence Volume 2: Triumph to Exile 1912-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 506, Catherine Carswell, *The Savage Pilgrimage: A Life of D. H. Lawrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981 c1932), pp. 110-112.

[38] See Eliot, *Letters 2,* p. 544 (25 November, 1924); p. 567 (6 January 1925). D.H. Lawrence wrote to the publisher of the *Criterion*, Richard Cobden-Sanderson, on 1 December 1924 following the publication of 'Jimmy and the Desperate Woman' in the October number (he cannot at this time have received Eliot's first letter). Lawrence replied to Eliot having received the January number, the letter remains unpublished although it is apparently in the Faber archives. See *Journal of the D.H. Lawrence Society,* 2.2 (2010), 13, 15-6.

[39] Eliot, 'Lecture Notes for English 26', *Prose 4,* pp. 783-4.

[40] T.S. Eliot, *The Letters of T. S. Eliot Volume 3: 1926-1927* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), p. 259n.

[41] Eliot, 'Lecture Notes in America', *Prose 4,* p. 790.

[42] See for instance the anecdotes in T.S. Matthews, *Great Tom: Notes towards the Definition of T.S. Eliot* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), pp. 112-116. For Ezra Pound, see Ezra Pound to Harriet Monroe, 30 September 1914, *The Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941*, ed. by D.D. Paige (London: Harcourt Brace, 1950) cited in Matthews.

[43] Worthen, discusses the adoption of 'D.H.L', *Early Years*, p. 135; for 'T.S.E' see Crawford, p. 42.

[44] Lawrence, *Letters 1*, p. 430; Eliot to Conrad Aiken, *Letters 1,* p. 121.

[45] Lawrence, *Letters 1,* p. 551; Worthen, *Early Years,* p. 407.

[46] Eliot, *Letters 1*, p. xix; see also Crawford, p. 231; Ackroyd, p. 63.

[47] Eliot, 'Le Roman Anglais Contemporain', *Prose 3,* pp. 669-75.

[48] Lawrence to Edward Garnett, 14 November 1912, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume 1 1901-1913,* ed. by James T. Boulton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 476. The letter is also in Huxley's collection.

[49] Crawford, p. 205.

[50] See John Worthen, *D.H. Lawrence: A Literary Life* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1989), p.63.

[51] Eliot to Henry Eliot (brother), 25 August 1918, *Letters 1*, pp.241-24; also Eliot to Henry Ware Eliot (father), 4 November 1918, *Letters 1,* pp. 246-249.

[52] Quoted in Paul Delany, *D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare: The Writer and His Circle in the Years of the Great War* (Sussex: Harvester, 1979), p. 19. Delany's account of Lawrence's experiences during the war years demonstrates the awful and transformative impact of the period on Lawrence's development.

[53] 'England, My England' is arguably the most obvious case, a tale which concludes with an account of death at the Front. For the most part, however, it is the impact of the War on returning soldiers and the 'Home Front' which provides Lawrence's subject.

[54] Carole Seymour-Jones, *Painted Shadow: A Life of Vivienne Eliot* (London: Constable, 2002), p. 173.

[55] There are further, quirky biographical parallels between the two men. Each had a highly able and intelligent elder sister called Ada, with whom they remained on closely affectionate terms to the end of their lives, albeit largely by correspondence. Both were smokers, Lawrence even including references to this in the poem 'Sorrow' (in *Amores*, 1916), Eliot only giving up in 1956 (he eventually died of emphysema). Both were bearded, albeit in Eliot's case only briefly. Lawrence grew his familiar beard in October, 1914, in part as a deliberate and visible protest, 'a sign of his difference and of his status as a radical and an outsider', see Andrew Harrison, *The Life of D.H. Lawrence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2016), p. 129. Richard Aldington, whom Lawrence met in July of that year, later recalled the experience of 'gibes and sneers at Lawrence's red beard' on leaving a theatre in London. Aldington it was who introduced Eliot, wearing a beard, on 29 September 1919, to Bruce Richmond, editor of the *Times Literary Supplement*: 'TSE arrived wearing a derby hat and an Uncle Sam beard […] he looked perfectly awful, like one of those comic-strip caricatures of Southern hicks.*'* See Aldington, *Life for Life's Sake: A Book of Reminiscences* (London: Cassell, 1968), p. 269, also Eliot, *Letters 1,* p. 392n; Vivienne noted in her diary, 31 August 1919 that on returning from a walking holiday with Ezra Pound in France, 'Tom […] has begun to grow a beard'. Eliot wrote to Pound on 12 September 1919, 'I will come in tomorrow […] to refresh you for a few moments with the sight of my beard', *Letters 1,* p. 395. Eliot's motivation for growing his beard is not clear, although it appears to have been partly, in contrast to Lawrence,

an indication of his cheerful, relaxed good humour. Both Eliot and Lawrence were, for many years, avid walkers and hikers, despite unpropitious health.

[56] Rosie Marie Burwell, 'A Checklist of Lawrence's Reading' in Keith Sagar, ed., *A D. H. Lawrence Handbook* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), pp. 59-126. Information about Eliot's reading primarily drawn from Crawford.

[57] See Michael Bell, *Literature, Modernism and Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) for an extended comparison of Lawrence and Eliot's use of myth.

[58] D. H. Lawrence, *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*, ed. by Bruce Steele (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). Eliot reviewed a work on Hardy for the *Manchester Guardian* (23 June 1916), and also prepared lectures and classes on the author, see *Prose 1,* pp. 404-405.

[59] Mark Kinkead-Weekes, *D.H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile 1912-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 245-247; Crawford, pp. 171-2. 'Burnt Norton' is heavily indebted to Heracleitus, see Eliot, *Poems*, pp. 905-7.

[60] Crawford, p. 338.

[61] For the genesis of Lawrence's American essays, see D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature,* ed. by Ezra Greenspan, Lindeth Vasey, John Worthen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[62] Eliot, 'In Memory of Henry James', *The Egoist,* 5 (January 1918), 1-2; 'The Hawthorne Aspect', *The Little Review, 5* (August 1918), 47-53; 'American Literature', *The Athenaeum,* 4643 (25 April 1919), 236-37; 'A Sceptical Patrician' (On Henry Adams), *The Athenaeum*, 4647 (23 May 1919), 361-362; 'War Paint and Feathers', *The Athenaeum*, 4668 (17 October 1919), 1036. There were also several pieces relating Ezra Pound's work to American and European contexts.

[63] Lawrence met Pound through Ford Madox Hueffer and Violet Hunt; see Worthen, *Early Years,* p. 220. Although the relationship between the two soon cooled, Pound remained conscious of Lawrence's value, involving him in several of his subsequent poetical projects.

[64] The tendency is exemplified in Ray Monk's biography of Russell, in which Lawrence and Eliot are each the subject of separate chapters. This strategy clarifies the individual relationships Russell/Lawrence and Russell/Eliot, but at the expense of exploring the ways in which his profound engagement with both of them, at the same time, was surely significant for Russell's own development, just as much as it might have been for the two young writers.

[65] Monk, p. 188.

[66] Monk, p. 353.

[67] Monk, p. 401.

[68] Monk, p. 409, p. 418.

[69] Lawrence to Russell, 7 July 1915, in D. H. Lawrence, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Volume 2: 1913-1916,* ed. by James Zytaruk and James Boulton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 361.

[70] Lawrence to Cynthia Asquith, 16 August 1915, *Letters 2,* p. 378.

[71] Harry, T. Moore, 'Introduction' to Harry T. Moore, ed., *D. H. Lawrence's Letters to Bertrand Russell* (New York: Gotham, 1948), p. 9.

[72] Eliot, 'The Interpretation of Primitive Ritual', *Prose 1,* pp. 106-109 (p.106).