



The editor, his collaborators and contributors: Eliot's editorship of *The Criterion*

Ian Campbell

OTHER contributors examine aspects of Eliot's legacy in terms of the impact of his poetry upon the development of twentieth-century literature. But if our attention turns to his role as editor of the cultural review, *The Criterion*, from 1922 to 1939, we are immediately confronted by the paradoxical situation that often arises when trying to put into perspective the precise roles taken in the historical period by an influential figure and those who might be termed his 'collaborators' and 'contributors'. The paradox is that myth-making often advantages the role taken by the dominant actor, such as Eliot clearly was, without a closer examination of what really happened. In the initial reflections upon Eliot's life and work published shortly after his death in 1965, it is understandable that most attention was placed on an examination of his contribution as poet and dramatist. This was natural. However, if one takes account of Eliot's day-to-day literary activities in the 1920s and 1930s, one would have to conclude that a great deal of Eliot's time must have been occupied in attending to the functions of establishing, then running, the literary review, *The Criterion*. A few, although not most, commentators about Eliot's legacy in that period just after Eliot's death did pay some attention to Eliot's role as literary review editor. One such commentator was Herbert Howarth, in 'The Editor and his contributors', in his 1965 study *Notes on Some Figures Behind T.S. Eliot*. But even here in the immediate aftermath of Eliot's life, we should not be at all surprised that assessments of Eliot's role as a literary review editor tended to place greater emphasis on his dominant role rather than upon an examination of the perspectives and contributions

Literature & Aesthetics 18 (1) June 2008, page 69



of those who might be termed 'contributors' or 'collaborators' with the editor. Howarth, observes that

Eliot launched The Criterion as a quarterly in October 1922, almost lost it when his sponsor withdrew in 1925, resumed it under the Faber imprint in 1925, made it a monthly in 1927, cut it back to a quarterly in June 1928, then issued it steadily until New Year 1939. Yeats told Poetry's guests at a cocktail party in Chicago that the way to treat a man of genius was to endow him and leave him to it. Viscountess Rothermere endowed Eliot, and left The Criterion to him, and then when she withdrew, the Faber board endowed him and left him to it. No other editors or advisers were named on The Criterion's pages. For twenty years it was his autocracy. Allen Tate was eventually to call it a model: 'The great magazines have always been edited by autocrats'.¹

Although this view was moderated somewhat by Howarth when he referred in the same publication to the view that 'the autocrat imposed upon himself the law of free enquiry, free debate', it nevertheless sent a powerful signal concerning the dominant way in which literary commentators saw Eliot's editorship of *The Criterion* as 'simply autocratic'.²

Indeed, the myth of total dominance by Eliot of the magazine continues to this day. For example, the Faber and Faber website currently (2007) refers to 'Eliot's quarterly' in its web reference to this aspect of the publishing company's history.³ Likewise, the Chronology of T. S. Eliot's life in the *Cambridge Companion to T. S. Eliot* notes against the year reference for '1922':

*The Waste Land being published that year in The Criterion which is to be Eliot's quarterly until he [my emphasis] brings it to an end in 1939.*⁴

Certainly, too, some of these perceptions of autocracy have undoubtedly been strengthened by the tone in which Eliot used his 'Commentary' section in each number of *The Criterion* to espouse his cultural or political ideas. However, recent research by Jason Harding has helped to change some of our perceptions of Eliot's editorship of the journal by focusing far more than previous accounts have, upon the interplay of cultural and literary networks; between Eliot, his contributors and collaborators in the work of producing the review.

This chapter discusses some of the points raised by Harding's pioneering 2002 publication about the cultural and literary context of



that significant cultural publication.⁵ Indeed, a key finding in Harding's account and examination of these literary and cultural networks is that they provided the context for Eliot's work, and were often influential in assisting him to set a course for the review.⁶ The key network which Harding sets out in his Introduction was an informal group, 'a conclave of civil servants and men of letters', which met initially in the 1920s at the Grove tavern, near the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.⁷ Brief biographical details of the persons involved are set out by Harding in his account, with a more definitive consideration of the roles some of the most prominent contributors and collaborators elaborated in later chapters. He suggests that

after Eliot's appointment at Faber, the Grove lunches became informal gatherings of the so-called 'Criterion group' where matters of finance and policy were discussed.⁸

The value of Harding's account is that this approach also enables us to chart aspects of the course of changing fortunes of *The Criterion* in relation to Eliot's views and world events, and thereby move beyond a perception of the journal as demonstrating a monolithic ideological stance throughout its publication life. Harding also suggests, *inter alia*, that Eliot saw the evolving and changing nucleus of writers who met weekly at the Grove as:

'a phalanx of critics,' whose beliefs were not antagonistic to his own. They represented, in effect, the editorial advisory committee of The Criterion ...⁹

This then was the position in the mid-1920s when Eliot had been able to gather around him a brilliant and scholarly group of individuals who saw, with him, the need for a high-quality cultural review. It was on this point that there was total unanimity of opinion. But such unanimity would not be sufficient to ensure that all would hold views about literature, religion and politics that would be in accord or at least not antagonistic to Eliot's particular blend of classicism, royalism and Anglo-Catholicism that he embraced and developed after his conversion in 1927. Harding also takes the view that, even allowing for the complexities of changing personal relationships and networks that Eliot used and was sustained by, through his editorship, perhaps the most important continuing thread of his editorship of the review was



*Eliot's foundational desire to stitch together into some kind of unity the Latin-Christian elements in the otherwise diverse cultures of Western Europe, an undertaking modified by his Anglican via media during the 1930s.*¹⁰

Harding draws attention to the fundamental importance of what he termed Eliot's 'celebration of Virgil as the criterion of Western literature' in this concept of a 'perpetually renewed Latinate tradition'.¹¹ Here he follows the stance enunciated by Frank Kermode in 1975 when the critic spoke of Eliot's struggle as editor of *The Criterion*

*to make our mind, provincial and vernacular though it is, part of the mind of Europe; of which mind Virgil was figura and founder.*¹²

Gareth Reeves has pushed this analysis even further. He suggests that Eliot was greatly influenced by the ideas of the German Catholic philosopher, Theodor Haecker, whose 1934 book *Vergel, Vater des Abendlandes*, postulated that the poet was the key link between the Roman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire.¹³ This is not to deny the importance of playing close attention to Eliot's own pronouncements, especially in the 1920s, about the theoretical aims of *The Criterion* in which there is no mention of religious or overtly party political sympathies.¹⁴ But I suggest we need to pay far more attention to the empirical evidence within the pages of *The Criterion* for the kinds of broad developments Harding is referring to, whilst at the same time paying closer attention to archival material becoming available now concerning the precise, albeit often changing, relationships Eliot had with his collaborators and contributors. Bearing these points in mind it is useful to examine specific numbers of *The Criterion* to assess just how Eliot's 'foundational desire to stitch together some kind of unity' evolved in the 1930s when Europe was starting to confront grave threats to any such consensus.

I would also provide some family archival material linked to the Eliot/Read story which goes some way to confirming the importance Harding places upon the changing fortunes of Eliot's professional relationships with Herbert Read. That relationship acted, it might be said, as a kind of barometer of the changing style and content of *The Criterion* as it became more closely identified with Eliot's Church-State Anglicanism as he began to

*prefer to put more trust in younger critics like Michael Roberts and Janet Adam-Smith who shared these basic sympathies.*¹⁵



Yet even these younger literary critics who, into the thirties, started to take on more of the functions that Herbert Read and others had espoused in the 1920s, never gained the stature that Read attained as an aesthetic and literary critic.

Turning to *The Criterion* itself, I have chosen to examine aspects, firstly, of the January 1930 number and then of October 1938 – eight years apart. The first, at the beginning of the decade, was published shortly after the Faber and Faber board consolidation of 1929 which, I suggest, gave Eliot the confidence he needed to continue with the magazine. Despite the onset of the Depression, the world of the 1930s began with a sense of optimism that European disarmament and the growth of international bodies for dispute resolution between nations would prevail. In the January 1930 number, the format of the review (which was to last until its demise in 1939) had been securely established. It was a quarterly literary review, but Eliot maintained, as he had suggested in his 1926 statements, that literature should always be 'alimented by non-literary sources'.¹⁶

Accordingly, continuing features of *The Criterion* from the 1920s were the Music and Art Chronicles, presented respectively in the January 1930 number by J. B. Trend and Roger Hinks. The Music Chronicles examined Jewish and Arabic influences in western music and civilisation generally, while Hinks argued strenuously against the adoption of 'a complete surrender to modern tastes', in art and elsewhere in life, even if he is prepared to admit that

*there was more likelihood of a new tradition (in art) emerging from the mechanistic architecture of Corbusier than from the quaint calligraphy of the English decorators.*¹⁷

In the 'Books of the Quarter' segment, Eliot himself undertook a mixed review of J. Middleton Murry's *God: Being an Introduction to the Science of Meta-biology* in which he even suggests that

*Mr Murry seems to me in the end to offer only a variation of biological naturalism, yet he has seen far more clearly than others the real issue: the fact that you... have to take the whole of revealed religion or none of it. And he shows a remarkable understanding of Catholicism; it may even be that he understands Catholicism better than his own beliefs.*¹⁸

Eliot also reviewed Peter Quennell's study, *Baudelaire and the Symbolists*,





acknowledging his great regard for 'a master like Baudelaire'.¹⁹ God and Baudelaire were obviously too important to Eliot to be left for other reviewers to comment upon!

'The Foreign Periodicals' review section was particularly strong in the January number, in its reviews of American and German language periodicals of the quarter.²⁰ The reviewer of *Die Literatur* (Berlin) notes the October 1929 numbers of *The Criterion* as including comments by Ernst Robert Curtius about Eliot, Anglo-Catholicism and the 'Anglo-European Universalism' of which, in his view, Eliot was the representative.²¹ But the main body of articles in the January 1930 number feature, amongst other items, a play by W H Auden, *Paid on Both Sides*, facetiously dedicated to C.S Lewis, and an article by Ezra Pound in which he grudgingly accords a place for Horace in the pantheon of great Latin poetry.

Eliot's own 'Commentary' section reveals an editor, apparently in charge. He chides prospective critics about possible tardiness of book reviews:

*When some important books are ignored altogether, the reader must remember that we aim to review adequately those books which we do review, rather than give a complete survey of the best of the season.*²²

But it was his announcements about a new literary award, of pan-European kind, for the best short story in English, Spanish, French, German or Italian that really was cause for celebration, with the winning entry, a short story from Germany, being published in translated form after selection by the five-person review jury. Eliot wrote that this process was

*visible evidence of a community of interest, and a desire for co-operation, between literary and general reviews of different nations, which has been growing steadily since 1918.*²³

Yet it is in his comments about 'Nationalism, disarmament and peace' that we get a sense of the less-than-coherent views Eliot sometimes expressed later in the 1930s concerning events in Europe and the *realpolitik* of the day. Eliot argues, in his discussion about prospects for European disarmament, that

*perhaps the most significant thing about the War was its insignificance, and it is this insignificance which makes it so acutely tragic.*²⁴





These were certainly the views of someone who had kept a certain detachment from a conflict which had excruciating significance for the millions killed and maimed in it, and their families, whatever the geopolitical consequences of the War.

As events in Europe were moving, almost relentlessly, towards another European war by the end of the 1930s, English poets and literary figures had been embroiled in the controversies of the Spanish conflict, but Eliot opted again for a position of rather contorted yet idealistic Olympian tranquility on this issue.²⁵ Yet it was not a position that all Christian commentators had adopted when faced with the realities of the European situation. No better illustration of Eliot's dilemma is to be seen than in his October 1938 'Commentary' relating to views expressed by the prominent Catholic philosopher, Jacques Maritain, when the latter wrote the introduction to a book by a Señor Mendizabel.²⁶ Eliot noted that Señor Suner, Franco's Foreign Minister in the newly victorious Spanish government, had reportedly attacked Maritain's views, in a speech reported in the Spanish press, and noted in translated form in the English publication *Blackfriars*. Eliot asserted in his 'Commentary' that Señor Suner was incensed primarily because of 'M. Maritain's refusal to admit the assertion that the war of the Franquistas is a holy war'.²⁷

Here we have clear signs of the ethical dilemmas facing Eliot in these years as he tried to reconcile his longing for inter-European unity with his Anglo-Catholic religious convictions, whilst at the same time noting his regard for Maritain's credibility as a Catholic philosopher of considerable standing. But what conclusions does Eliot draw from all this? He strikes out to suggest that rather what should be of concern was

*that part of the public which is inclined to attribute all of the 'holiness' of this war to the parties of Valencia and Barcelona, and which... would hardly find M. Maritain's philosophy any more acceptable.*²⁸

He continues in this vein to decry

*that group of 'heirs to liberalism' who find an emotional outlet in denouncing the iniquity of something called fascism.*²⁹

The 'irresponsible anti-fascist', Eliot suggested in October 1938, was a danger in several ways.³⁰ It is not hard to conjecture that Eliot, by this



time, was including in this category his erstwhile greatest supporter for *The Criterion's* mission from its outset, the poet and art critic, Herbert Read. Reading Harding's 2002 account of the changing relations between Eliot and Read, suggests to me that Eliot certainly had in mind, amongst others, Read himself.³¹ By this time, Read had taken public stances far beyond what Eliot still considered an achievable aim – the maintenance of inter-European unity even if all around this world was falling apart.³² Yet Eliot could still be at his most 'pithy' towards the end of his 'Commentary' when discussing the financial woes of a life of writing as he noted:

*For most of my life, when I needed money, I did not write poetry: I wrote
– or talked – about it.*³³

More is the pity that he could not respond to the challenges posed by European disintegration with this degree of simplicity and directness. The Periodicals section in October 1938 covered primarily American and German language periodicals and strove to keep an even-handed stance in the review of the German language periodical by drawing attention to the pressures facing writers in the increasingly Nazified Germany of the time. But it is in the Art Chronicle that we can best appreciate the agonies facing English cultural critics trying to weigh up the role of the artist and the state in the late 1930s. Here, Roger Hinks assessed the 1938 Burlington Exhibition of Modern Art which featured New German Art. Hinks takes us with him as he expounds an admittedly conservative view. He considered that artists needed to be mindful of their lack of total independence 'or else their freedoms will be eroded' through their failure to pay due regard to societal expectations. Hinks, nevertheless, evaluated the exhibition of German art thus:

*If we look at the official exhibition of National Socialist Art and at the
would-be symbols of the new order what do we find? An intolerable frost of
tenth-rate oleography, far more obsolete and degraded than the 'degenerate'
art it sets out to replace.*³⁴

Hinks goes on to state that if modern artists did nothing with their freedom they could not be surprised if it is taken away from them. But, he concluded, they do not deserve 'to be replaced by Herr Ziegler and his kind'.³⁵



So, *The Criterion's* art critic, having given his account of the social responsibility of the artist, comes resoundingly to the only conclusion possible. It is perhaps not surprising that Eliot's own contributor on art matters makes Eliot's own Commentaries by 1938 look increasingly all-at-sea when facing issues threatening his ideas of inter-European unity. The 1938 October number also included a lead article by poet John Betjeman – not a poem, but rather a spirited commentary on the deficiencies (as he saw them) of the 1938 Bresssey Report on British town-planning. An article by Montgomery Belgium purports to show why Kafka was not great. There was a 'Poem' by Dylan Thomas. The Book Reviews section included a very sympathetic account of Bronislaw Malinowski's pioneering anthropological study of the Trobriand Islands, *Coral Gardens*.

My primary focus has been to make some observations about what is valuable in discerning aspects of Eliot's editorship of the *Criterion* in the 1930s. There is also much to be gained by exploring more recent archival material in so far as it casts light upon the crucial relationships between Eliot and some of the 'collaborators' and 'contributors' of the 'Criterion group' identified by Harding. Indeed, it is possible to see the role of Australian-born Arthur Wesley Wheen (1897-1971) as an example of the way Eliot's Anglo-Catholic classicism had, by the mid-1930s, started to bring into the open the always inherent tensions within the 'Criterion group' which had established itself so successfully in the mid-1920s, as Eliot's collegial 'phalanx of critics' assisted him with his editorship of the review.

Arthur Wheen was the 1919 Rhodes Scholar to Oxford from the University of Sydney.³⁶ He was the immediate younger brother of my late grandfather, Harold Frank Wheen, who was the eldest of eleven siblings.³⁷ As children of Methodist minister, Harold Wheen snr, the brothers grew up with their siblings in New South Wales in parsonages in both Sydney and rural centres, as their father moved in accordance with his Church's directives. But 1916 saw Arthur Wheen on the Western Front, along with so many of his compatriots, in the Australian Imperial Forces. For bravery, he was awarded the Military Medal and two bars, one of only seven Australian soldiers in World War One to have been so decorated.³⁸ Like



so many of that generation who physically survived the slaughter that was the Western Front, he was utterly changed by the experience.³⁹

During his Oxford days and in the long period spent trying to secure a position in England, Wheen's friend and one time flat-mate, Frank Morley, was an important influence on his life. In 1924, he finally gained a position as an Assistant Keeper of the Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.⁴⁰ Here, Wheen came into contact with Herbert Read who was himself also employed at the Museum until 1931. It was certainly through his friendship with Read, also a returned soldier, and with Frank Morley, that he became involved in 'the conclave of civil servants and men of letters' which assisted Eliot in the 1920s in his task of developing *The Criterion*. It was Read too, assisted by Morley, who in 1928-29 played a crucial role in suggesting Wheen take on the task of translating into English the book in German by Erich Maria Remarque, *Im Westen nichts Neues*.⁴¹ This novel, in English translation by Wheen, was published in London by Putnam in early 1929 under the title, *All Quiet on the Western Front*.⁴²

In 1929, Frank Morley, having just joined the board of Faber and Faber, seems to have convinced other Board members, including Eliot, that Faber could accompany *The Criterion* series with a series of longer pamphlets of work by single authors. The result was *The Criterion Miscellany* series. Partly to capitalise upon the extraordinary publication success of *All Quiet on the Western Front* when it was published in Wheen's translation, and partly, I suspect, to raise Wheen's profile as a writer as distinct from his translating work, his own novella, 'Two Masters', came out as the first number in the *Criterion Miscellany* series, also in 1929.

In the 1930s, Arthur Wheen continued to translate German language novels, including two further novels by Remarque. But it had always puzzled me that amongst his other translations from German, the proof versions of which are now held by the National Library of Australia, Canberra, is the 1934 translation of Haecker's *Vergil, Vater des Abendeslandes*.⁴³ I now think that it is almost beyond doubt that he must have undertaken this translation specifically at Eliot's request, given Eliot's acute interest in Haecker's writing on Virgil.



Central to Harding's 2002 account of these cultural networks in which the story of *The Criterion* is embedded, is the changing relationship between Read and Eliot. Right at the outset of his chapter 'Herbert Read – Anarchist Aide-de-Camp', Harding puts into the frame many of the contradictory aspects of the Read/Eliot relationship that were, and still are, crucial to how we may view the whole *Criterion* story.⁴⁴

I think that the most striking aspect of this relationship was the almost unstated pact that each seems to have had with the other 'not to mention the War'. Of course, we have Eliot's own comments mentioned previously about 'the most significant thing about the war being its insignificance'. It is easy to imagine the inner turmoil experienced by veterans of the Great War, such as Read and also Wheen, when faced with such perspectives from one who had had no direct experience of the war itself. Intellectually, they would have agreed with Eliot, perhaps. But on an emotional level, it would have been beyond their comprehension not to agonise about the enormous impact and suffering of the generation of combatants.

There were by the 1930s other differences of view which Harding notes in his chapter on the relationship between Eliot and Read. Indeed, as Harding notes, Wheen had been an early commentator on the developing differences of opinion in the early 1930s between Eliot and Read.⁴⁵ But to the elements Harding enumerates, I would add the importance of this fact that whereas Eliot was not a combatant in the Great War, Read's own views were profoundly shaped by his war experience. Indeed, quite apart from his own poems and prose writings, Read's reviews in *The Criterion* and various London periodicals of the time of publication in 1929 of the translation *All Quiet on the Western Front* by his Australian-born colleague at the Victoria and Albert reveal just how significant this was.

This is a common theme which has been too little commented upon by literary historians writing about Eliot's role as literary figure in the 1930s. We can see further evidence of Read's 'unspoken rejoinder' to Eliot's views about the Great War in his review in *The Criterion* of Douglas Jerrod's *Criterion Miscellany* (1930) pamphlet *The Lie about the War* in which the latter dismisses the books that had emerged, such as *All Quiet on the Western Front* that claimed to be 'exposing the truth about the War'. Again,



in his defence of *All Quiet* in *The Nation and Athenaeum* (27 April 1929), Read refers to how soldiers were driven to 'the dumb verge of insanity' by the war experience itself and also afterwards when others suggested that the world was being made 'safe for democracy' through a conflict for which there was no justification.

However, like Read, although to a much lesser extent, of course, Wheen continued to be a close observer of, and participant in the various literary circles that were, in part, also Eliot's 'literary London'. He remained known to Eliot throughout the 1950s and presumably, until the poet's death in 1965. In 1954, for example, Eliot wrote to Wheen, recalling that he had mentioned a new play by author, Djuna Barnes, and sought his views on its suitability for publication by Faber and Faber.⁴⁶

I would conclude by drawing attention to correspondence from Arthur Wheen to a son of Herbert Read in so far as it provides a further perspective about the Eliot/Read literary and personal relationship that was such a crucial barometer of *The Criterion's* progression through the twenties to the end of the thirties. The letter written by Wheen, probably shortly before his death in 1971, to Ben Read sheds some additional light on that relationship, as seen by one of the 'Criterion group' who was close to Read. This was increasingly bitter during the thirties, even if there was a general rapprochement of sorts at the personal level that Harding notes as each became older and the conflicts of the that decade became more distant. In the letter, Wheen speaks about a gathering in London attended by both Read and Eliot:

... once at the Reform Club, or was it at the Garrick (?), Eliot feeling very sick told how he came to get [sic] the start of the majestic world of literature in the 20s – it was not that he was all that good himself, it was that there was a literary power-vacuum, somebody just had to assume (the role of) God and seem to shake the Spheres; the good men were all dead, not that he felt all that well himself, not at all.

Yes, said Herbert, it was the same with me and all that aestheticism. ... Roger Fry and so on were all of them gone, there was no obvious successor, I was just thrust into the throne for which I wasn't particularly suited. For the good of the community I just had to take up the Orb – not that I thought I was fit, not at all.

'Well, Herbert', observed Eliot, 'this is a conversation which, it must be allowed, does the modesty of all of us great credit'. Whereat Herbert smiled happily as did the rest of us.⁴⁷

The tone of the letter bears out Harding's views in his 2004 Read lecture about the enduring regard each of the literary figures had for the other as they entered their older years. But it also shows that, in some ways, Read did perhaps see his contribution to the development of aesthetic theory as being of some equivalence to Eliot's contribution to literature. And it shows (what has not been noted before) how an Australia-born man of letters, Arthur Wheen, was uniquely placed, sometimes at the centre, but certainly always within the circle of Eliot's acquaintances in that period of twentieth-century English literary history associated with Eliot's life and times and, specifically, the world of *The Criterion*.

Notes

- 1 Herbert Howarth, *Notes on Some Figures Behind T.S. Eliot* (Chatto and Windus, London, 1965), p.250.
- 2 *Ibid.*, p.250.
- 3 www.faber.co.uk/about_faber.html sighted on 1 June 2007.
- 4 See 'The Chronology' in A. David Moody ed. *The Cambridge Companion to T.S. Eliot* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006), p.xvi.
- 5 Jason Harding, *The Criterion: Cultural Politics and Periodical Networks in Inter-War Britain* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
- 6 Harding, *op. cit.*
- 7 *Ibid.*, p.15. The phrase is Harding's.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p.16. Eliot was appointed to the Faber board in 1925.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p.228.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 224.
- 12 Frank Kermode, *The Classic* (Faber and Faber, London, 1975) p.42, quoted in Harding, *op. cit.*, p. 224.
- 13 Gareth Reeves, *T.S. Eliot: A Virgilian Poet* (Macmillan, London 1989).
- 14 See particularly Herbert Howarth's comments on this point in Howarth, *op. cit.* pp. 251-253. See also Timothy Materer's discussion of 'Eliot's critical program' in A. David Moody ed., *The Cambridge Companion to T.S. Eliot*, pp 55-56, especially regarding "tradition" and "criterion". ['Next to "tradition" no term is more crucial to Eliot's work than "criterion"' (p.55).]
- 15 Harding, *op. cit.*, p.227.
- 16 Howarth, *op. cit.*, p.253.
- 17 'Art Chronicle' in *The Criterion*, January 1930, 318
- 18 T.S.Eliot, in his book review, in *The Criterion*, January 1930, 336.
- 19 Peter Quennell, *Baudelaire and the Symbolists. Five Essays* (Chatto and Windus, London, no date given). Book review in *The Criterion*, January 1930, 357-359.
- 20 *Criterion*, January 1930, 369-379.

- 21 *Ibid.*, 375.
- 22 'Commentary', *Criterion*, January 1930, 184.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 182.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 183.
- 25 Jason Harding, in Harding, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-199, mounts a persuasive argument regarding Eliot's espousal of the 'non-interventionist' case 'adopted by the British government.' While clearly the position Eliot took was not one, as some British commentators have suggested, of being pro-Franco, it was, as Eliot's 'Commentary' of October 1938 demonstrates, so tortuous and circuitous, as to be of little relevance. The 'non-interventionist' stance did not have one of its best exponents in Eliot.
- 26 In the previous (July 1938) edition of *The Criterion*, J. Middleton Murry had reviewed this book. No publication details given.
- 27 'Commentary', *Criterion*, October 1938, 58.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 58-59.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 59.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 59.
- 31 Jason Harding in his account of the Eliot/Read relationship does not necessarily draw this conclusion specifically as I do in relation to this aspect of the 'Commentary' in the October 1938 number of the review. However, all the evidence he presents concerning the Eliot /Read relationship in the period 1937-38 points in this direction, despite the 'cordiality' of this stage of their professional working relationship. See Harding, *op. cit.*, pp.124-125.
- 32 Correspondence from Arthur Wheen's wife, Aldwyth, to her mother, probably in 1938, mentions a discussion between Read and Wheen just after the birth of Read's son, Thomas, about the coming European conflict and their wish to see it avoided at all costs, given their predictions of deaths of millions and the death of European civilisation. This 'lesser-of-two-evils' position was a common one in 1938 particularly amongst those who had had direct experience of the First World War.
- 33 'Commentary', *Criterion*, October 1938, 62.
- 34 *Ibid.*, 65.
- 35 *Ibid.*, 65.
- 36 Papers of Arthur Wesley Wheen are held at the National Library of Australia, Canberra (MS 3656). These primarily cover Wheen's translation work, but there are some personal letters. Biographical details are set out in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* – online edition at www.adb.online.anu.edu/biogs/A120511b.htm (accessed on 4 September 2007). However, these holdings are being substantially augmented through the recent limited publication by a relative of Wheen's wife, Aldwyth (Tanya Crothers) of Wheen's selected letters over the period 1915-1970. All extant letters sent by Arthur Wheen to Australian relatives are also being added successively to the National Library holdings.
- 37 The last remaining sibling, Marie Arthur (*née* Wheen) still lives in Canberra, Australia. She is the widow of a former Anglican Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, Bishop Gordon Arthur.
- 38 Records of Wheen's military service are held at the National Archives of Australia, including details of the actions leading to the award of the Military Medals (MM) and two bars. A summary of the details of these actions and military award commendations is also set out in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* reference to Arthur Wheen.
- 39 These included a nervous break-down in the period he was at Oxford University.
- 40 See letter, dated 20 September 1976, from Frank Morley to Gretchen Wheen, Arthur Wheen's daughter, after Wheen's death, which supplements existing published material on this point. Surprisingly Morley also mentions a great deal about Wheen in his personal reminiscences about Eliot published in 1965. Frank Morley, 'A Few Recollections of Eliot', in Allen Tate ed. *T.S.Eliot: The Man and his Works* (Chatto and Windus, London, 1967), pp.90-113.



- 41 Letter from Frank Morley to Gretchen Wheen of 20 September 1976.
- 42 Wheen's translations and proofs are now in the Manuscript Section of the National Library of Australia. (MS 3656).
- 43 Harding, *op. cit.*, pp.109-126, especially pp.109-110 which encapsulate these aspects of the Read/Eliot relationship, including a reference to Read's famous comment repeated in the *Sewanee Review* (January-March 1966), 46-47, in which he says he retorted to Eliot that he was: 'a romanticist in literature, an anarchist in politics and an agnostic in religion' (p.109). Harding counter-poses this quote with Read's statement after Eliot's death that their friendship had been one of 'deep personal devotion'.
- 44 See Harding, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
- 45 Letters from Eliot to Wheen, dated 9 November 1954 and 2 December 1954. Eliot discussed with Wheen a new work by Djuna Barnes, author of *Nightwood*, which Eliot admits 'has puzzled me and dumbfounded my colleagues'.
- 46 Harding notes this particularly in the Abstract for his paper to the Herbert Read Conference 2004. See www.geocities.com/herbertread/harding.html?200712 sighted on 12 August 2007: '... although pronounced differences in taste and temperament placed a strain on their professional relationship, these differences did not ultimately rupture an underlying mutual affection and respect'.
- 47 The copy of this letter was held by Arthur Wheen's daughter and seems to belong to this time shortly before his death, as with failing health there were gaps and some grammatical errors. The original letter presumably is with Ben Read.

