

- (25) Review of *In a Valley of This Restless Mind*, *Ibid*.
- (26) Ian Hamilton, *The Waste Land*, in, *Eliot in Perspective*, ed., Graham Martin, (Macmillan & Co. London, 1970) P. 106.
- (27) Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, II. III.
- (28) *The Waste Land*, II.
- (29) Stopp, P. 177 .
- (30) Frank Kermode, *Puzzles and Epiphanies, Essays and Reviews*, (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1968), P; 169.
- (31) James P. Carens, *The Satiric Art of Evelyn Waugh*, (University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1966, P. 92.
- (32) *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*, op. cit., P. 295.
- (33) *Ibid*, P. 304
- (34) Quoted in G.D. Philips, *Evelyn Waugh's Officers, Gentlemen and Rogues*, (Nelson-Hall, Chigaco, 1975) P. 54.
- (35) Quoted in Phillips Temple 'Some Sidelights on Evelyn Waugh', (*America*, April, 1946) .
- (36) 'Religion and Litature', *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*. PP.(105-6 .
- (37) 'Fan-Fare', (*Life*, April 8, 1946).
- (38) *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*, P. 278.
- (39) 'Come Inside', in *The Road to Damascus*, ed; John O'Brien (Garden City, 1949) PP. 18-19.
- (40) 'Catholicism and International Order', *Essays Ancient and ,New* PP. 123-24.
- (41) 'Come Inside', *Ibid*, P; 20 .
- (42) 'The Idea of a Christian Society', *Selected Prose of T. S.Eliot*, P.289.
- (43) 'Notes Towards the Definition of Culture', pp; 301-302.
- (44) 'Open Letter to the Honourable Mrs. Peter Rodd on a Very Serious Subject' (*Encounter*, December 1955) .
- (45) 'Notes Towards The Definition of Culture,' P. 305.
- (46) Quoted in *Eliot In Perspective*, *Ibid*, P. 218.
- (47) David Pryce-Jones, ed., *Evelyn Waugh and his World*,; Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London 1973), P.3
- (48) Evelyn Waugh, *Waugh In Abyssenia*, (Longmans, Green & Co, 1936 pp. 40-41.
- (49) *Ibid*, p. 253 .
- (50) Quoted by Sykes, P. 366 .

NOTES

- (1) Christopher Sykes, *Evelyn Waugh, A Biography*, (Collins, London, 1975), p. 34.
- (2) *Ibid*, pp. 315-16.
- (3) T.S.Eliot,*Selected Essays,1917-1932*,(Harcourt Brace & Co.1952p.96.
- (4) F.J. Stopp, *Evelyn Waugh, Portrait of an Artist*, (Chapman and Hall Ltd., London, 1958), P. 181.
- (5) Evelyn Waugh, *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold*, (Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1962), P.9.
- (6) T.S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood*,(Methusn & Co,London, 1934) P.x.
- (7) Frank Kermode, ed., *Selected Prose of Eliot* (Faber And BFaber, London, 1975) P. 41.
- (8) Evelyn Waugh, 'People Who Want To Sue Me', *Daily Mail*, 31 May 1930, P. 10.
- (9) Evelyn Waugh,'Ronald Firbank',*Life And Letters*,IIs, March 1929.
- (10) Evelyn Waugh, 'The End of The Affair'A Review; in, *Common-Weal*, August 17, 1951.
- (11) Evelyn Waugh, Review of *In a Valley of This Restless Mind*, by Malcolm Muggeridge, (*Spectator*, May 27, 1938..)
- (12) 'Ronald Firbank', *Ibid*.
- (13) Evelyn Waugh, 'Literary Style in England and America',*Books On Trial*, October 1955.
- (14) Ezra Pound, *Make It New*, (New Haven, 1935) P. 187.
- (15) Evelyn Waugh, 'Present Discontents',Review of *Enemies Of Promise* by Cyril Connolly, (*Tablet*, 3 December 1938).
- (16) Evelyn Waugh 'A Neglected Masterpiece', a review, (*Graphic* 14 June 1930).
- (17) 'Ronald Firbank', *Ibid*.
- (18) 'Present Discontents', *Ibid* .
- (19) Evelyn Waugh,Review of,*Journey to a War*(*Spectator*,March 24,1939.
- (20) Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane , ed . *Modernism 1980-1930* , (Penguin Books Ltd., Middlesex, 1976) p. 397.
- (21) 'Ronald Firbank', *Ibid*.
- (22) 'Literary Style in England and America', *Ibid*.
- (23) T.E. Hulme, 'Romanticism and Classiciam', in *Speculations* (Harcourt & Brace, New York, 1924) p. 136.
- (24) Benedetto Groce,*Aesthetics as The Science of Expression and General;al Linguistics*,trans.Douglas Ainslee,(Mac Millan,London,1922

this difference is that Eliot's notion of a stratified society and of the élite do not limit the opportunity of climbing the cultural scale in society to the aristocratic class. He calls for the existence of 'a positive distinction—however undemocratic it may sound—between the educated and the uneducated'(42). And in the meantime he calls for putting, 'the right people in the right places', and ensuring that, 'the ablest artists and architects rise to the top, influence taste, and execute the important public commissions'(43). Waugh was against privileges to be granted to people outside the aristocratic circle. In an article he says, 'Mr. Butler in his Education Act...provided for the free distribution of university degrees to the deserving poor'(44). Both writers were against the tyrannic supremacy of the State and the complete submission of the individual to it. Eliot finds it fantastic, 'to hold that the supreme duty of every individual should be towards a super-state' (45), and this is precisely the theme of Waugh's *Love Among the Ruins*, a mock-utopia where the individual is a victim to a totalitarian state .

Both Eliot and Waugh had sympathies with Fascism, first because both of them rejected rationalism, liberalism, democracy and science, secondly, because they were advocates of aristocracy. Thus, Fascism appealed to their attitudes and ethics. Eliot found in Charles Maurras, 'most of the concepts which might have attracted me in Fascism' (46). He expressed his respect for the party of British Union of Fascists founded in 1932 by Sir Oswald Mosley. He has respect also for *The Action Francaise*, which had associations with fascist organizations. Waugh's expression of his support of Fascism is more provocative, it parallels that of Wyndham Lewis. Although Waugh declared that 'I am not a fascist nor shall I become one'(47), there is every evidence that he was one of the exponents of Fascism. An example can be found in his travel book *Waugh in Abyssinia* where he approves of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia and displays extreme disgust and ridicule of the Ethiopian natives and their emperor. The Abyssinians being 'an inferior race', 'lesser breeds without the law', 'half-human rabble', (48). The Italians have every right to use force to civilize them and to develop the natural resources of their country. Waugh lapses in this unfortunate a moral imperialist sentiment and invective propaganda, and concludes the book praising the Italians for building great roads along which, '... will pass the eagles of ancient Rome as they came to our savage ancestors in France and Britain and Germany (48). It is no wonder then that the book was described by Rose MacCaulay as a 'fascist tract' (50).

the ages, that possesses the power of surviving attempts at destruction and disintegration. The church has thus come to represent continuity and permanence. The two writers always contrast the continuity of religions to the casualness and temporality which characterise modern life whether in its institutions or human relations. Both writers wish to see life as a continuous flux and they find in the church the paramount example of this continuity, tying the past to the present to the future. Eliot finds a major difference between humanism and Christianity in the fact that "Humanism has been sporadic, but Christianity continuous" (38). And Waugh expresses his yearning for a continuous tradition when he writes, "England was catholic for nine hundred years, then protestant for three hundred, then agnostic for a century. The catholic structure still lies lightly buried beneath every phase of English life, history, topography, law, archaeology everywhere reveal catholic origins" (3). Meanwhile the church is renowned for its capacity to transcend differences and schisms and hence its capacity for unification. Eliot finds that the only possible reconciliation of unity and diversity is in the church. He maintains that "The only positive unification of the world, we believe, is religious unification, ... culture unity in religion" (40). Waugh finds that schisms in Christian history have been temporary and local revealing "the universal and eternal character of the church" (41). In *Brideshead Revisited* and the war trilogy we have two sanctuary lamps still burning in the old houses of Brideshead and Broom, a reminder of this continuity in spite of the passing orders and forgotten traditions.

There remain the political views shared by Eliot and Waugh. The first was a royalist who never approved of democracy. He was of the view that totalitarian democracy has much in common with pagan society. It means conformity at the expense of the needs of the individual soul. He calls for a social stasis with order, hierarchy and tradition. Waugh was also anti-democratic, condemning the present century for being "the century of the common man". He used to repudiate the fact that aristocracy is fading away in favour of the common man, a repudiation expressed uncompromisingly in *Brideshead Revisited*, mildly in the war trilogy, and provocatively in some of his articles. Still, one must admit the fact that Eliot's approach to the question of democracy differs from that of Waugh. Eliot's is philosophical, intellectual and educational, while Waugh's approach is basically nostalgic, aggressive and provocative. An example of

portrays the modern world as a waste land, the second as barbarian and vulgar in its civilization. As Carens says, after enumerating some details and images from the works of both writers, 'these symbols, images and details, which embody the visions of Eliot, Greene, and Waugh, explain better than the abstract, pejorative epithets of controversy what characteristics of the century led to their conversion' (31) .

The notion that culture and religion are inseparable lies deep in the thoughts of both Eliot and Waugh. They believe that culture could never develop without Christianity as the latter forms, supports, enriches, and imparts significance and grants survival to the former. Eliot says in *Notes Towards A Definition Of Culture* 'no culture can appear or develop except in relation to a religion' (32) . And he goes on to assert that Christianity European arts have developed, laws have been rooted, thought has gained significance, so that, 'If Christianity goes, the whole of our culture goes' (33). Waugh is of the same idea; in a letter to Father Martin D'Arcy he writes 'Christianity is the essential and formative constituent of Western culture, (34). Also in an essay for the *Daily Express* he says, 'Civilization. has not the power in itself of survival. It came into being through Christinanity, and without it has no significance or power command allegiance' (35). That is why one finds in the works of Eliot and Waugh a hostility to culture and civilization severed from religion. In fact, the Whole of the modern age is repudiated with all the progress achieved in the various aspects of life because religion is forsaken. this is apparent in the spirit of despair and futility suffusing *The Waste Land* and Waugh's satires. Even modern literary works which ignore the religious element in man's life are regarded by Eliot and Waugh as deficient. Modern literature for Eliot is 'corrupted by what I call Secularism, that it is simply unaware of, simply cannot understand the meaning of, the primacy of the supernatural over the natural life,... it repudiates, or is wholly ignorant of, our most fundamental and important beliefs' (36.) Waugh passes almost the same judgement on modern novelists, 'The failure of modern novelists since and including James Joyce is one of presumption and exorbitance.. they try to represent the whole human mind and soul and yet omit its determining character—that of being God's creature with a defined purpose' (37).

Both writers are then aware that ignoring religion in the modern age means breaking away from a deeply-rooted tradition, established down

A nice little, white little, missionary stew.

Doris : You would'nt eat me!

Sweeney : Yes, I'd eat yo!

Both works examine the ills of modern civilization and expose the reality of barbarism hidden behind the mask of progress. The reality of modern life is 'birth, copulation and death' which makes modernity, barbarism and animality identical.

Waugh's *A Handful of Dust* illustrates clearly that the influence of Eliot upon Waugh was not a casual one; it was a far reaching influence. The title and epigraph to the novel are taken from *The Waste Land*:

'..... I will show you something different from either
Your shadow at morning striding behind you
Or your shadow at evening rising to meet you;
I will show you fear in a handful of dust.'

The emotional barrenness of characters in the novel and their inability to think deeply, the superficiality of London life, the fortune-teller—a counterpart of Eliot's Clairvoyant, and in both cases, as Frank Kermode has remarked, there is an element of pagan activity, (30) —Brenda's sexual relation with the despicable Beaver—she echoes the words of Eliot's typist, she is 'tired and bored'—Tony Last's search for an unreal city, and finally his death-in-life condition parallel to that in *The Waste Land*, all demonstrate the influence of Eliot's work.

One of the outstanding similarities between Eliot and Waugh is their view of the modern age as hostile, rootless, mechanized and decadent. In rejecting this valueless age they took refuge in the oldest of churches; Eliot in the Anglo-Catholic, and Waugh in the Roman-Catholic. The Church represents for them the timehonoured tradition, permanence survival of true values, and hope to restore order and integration. This attitude is shared by other converts like Graham Greene, Belloc, Chesterton, and Auden. But Eliot and Waugh have in common a similar set of values which binds the aspects of religion, culture and politics. The modern age for them is condemned for its materialism and totalitarianism which threaten the spiritual and cultural life of man and hasten him either to paganism, as Eliot maintains, or to dark ages, as Waugh states. This attitude is reflected in the writings of Eliot and Waugh; the first

made the water, 'amorous of their strokes', Cleopatra 'O'er picturing that Venus', the boys by her side' like smiling Cupids' (27). In *The Waste Land* Eliot alludes to Shakespeare's passage in portraying modern woman before her table of cosmetics. The description, however, is a parody of Shakespeare's so that the comparison of the two women shows the modern one as the sheer antithesis of Cleopatra. She is ugly, lonely, emotionless, living in an artificial world where everything seems to be synthetic she is described in this stream: 'The chair she sat in, like a burnished throne', 'golden cupidon', 'her strange synthetic perfumes ... troubled, confused and drowned the sense in odours', 'coffered ceiling', 'huge seawood fed with copper', 'sad light'. (28)

In Waugh's *Officers and Gentlemen*, modern Cleopatra is Julia Stitch. During the Second World War, she is so influential in Alexandria both in the military and the civil worlds. She protects the cowardly deserter Ivor Claire and plans to cover up his crime. Guy Crouchback hands her an envelop containing the identity disc of a soldier he found dead in Crete, and asked her to send the envelop to the general Headquarters. But, thinking that the envelop contains evidence of Claire's desertion, Julia throws it in the waste basket and then, 'Her eyes were one immense sea, full of flying galleys'. The allusion here, as Stopp notes, is to Heredia's sonnet on Cleopatra whose eyes are 'Toute une mer immense ou fuyaient des -aleres'(29). But if Cleopatra chose death rather than shame, Julia is her antithesis; she confounds death with shame.

It is interesting to find that Waugh makes a literary allusion to one of Eliot's works. In *Black Mischief* barbarism is a prevailing theme. Barbarism and lust are linked together in a brief conversation between Prudence and her lover Basil. "You're a grand girl, Prudence, and I'd like to eat you".

"So you shall, my sweet.... anything you want".

The wish is astoundingly granted. She is captured by a group of cannibals in Africa and is made into a stew. Basil, unknowingly, shares in eating her. The previous conversation recalls to the mind lines from Eliot's *Sweeney Agonistes*, Fragment of an Agon:

Doris : You'll carry me off? to a cannibal iste?

Sweeney : I'll be the cannibal.

Doris : I'll *convert* you!

into a stew.

when they say, 'the form is not simply an enabling means of handling the content, but in some sense it *is* the content!' (20) Here one can find a similar view in Waugh, which shows him as conforming to the modern classical movement in general. . . He praises Firbank for achieving 'a new balanced interrelation of subject and form!' (21) a statement which recalls Eliot's notion of adequacy in the work of art of emotion and subject.

One of the basic classical tenets is that subject matter outside the artistic form it assumes, is irrelevant in judging the merits of the work of art. Waugh echoes this principle when he says that, 'there are no poetic ideas, only poetic utterances' (22) a notion which can be traced back to T.E. Hulme when he maintains that there is no such a thing as poetic subject matter, (23) and to Benedetto Croce's statement that the poetic material permeates us all, only form makes the poet. (24)

As for style, one can find some striking similarities between the techniques of both Eliot and Waugh. Basic among these similarities is the use of literary allusions for the purposes of irony, parody and passing-indirect judgement on the modern age. I will confine my discussion of Eliot to *The Waste Land* which undoubtedly epitomizes his technique. Waugh makes use of this device in his first novel, *Decline and Fall*, and it appears in almost all his novels .

He says of a book he reviewed, 'There is an abundance of literary allusions and concealed quotation to flatter the reader's knowledge'. (25) Flattering the reader's knowledge through the use of literary allusions is a purpose shared by Eliot and Waugh. In *The Waste Land*, the difficulty arising from the abundance of literary allusions is not a coincidence; it was meant to be so. It tends, in the words of a critic, 'to flatter those who know the cultural score and despise those who don't' . (26) The use of literary allusions is meant primarily to pass judgement on the modern times as decadent, valueless and mechanized. It is interesting to see how both Eliot and Waugh make use of literary allusions to Cleopatra. Eliot's source is Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. In the play there is a passage where Cleopatra is portrayed in the most enchanting description which associates her with richness, beauty, nature, love and pride. We have this stream: 'The barge she sat in like a burnish'd throne ...', the sails were, so perfumed that/ 'the winds were love sick with them,', the silver oars

art. His norms are always implicit and his judgement is conveyed by means of different technical devices. One of the qualities he admires in Firbank's novels is that 'there is the barest minimum of direct description', and Waugh does the same in his novels. He depends more on dialogue (12) and situation. He regards writing 'as an exercise in the use of language.. It is drama, speech, and events that interest me'. (13) 'drama, speech, and events' can adequately correspond to Eliot's 'a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events' which are for him the objective correlative of the emotion to be evoked. Both Eliot and Waugh follow Pound's doctrine that one should suggest not state. (14)

Having a life of its own, a work of art is necessarily an autonomous organic whole in which all the elements which go into its making are indivisible. It is distinguished by a skilful artistic structure. Waugh finds the word 'architectural' better than 'creative', because when he talks of the *individual talent* of the writer he says that 'what makes a writer, as distinct from a clever and cultured man who can write, is an added energy and breadth of vision which enables him to conceive and complete a structure' (15). Structure means of course the complete artifact in which every constituent is functional and gains relevance only by virtue of its necessity to the work of art as a whole. In his review of Henry Green's *Living* he talks of 'the structural necessity of all features' (16). This rule applies even to wit, and here he points at a distinction between Oscar Wilde and Roland Firbank, for although their material is almost identical, 'his [Wilde's] wit is ornamental; Firbank's is structural' (17).

Placing the stress on form leads inevitably to the fact that/ style and subject matter become inseparable from structure. Waugh stresses that 'Properly understood, style is not a seductive decoration added to a functional structure; it is the essence of a work of art (18). It follows that use of such devices as clichés is rejected as an artistic defect. Waugh praises Christopher Isherwood because, 'not only does he seldom use a cliché, he never seems consciously to avoid one' (19).

The importance attached to structure and style is in effect the stressing of a remarkable phenomenon in modern literature, namely, the minimizing of the duality of form and content. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane in *Modernism* sum up this trend in the modern novel

is undoubtedly one of the outstanding characteristics of the new criticism which places the stress on the work of art not on the artist. It is noteworthy in this respect that most of Waugh's novels have autobiographical elements, but even *Gilbert Pinfold* which is based on Waugh's personal experience of mental breakdown in 1954, is, after all, a novel of a highly developed technical skill where life emotions are transformed into art emotions. So, the creative process, the work of art in relation to the artist is almost the same with both Eliot and Waugh. A comparison of the following two passages makes this fact explicit. In 'Tradition and Individual Talent' Eliot states that 'The poet's mind is in fact a receptacle for seizing and storing up numberless feelings, phrases, images, which remain there until all the particles which can unite to form a new compound are present together.' (7) In his article 'People who want to sue me' Waugh in a similar vein, says, 'One has for one's raw material every single thing one has ever seen or heard or felt, and one has to go over that vast, smouldering rubbishheap of experience ... Then one has to assemble these tarnished and dented fragments, polish them, set them in order, and try to make a coherent and significant arrangement of them' (8).

Objectivity as a major principle in Eliot's criticism is also a major feature in Waugh's. He praises Ronald Firbank because while his contemporaries were forced into 'a subjective attitude to [their] material, Firbank remained objective' (9). Waugh's impersonality is best illustrated in his detachment and his standpoint as the cool external maker who has full control over his material.

Eliot's anti-romantic stress on craftsmanship, as apparent in his doctrine of the 'objective correlative' is echoed in Waugh when he praises writers like Firbank, Graham Greene, Wodehouse, Belloc, Beerbohm for their craftsmanship. He praises Greene's *The End of The Affair* for 'the variety and precision of the craftsmanship' (10). He regards a book by Muggeridge as 'a highly unusual and welcome piece of workmanship' (11),

Eliot emphasizes the importance of indirection in his doctrine of the 'objective correlative' as he maintains that the emotions should not be directly stated or outpoured. This is possible only by the finding an objective correlative. Indirection is the most salient characteristic of Waugh's

T.S. Eliot and Evelyn Waugh

Evelyn Waugh's writings, thoughts and attitudes reveal an apparent similarity to those of Eliot who had a considerable influence on Waugh. Christopher Sykes recounts in his biography of Waugh that in 1922 Harold Acton converted Waugh at Oxford from 'Georgian poets to T.S. Eliot' (1). It is noteworthy that it was the year when *The Waste Land* was published and started to have a tremendous influence upon the literary scene. Sykes talks also of Waugh's admiration of Eliot and the unsuccessful attempts to arrange a meeting between the two writers (2). There is also the curious fact that nowhere in Eliot's critical writings can one find a hint on Waugh although Eliot wrote about other contemporary satirical novelists like Wyndham Lewis and Orwell.

Unlike Eliot's, Waugh's critical views are expressed in a limited number of articles and in different remarks which appear in his book reviews. However, these miscellaneous writings provide an adequate clue to Waugh's literary and critical stance. This stance is essentially classical revealing the influence of the modern classicists particularly that of Eliot.

Eliot's aesthetic theory rests upon his impersonal conception of art and the doctrine of the 'objective correlative'. He views art as the creation of an object. Such creation results from 'concentration upon a task in the same sense as the making of an efficient engine or the turning of a jug or a table leg' (3). Waugh says almost the same when he states that 'writing should be like clock-making' (4). Thus, it is the meticulous creation of an object. In his autobiographical novel *The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold* Waugh says of his hero-novelist, 'He regarded his books as *objects* which he had made, things external to himself to be used and judged by others'. This implies that the created object has a life of its own independent of the personality of the creator. That is why Mr. Pinfold fails foreign students who choose him as the subject for theses, when they attempt to relate his work to philosophical, social or psychological issues, 'Mr. Pinfold gave nothing away. Not that he was secretive or grudging by nature; he had nothing to give these students' (5). His works are there, things external to himself. Eliot says almost the same thing when he maintains that a poem has a life of its own and that its parts 'form something quite different from a body of neatly ordered biographical data' (6). This

T.S.Eliot and Evelyn Waugh

A research paper

by

Dr. Ezzat Adly Demian

Mosul University

Faculty of Arts

Dept. of English

A prefatory note

This is a comparison between two figures, one gigantic with an abundant output, who expounded a whole critical theory, T.S. Eliot, and the other a minor figure who echoes the major tenets of Eliot's theory, Evelyn Waugh. Although Waugh was not a critic, he expressed, as a book reviewer, critical points of view which demonstrate a classical stance similar to that of Eliot.

Besides demonstrating Eliot's far reaching influence on one more 20th figure, it is one of the purposes of this paper to introduce Waugh through a comparison with Eliot, not only his classical views, but as a type of figure we frequently come across in the 20th century sharing with Eliot certain attitudes shaped as a result of a rejection of the century as decadent.

Needless to say, in a comparison between a major figure and a minor one, it is inescapable that it is the minor one who steers the whole endeavour, otherwise he would be hopelessly overshadowed in the paper by the major figure.

As for the point that Eliot is a poet and Waugh a novelist so that similarities in technique could seem groundless, one should first state that the modern novel has approached the status of poetry in areas like precision, suggestiveness, indirection and the stress on language for maximum expression. Secondly, techniques like counterpointing or literary or scriptural allusion are used by both the modern novelist and the poet to serve their purposes. Thirdly, almost all of 20th century literature falls within the ironic mode—as Northrop Frye states in his *Anatomy of Criticism*—and this is an area where the novel and poetry are brought together.