Eastern Illinois University
The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

1994

From Tragedy to Hope: A Study of the Parallels in the Thought of Samuel Johnson and T.S. Eliot

Thomas Daniel McGrath

This research is a product of the graduate program in English at Eastern Illinois University. Find out more about the program.

Recommended Citation
McGrath, Thomas Daniel, "From Tragedy to Hope: A Study of the Parallels in the Thought of Samuel Johnson and T.S. Eliot" (1994). *Masters Theses*. 2038.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2038

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Aug 5, 1994
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

____

____

____

Author Date

From Tragedy to Hope: A Study of the Parallels in the thought of Samuel Johnson and T.S. Eliot

by:

Thomas Daniel McGrath

Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of:

Master of Arts in Literature

1994

I hereby recommend this thesis be accepted as fulfilling this part of the graduate degree as cited above.

8-5-94

8/5/94

Abstract

In this paper, the similarities between Samuel Johnson and T.S. Eliot are explored. Both men opposed the optimism with which their contemporary intellectuals had begun to regard humanity and its possibility for fulfillment on earth. While Johnson was from the 18th century, and Eliot from the 20th, the intellectual movements of their day bore a similar tone. The reaction of these two men was also similar.

Johnson and Eliot presented in their writing a similar view of the emptiness of human experience. This is most apparent in Johnson's The History of Rasselas and Eliot's The Waste Land, and the parallel theme of these works shall be explained. The theme they present opposes the optimism which gained intellectual momentum during Johnson's and Eliot's lifetime.

Perhaps responding to the need for hope to juxtapose such a view of life, or to provide solace to the events of unhappy lives, both men embrace the orthodox Christianity of the Church of England. Furthermore, both Johnson and Eliot believed orthodox Christianity to be the best means of organizing society, and bringing order to the chaos these men believed to exist.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. Christhilf for his excellent direction and assistance, Dr. Allison and Dr. McCormick for their readership and suggestions, and my parents and friends for their continued support.

Table of Contents

I. Opposing the Optimistic View of Humanity 6

II. Presenting the Tragic View 16

III. The Argument for a Christian Society 36

IV. Conclusion 66

Section I.

Opposing the Optimistic View of Humanity

When speaking with Virginia Woolf, T.S. Eliot once said that "all poets since Johnson are lazy." In his Essays From the Southern Review, Eliot states:

> The poetry of the eighteenth century is of two kinds, that descending from Dryden through Pope, and that descending from Milton. The evidence that the tradition of Dryden was the superior is the work of Samuel Johnson... Possibly I do not appreciate any English poetry subsequent to Samuel Johnson (12-13).

Eliot's admiration for Johnson's work establishes a framework through which to compare these two writers. The style of Eliot's poetry is often compared with that of the metaphysical poets, as he attributes much influence to them. His themes and social thought, however, are much more comparable to the work of Samuel Johnson.

Eliot's poetry and Johnson's creative work explore humanity's lack of interior fulfillment. Both men believed in original sin, and their work suggests a tragic view of humanity. Each man rejected those philosophies (common to their respective ages) which argued otherwise. For these men, the proposed order of Christianity provided hope amidst the chaos and tragedy of human circumstances. Johnson and Eliot are each considered a dominant figure of letters in their respective ages. In light of these circumstances I will compare them.

In addition to their similar world view, the ages in which they lived were also similar. Johnson and Eliot lived at times when the optimistic view of humanity was popular. Although the belief that people were inherently good dates back to the fifth

century British monk Pelagius, this belief did not gain much intellectual credence until the eighteenth century. In Ideas Have Consequences Richard Weaver states:

> The eighteenth century saw the domination of the Whigs in England and the rise of encyclopedists and romanticists on the continent, men who were not without intellectual background but who assiduously cut the mooring strings as they succumbed to the delusion that man is by nature good (38).

To Johnson, this optimism towards human nature was merely "novelty" (Boswell 277). Because it opposed the church, he viewed it as an intellectual trend. By Eliot's 20th century, this idea was in full effect.

Although the orthodox Christian Church denounced the optimistic view of humanity as heresy, the penalties for those who took this view were more mild than they once had been. Johnson feared that the positions of Hume and Gibbon might gain intellectual respect. The rigorous discipline with which the Middle Ages combatted such problems had almost vanished (Sambrook 46-52). Even the climate of England, which was stricter than that of France, was favorable towards the new intellectual movement (44). By Eliot's age, free-thinking was thoroughly imbedded in social thought. To Eliot and Johnson, these ideas not only conflicted with those of the Church, but also with their view of life.

At the forefront of the intellectual movement towards an optimistic view of humanity were the philosophers. In the eighteenth century, Rousseau and Voltaire were among the influential thinkers. Johnson disliked both men with equal fervor.

To him these philosophers were "sceptical innovators" who were "led away from the truth by a childish desire for novelty" (Boswell 447). While the opinions and philosophies of Rousseau and Voltaire were not identical, their optimism towards human nature and their mutual belief in the perfectibility of humanity, as evident through Candide and The Social Contract, caused Johnson to place them in the same category of "infidel writers" who rely solely on "the floridness of novelty" (301).

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), was the more optimistic in his ideas towards human nature. He maintained that humanity was inherently good, but his assertions went deeper. He believed that the corruptive force on human beings had been the civilization of society (Babbitt 107-111). Uncivilized people, as seen in Rousseau's figure of the "noble savage," represented the inherent goodness of human nature. The strictures of a regimented society impose upon this natural goodness and force them into corruption and evil acts. To Rousseau, each individual was a potential genius and society forced him into a role whereby this genius could not be expressed. Therefore, Rousseau argued that humanity must reject the ideas of civilization and go "back to nature" so as to return to natural human instincts of goodness and genius (Babbitt 34).

Rousseau openly opposed the Christian Church. For Rousseau (as was also the view of Johnson), Christianity had been integral in the development of Western civilization. But while Johnson viewed civilization in a positive light, Rousseau viewed it

as negative. Therefore, Christianity had been largely responsible for imposing discipline and false strictures on humanity's good nature. Furthermore, Christianity imbued people with false ideas of good and evil. For Rousseau there were no such things -- only good (Babbitt 67). Ultimately, Rousseau argued for the existence of a natural religion. It was these ideas that the Church deemed heresy, and that Johnson termed "vanity and novelty." (Boswell 694). By novelty, Johnson meant those ideas which were embraced because they were new and unique.

Johnson believed that "Rousseau knows he is talking nonsense [about the superiority of savage life], and laughs at the world for staring at him" (Boswell 458). To Johnson, the entire philosophical outlook of Rousseau was to "afford sufficient food to [his] vanity" (458). This outlook, however, was one that led Johnson to argue for strict disciplinary measures against the heresy of such men:

> I think him one of the worst men; a rascal who ought to be hunted out of society as he has been... I would sooner sign a sentence for his transportation than that of any felon who has gone from the Old Bailey these many years. Yes, I should like to have him work in the plantations (395).

Such statements indicate the powerful threat Johnson saw in the ideas of a man like Rousseau. Rousseau's "infidelity" was such that Johnson believed him a criminal against the order of the state.

Francoise Marie Voltaire (1694-1776) was "the end of the old world... (and) Rousseau is the beginning of the new" (Babbitt 32). Voltaire's ideas were more rooted in classicism than

Rousseau's, and this leads to their "incompatible views of life" (33). However, Rousseau and Voltaire shared several ideas which Johnson opposed. For Voltaire, too, humanity was inherently good and ultimately perfectible as well. His proposed method of attaining perfection was through progress and enlightenment, as opposed to Rousseau's idea of going "back to nature" (33). Both men embraced an equally optimistic view of life on earth. Voltaire's ideas opposed the Christian Church in this respect and his attacks on Christianity were blatant. He stated that Christianity was "a ridiculous exxageration, a terrible lie, and an absurd fable" (Sambrook 43). He promotes this outlook by saying that "Jesus was a mere human, a fanatic, ashamed of his bastardy, who preached firebrand sermons to a malcontent rabble and was duly hanged for his pains" (43). While his ideas were far more rooted in classicism than were Rousseau's, such anti-Christian statements as these found him a high place on Johnson's list of "vain men" and "infidel writers" (Boswell 394).

Eighteenth-century literature followed the intellectual guide of these philosophers. Rejecting the discipline and rational thought of the Augustan Age, writers like Laurence Sterne and Oliver Goldsmith took a more sentimental approach to literature and their movement became known as the Age of Sentiment. Sterne and his contemporaries all embraced the notion that humanity was inherently good (Babbitt 144). Because of this inherent goodness, they believed, humanity should adhere more to the demands of its emotions and less to the imposed strictures of society. For

Sterne, the "arch-connisseur of feeling," the conscience should heed the emotions more than the intellect (Brown 298).

Johnson criticized many writers from the Age of Sentiment for their emotionalism and their lack of adherence to traditional literary forms. At the root of Johnson's distrust for this movement was its optimism towards human nature. As Brown points out:

> Johnson's dislike for all the literary manifestations of sensibility, is based on ethical grounds. The passions and enthusiasms of man are lawless forces inconsistent with reason, and hence to be mistrusted (299).

To Johnson giving credence to the emotions was dangerous for this reason: the emotions were not necessarily in accordance with the proposed order of the law. For Johnson, anyone who denied "the laws of divine Providence" would soon find "the disorder and confusion of everything about us" (Sermon 5). In Johnson's view societal laws, particularly those he deemed the "justice of the Governor of the World," were essential to establishing order. To Johnson this order was threatened by the ideas of Rousseau, Voltaire, and Sterne.

* * * *

T.S. Eliot's retrospective view of what took place in the eighteenth century is similar to Johnson's. At Harvard, Eliot (1888-1952) was influenced by Irving Babbitt who termed the ideas of Rousseau and Voltaire "incoherent," and their intellectual persona "irreverent and mocking" (Akroyd 57-64). Under Babbitt, Eliot learned that the philosophies of these "sentimentalists" were

all guided by the optimistic view of humanity. Though the young Eliot did not subscribe to any sort of doctrinal belief in original sin, he saw no evidence of the inherent goodness of human nature. Eliot believed that Rousseau had "created a climate of emotional anarchy" in which the individual could claim freedom from the strictures of tradition. Eliot was opposed to "the work of sentimentalists who had derived from Rousseau the appealing but dangerously false notion that the human personality was innately good" (262). In a lecture he gave at Harvard, Eliot gives this definition of Romanticism:

> Romanticism stands for excess in any direction. It splits up into two directions: escape from the world of fact, and devotion to brute fact. The two great currents of the nineteenth century: vague emotionality and the apotheosis of science [realism] alike spring from Rousseau. (Kirk 271)

For Eliot, the impact of these philosophies lingered in his own age. It was apparent in men like John Dewey (1859-1952), who embraced a similarly optimistic view of humanity. Like Voltaire, Dewey believed that through progress humanity was ultimately perfectible. Dewey argued that "we have to see human nature not as limited and fixed, but as infinitely malleable" (Nathanson 76). To Dewey there was good in all aspects of human experience. In an age of scientific advancements and industrial progress, Dewey posited this belief against men like Eliot who believed that a "wretched generation of enlightened men" was being "betrayed by the mazes of [its] own ingenuities" (Choruses of the Rock). To Eliot, humanity could not escape its lack of interior fulfillment through progress.

Dewey argued that "there is no fixed datum called human nature" (Nathanson 44). He maintained that the individual should learn through his experience. Eliot argued from the classical view which he described as "the necessity for austere discipline rooted in tradition" (Ackroyd 268). In After Strange Gods, Eliot states, "the struggle of our time is to renew our association with traditional wisdom" (Panichas 63). As Eliot states in "Tradition and the Individual Talent," tradition, however, "involves... the historical sense, and the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence"(64). Such ideas as those of Dewey were troublesome for Eliot because they denigrate the belief that we must learn from the past. The reactions of T.S. Eliot towards John Dewey are expressed by George Panichas, one of Eliot's commentators:

> After Strange Gods can be interpereted as a condemnation of the intellectual revolution that Dewey's thought crystallized... What Eliot condemned was the spirit of indulgence that pervades Liberalism. The results of such softness bring a decay of cultural standards (74).

As we can see, the intellectual currents of Johnson's and Eliot's ages were similar. Johnson's age was one in which free-thought and the optimistic view was introduced to the people, and gained some intellectual respect. Eliot lived during a time when optimism towards human nature was high, and respect for tradition and its authorities (particularly Christianity) were low. Their responses to such movements were also similar. Both men argued against the optimistic view of humanity and upheld the traditional idea that human nature was inherently flawed.

This paper will explore Johnson and Eliot's mutual opposition to these above-mentioned views. The work of both men advocates a much more tragic view of humanity. However, Johnson and Eliot both find solace from this tragic view of humanity on earth in the eternal hope presented by Christianity. It is these parallels in thought that I will examine in this paper.

Section II.

Presenting the Tragic View

In contrast to the optimistic view of humanity, Johnson and Eliot present the tragic view of human life. By the tragic view I mean the belief that humanity could not attain fulfillment in this life. For Johnson and Eliot life was inescapably empty, and humanity was forever plagued with the problem of interior dissatisfaction. To both men, the human wish for happiness and fulfillment was vain. All attempts at these ends would leave their seekers disillusioned and empty.

The work of both men demonstrates the emptiness of material experience. For both poets the accumulation of material wealth is empty. More importantly, both Johnson and Eliot argue against what has been termed philosophical materialism. Philosophical materialism can be defined as those philosophies which propose that interior fulfillment can be found in the various forms of human experience. Such philosophies would argue that human happiness is attainable through material things, particularly progress. Neither Johnson nor Eliot believed this was the case. They present the antithesis to this idea in their work.

Johnson once said that he was "very certain of the unhappiness of human life" (Boswell 527). This statement exemplifies the attitudes that prevade his story The History of Rasselas. In Johnson's view, even the "hope for a future state of compensation" is something of which "we are not certain until we have a positive revelation." He believed that no matter where one sought fulfillment and happiness, it could not be found. He argued

that the human wish for these things was vain, and his work can therefore be said to present the tragic view of humanity.

Eliot's view of human life was also tragic. He too believed that the individual was incapable of attaining fulfillment without revelation. His poetry reflects this view as it embodies the emptiness and dissatisfaction common to the human experience. As Akroyd points out, the "bland optimism" of Eliot's day failed to recognize his conviction that "man is by nature bad or limited" (49). These limits (more commonly known as original sin) are what prevent humanity from achieving the fulfillment it seeks. Eliot's strong belief in this doctrine can be seen throughout his poetry.

Johnson's <u>The History of Rasselas</u> takes a thorough look at life, and demonstrates its emptiness. The story portrays the journey of a young man and his search for fulfillment in each phase of life. In each form of experience Rasselas learns that he will not find fulfillment. Even in the comforts of his youth, he was dissatisfied. In the early chapters of this story, we are introduced to young Rasselas in his home: the Happy Valley. Here, there are descriptions of lovely greenery and picturesque mountains which leave little to be desired. The narrator tells us that anyone who enters this valley shall "want for nothing"(339). All wishes are granted here, and entertainers compete annually for admission to its "blissful captivity" with the knowledge that they will never escape.

All of the valley's attributes are designed to provide fulfillment, or "happiness" (to use Johnson's word), to the young

prince Rasselas so that he too will "want for nothing." But as Johnson demonstrates, the fact that he "wants for nothing is the source of [his] complaint" (340). Even amidst a world in which his every need is provided and his every wish is granted, the prince is dissatisfied. This problem suggests that satisfaction consists of something more than material comfort. Because his "every (material) desire was immediately granted," the "source of his complaint" cannot be external. Therefore, it can be inferred that his dissatisfaction is interior (340). It is a dissatisfaction with his own experience.

Though the reader is never told the precise age of Rasselas, the fact that he is "young" and the descriptions of the "green" valley suggest childhood or youth. As a young child's world is one where needs and wants are provided for by parents, Rasselas's world is like that of a child. The Happy Valley fits the traditional ideas of childhood because Rasselas does not work, and his world is one without struggle. Though Rousseau may have believed the child's world was one of happiness and fulfillment (as it was closest to man's natural state), Johnson did not. Therefore, as a child usually chooses the world of experience, similarly Rasselas is unhappy in this youthful world of "bliss" and seeks escape from the Happy Valley. Johnson's picture of youth is not one of fulfillment, but one of dissatisfaction: "pleasure has ceased to please" (343). This dissatisfaction is what leads Rasselas to escape the Happy Valley and seek further experience.

Rasselas's desire to leave is also suggestive of Johnson's belief in the fallen nature of humanity. The Happy Valley is often viewed by critics as a metaphor for the garden of Eden (Bate 237-239). That Rasselas is malcontent and seeks further knowledge of life echoes Adam's choice to seek the knowledge contained in the forbidden fruit. As the serpent nagged Adam and Eve to seek greater knowledge of the world, so Rasselas hears the voice of Imlac's experience, causing him to "long to see the miseries of the world, since the sight of them is necessary to happiness" (350). The hardships Rasselas must face upon his departure from the valley are similar to those faced by Adam and Eve upon being cast out of the garden (239-241). That both parties wilfully choose to leave a world where all their needs are met demonstrates that even innocence and youth are unfulfilling stages of the human experience. Rasselas departs for the world. Imlac takes him to Cairo so that he may see life beyond the Happy Valley. In this city of commerce and progress Rasselas hopes to find the fulfillment that previously eluded him.

This venture further demonstrates Johnson's tragic view. Although during Rasselas's first experiences in Cairo he finds "every man happy," we soon learn that this "happiness" is an illusion. Here too humanity is dissatisfied with its lot. In Cairo, Rasselas's initial reaction is one of wonder, which is sparked by the novelty of his first experience with the adult world. But even the advantage of meeting men of "every character and every race" is not enough to sustain his interest. As the

excitement begins to fade, he is again faced with the dissatisfaction that plagued him earlier. Soon he realizes that the inhabitants of the city, despite their appearance of happiness, are also dissatisfied with life.

Rasselas's disillusionment with these two forms of experience leads him to seek fulfillment elsewhere. He then decides that he will attempt to "gratify his desires" through an association with "young men of spirit and gaiety" (364). While there is an element of egocentricism to this portion of the story, the fact that Rasselas chooses to gratify his desires among other young men suggests that part of what he seeks here is human friendship. Although he is "readily admitted to such societies [those of the affluent young men]," Rasselas returns "weary and disgusted" from the emptiness he finds in this form of experience (365). He finds little companionship among these men and discovers that "the mind has no part in their pleasures." That he sought to gratify his desires, which he learns is the "only business" of these young men, leads him to the conclusion that "happiness must be something solid and permanent, without fear and uncertainty" (365).

When Rasselas attempts to enliven their minds, he is scoffed and "derided" by those in whom he placed his trust -- those whom he considered his friends (365). Rasselas learns that friendship is not fulfilling. Its solaces are few and its trials are too many to bring about happiness. Neither friendship nor the attempt to gratify his desires brings him anything more than

temporary satisfaction. Through these episodes Johnson demonstrates the emptiness and dissatisfaction with these forms of the human experience.

While this portion of the story indicates Rasselas's search for fulfillment through friendship, there is also a suggestion that he seeks fulfillment through sex. Because Johnson believed it was unconscionable to write explicitly about sex (Johnson attacked Sterne's Tristram Shandy for doing so), it is difficult to know precisely which desires are being gratified here. However, we do know that these young men spend their time "in a succession of enjoyments" which are discovered to be "gross and sensual, in which the mind has no part" (365). The circumstance that Rasselas is a young man in the company of other young men "whose only business is to gratify their desires" makes it likely that these images denote sex. Rasselas's emptiness at the end of this section reflects Johnson's belief that the experience of sex could not bring about fulfillment.

It is these experiences which lead Rasselas to seek fulfillment in wisdom. He becomes attracted to the philosophies of "a wise and happy man." The happiness or fulfillment this man has found through his philosophies is appealing to Rasselas after the disillusionment of these prior experiences. This man's ideas seem capable of bringing Rasselas the fulfillment he seeks. For the man's wisdom seems to have allowed him to escape his own interior dissatisfaction, and Rasselas tells his friend Imlac: "I have found a man who can teach all that is necessary to be known...

This man shall be my future guide: I will learn his doctrines, and imitate his life" (367).

The "wise and happy sage" (who is to be distinguished from Imlac), philosophizes that the means of attaining happiness is by not allowing the emotions to govern reason. Rational and logical thought were the means of preventing this, and through an undistorted and logical view of the world, the sage argued that happiness could be found: "fancy, the parent of passion, usurps the dominion of the mind" (368). To the sage, reason must govern over all human actions which would keep passion from "degrading" human nature. To Rasselas, this philosophy contained great wisdom and he believed that if he were to live by it, he too would find happiness. Then he would have attained what was lacking in his prior experiences.

However, Rasselas learns that the sage is unable to live up to his words. The sage himself had warned Rasselas against being "too hasty to trust the teachers of morality: they discourse like angels but live like men," but Rasselas must learn this on his own (368). Holding true to his words, the sage is eventually unable to live up to the morality he preached and allows his emotions to over power his reason when he learns of his daughter's death. A disillusioned Rasselas attempts to remind him of his ideas, but the man responds: "What comfort can truth and reason afford me? Of what effect are they now but to tell me that my daughter will not be restored?" (370). Hoping to avoid adding further pain to the sage in his dire circumstances, Rasselas

departs. He is disillusioned by these events and realizes that the sage's wisdom was one that did not consider the realm of circumstances beyond human control. Rasselas learns "of the emptiness of rhetorical sound, and the inefficacy of polished periods and studied sentences" (370). The sage appeared to have achieved fulfillment through these philosophies prior to the death of his daughter, but the sage's daughter was the inspiration of his philosophies and she brought him "all the comforts of his age." Her death destroyed his "views, purposes, and hopes" (373). Rasselas comes to realize the emptiness of another form of experience.

Johnson's Rasselas continues to explore the various means by which human beings seek fulfillment. The prince repeatedly encounters men who have adopted a view or life-style which they believe will bring about interior happiness. But each time, as he learns of the wise and happy man, Rasselas finds that they too are unsatisfied with their lives. Rasselas learns that the hermit is dissatisfied with what he has chosen because he decides to abandon his seclusion and return to the city. The learned man who claims to have found happiness by living "according to nature" proves that he is living under a delusion when he provides Rasselas with discourse so confusing that it leads Rasselas to conclude that "the learned and the simple [are] equally ignorant" (374). Rasselas also learns of "The Dangerous Prevalence of Imagination" which leads to "disorders of intellect" when he encounters the astronomer who has lost contact with reality. Imlac warns Rasselas that these

instances demonstrate the way the human mind "feasts on luscious falsehood whenever she is offended with the bitterness of truth" (374). Imlac's warning seems an indication of Johnson's general distrust for ideas that did not conform to his view that life was empty, and that fulfillment was unattainable.

Johnson's Rasselas also warns against the accumulation of material wealth. In the chapter entitled "The Dangers of Prosperity," Rasselas encounters a man with magnificent wealth. Despite the man's many material "posessions," he warns Rasselas:

> My condition has indeed the appearance of happiness, but appearances are delusive... I have sent my treasures into a distant country, and upon the first alarm, am prepared to follow them. Then will my enemies riot in my mansion, and enjoy the gardens I have planted (368).

The man's position of wealth is such that he cannot even enjoy those things he has accumulated. He must constantly live in fear of the enemies he has made through its attainment, and cannot even be certain of safety in his own home. This portrayal of wealth as encompassing fear further suggests the emptiness of this end.

* * * *

T.S. Eliot's The Waste Land also presents a view in which fulfillment is impossible. Through its portrayal of "the immense panorama of futility and chaos which is modern history," the poem communicates the emptiness of the human experience (Daiches 32). In Eliot's view, humanity has reached a point in its history which is so chaotic that it can no longer find meaning in experience. This failure to find meaning has left humankind swirling about in confusion. Traditional ideas of right and wrong have become

muddled, and this has left humanity in a state of inertia. Images of infertility, emptiness, and sterility pervade the poem and demonstrate humanity's inability to find fulfillment in its circumstances.

Ultimately, this futility and chaos can be traced to humanity's failure to love (Bentley 76). In Rasselas, Johnson depicts the emptiness of all human experience, however; selfishness and a lack of concern for one's neighbor portray the particular reason for Eliot's position and can be seen in nearly all of the human encounters in the poem. It is this which leads to humanity's lack of fulfillment, and wreaks chaos on "the dead land" (52). As I will later demonstrate, all of the characters in the poem represent the futility of the human experience as they seek to gratify their own desires without regard for the needs of others. Eliot demonstrates that this selfishness is largely responsible for humanity's present state.

Eliot believes that the failure of love is the great tragedy of his time. It fosters an atmosphere in which self-gratification is all that mattered, and has in turn bred infertility in the land and futility in the lives of its characters. He argues that there is no cause for optimism in the modern age and portrays its land as one in which nothing can grow, for there is neither water nor love. He believes that love is as necessary to human growth as water is to the growth of crops.

At this point in Eliot's career, his view is perhaps less tragic than Johnson's. While Johnson believes that human happiness

was completely unattainable in this life, Eliot presents a contrast in that the possibility of happiness is evident, for the waste land is "waiting for rain." In his later work, however, Eliot will arrive at many of the same conclusions as Johnson. As we will see in the final section of this paper, Eliot too concludes that humanity can never find total fulfillment on earth, and, therefore, must turn to religion for hope.

In The Waste Land there is a consistent lack of fertility which predicates the futility of its situations. The poet repeatedly tells us that "there is no water" and all facets of nature are described as "dry" and "dead." The entire landscape seems barren and empty as even its flowers have "dull roots" and are bred out of a "dead land" (52). The scenes of this landscape establish a general sense of how a waste land must appear. Nature is dry and infertile and it seems to have lost its meaning -- as the title of the poem itself suggests.

The opening lines of the poem suggest this loss of meaning and reflect confusion. Here, "April is the cruellest month, breeding/ Lilacs out of the dead land." It is "winter [that] kept us warm, covering/ Earth in forgetful snow, feeding/ A little life with dried tubers" (57). Spring is traditionally a time of youth and re-birth and winter is associated with age and death. The first lines of this poem indicate that the traditional meaning of these natural seasons has been lost. This sense of confusion and disorder continues throughout the poem.

The next portion of the first section, "The Burial of the Dead," presents "a heap of broken images." Much of what we see throughout the poem seems broken. This fragmentation further suggests the chaos which prevails in the waste land. We are told that "the sun beats/ And the dead tree gives no shelter.../ And the dry stone no sound of water." These images suggest an inescapable aridity and infertility, from which there is no shelter. The poet tells us even the cricket (which should be used to such aridity), can find "no relief." All of these images establish the infertility and emptiness of the poem's landscape.

The images of "The Fire Sermon" further suggest such problems. In this urban setting we are told that "the river's tent is broken; the last fingers of leaf/ Clutch and sink into the wet bank. The wind/ Crosses the brown land unheard" (60). All of these images further the darkness and infertility of the landscape. The summer nights are gone as "the nymphs are departed." While the poet's memories would otherwise seem nostalgic, they are filled with images of emptiness. His memories bring to mind "empty bottles, sandwich papers,/ Silk handkerchiefs, Cardboard boxes, [and] cigarette ends"(60). The most memorable images of summer nights are of the rubbish they contain. These are signs that the poet is in a waste land. He feels "a cold blast" at his back, and hear[s] the rattle of the bones." These images suggest a cold horror to the landscape he surveys. The narrator's emptiness in the city echoes that of Johnson's <u>Rasselas</u>.

This sense of horror is furthered as the poet is fishing "in the dull canal/ On a winter evening round behind the gashouse." He relates: "A rat crept softly through the vegetation/ Dragging its slimy belly on the band" (60). As he contemplates the deaths of his brother and father, he sees "White bodies naked on the low damp ground/ And bones cast in a little low dry garrett,/ Rattled by the rat's foot only, from year to year" (60). While the poet does not specify to whom these bones and bodies may have belonged, the image establishes a sense of darkness and death.

The imagery of "What The Thunder Said" describes a similar landscape. The poet states: "Here there is no water but only rock/ Rock and no water and the sandy road" (67). This image suggests that this aridity has led to infertility as nothing can grow without water. The poet finds himself among "mountains of rock without water" which suggests the extensive nature of the aridity. He longs for water so that he may "stop and drink" and appears to have lost his thought processes to this dryness: "Amongst the water one cannot stop or think/ Sweat is dry and feet are in the sand" (68). As Nancy Gish connects, this physical longing for water suggests a spiritual longing for renewal or rebirth, and may be a desire for baptism.

The poet continues to wish for water to quench his thirst: "If there were water amongst the rock.../ If there were water and no rock/ If there were rock/ And also water/ And water/ A spring/ A pool among the rock"(66). These lines suggest that his longing for water transcends the hope to quench his own

thirst. The fact that he wishes for water among the rock suggests that he longs to end the problem of infertility and aridity in the land itself.

He realizes, however, that "there is no water." He is left only with the dry sounds of "the cicada/ And the dry grass singing" (66). Even the sound of thunder, which would appear to be a sign of rain, is described as dry and sterile. From the "arid plain" on which he sits in "this decayed hole among the mountains" he realizes the emptiness of all experience (69). He sees "empty cisterns and exhausted wells," suggesting that even reservoirs no longer contain water (69). The inability to fulfill his spiritual longing is reflected when he sees "the empty chapel, only the wind's home./ It has no windows, and the door swings" (69). Here, the poet indicates that, like the resevoirs for water, the places for spiritual rebirth are also empty.

The human encounters in this poem also establish the emptiness and futility of experience. As I mention earlier, because these characters lack love for one another, they are selfish. It is this selfishness that fosters their emptiness. Much as the landscape of this poem is barren and infertile, so are the lives of its characters void of meaning and fulfillment.

As David Daiches points out, the final portion of the poem's first section, "The Burial of the Dead," helps to establish Eliot's tragic view as it demonstrates the emptiness of human friendship (53). The situation is prefaced with an allusion to Dante's Inferno in which "A crowd flowed over London bridge." The

suggestion of hell provides a sense of emptiness and horror to the situation which follows. As the speaker "wanders down King William Street," he ponders the brevity of life: "I had not thought death had undone so many." When he sees "Stetson," apparently a long-lost friend, his hope is to escape the emptiness of this thought. "You who were with me in the ships at Mylae," he cries out, alluding to the famous battle, which indicates that Stetson is a war comrade -- a lost brother in arms (54).

The speaker then asks Stetson: "That corpse you planted last year in your garden,/ Has it begun to sprout?" The suggestion here is of re-birth, perhaps the rejuvenation of an old friendship. As in Rasselas, the scene indicates that the speaker is seeking fulfillment through friendship. However, something unexplained occurs which leads the speaker to cry out angrily: "You! hypocrite lecteur!" The man he once considered his "semblable" and his "frere," has somehow demonstrated hypocrisy. The speaker realizes his hope for fulfillment here is empty. Allen Tate argues that his entire passage can be traced to Dante's Inferno. Because this reference compares the situation to hell, it indicates the emptiness and horror of the speaker's experience (43).

In The Waste Land's second section, "A Game of Chess," Eliot portrays the relationships between men and women as meaningless and empty. The situation here suggests that the human relationship between the sexes will not bring about fulfillment. In Eliot's view, such things are ultimately empty. The section

opens with a description of a woman who sits before the vanity in her bedroom. She appears to have material wealth as she sits in a "marble" chair "like a burnished throne," and we are told of "the glitter of her jewels" (56). But this wealth appears to have deluded the woman. She has spent so much time and energy in her endeavours to become beautiful that she has lost touch with reality. She has "drowned [her] sense in [the] odours" of "her strange synthetic perfumes" (56). The fact that her perfumes are synthetic suggests something unnatural to her quest for beauty. That she lost her senses to this quest indicates that she can find no long-term fulfillment. Her meaning of life seems to be derived from her appearance. She is drowning in the boring vacuum of her own experience.

After the description of the woman at the vanity, a conversation between a man and woman begins. This situation portrays the futility of the communication which takes place between the sexes. The woman pleads with the man: "Stay with me,/ My nerves are bad to-night." When he is slow to respond she urges: "Speak to me. Why do you never speak./ What are you thinking of?" (57). He does not respond but allows this thought to pass: "I think we are in rat's alley/ Where the dead men lost their bones" (58). This image shows the darkness with which he views their relationship. The woman displays uneasy fear (perhaps because of her own discomfort with their lack of communication) when she misinterperets the sound of "the wind under the door." The man reassures her that the sound is "nothing," but she continues:

"What is that noise now? What is the wind doing?" He grows weary of her questions and responds angrily: "[it is] nothing again nothing" (57).

She then chides: "Do you know nothing?/ Do you see nothing? Do you remember nothing?/... Are you alive or not? Is there nothing in your head?" Her anger and frustration lead her to threaten: "I shall rush out as I am and walk the street,/ With my hair down, so" (57). The last portion of this vignette suggests that the couple "shall play a game of chess," the quote from which the sub-title was taken (58). The image of a chess match indicates an element of competition between men and women -- a struggle for the upper-hand like the one we have just seen. This situation suggests that while men and women should seek unity, they seem only to find competition which divides them. It suggests that relationships are not truly fulfilling.

The next conversation takes place in a pub, and bears the tone of gossip. We are only told the name of one of the speakers, Lil, whose husband was recently "demobbed" after having "been in the army four years." The speaker warns Lil that her husband Albert "wants a good time,/ And if you don't give it him, there's other's will" (58). The speaker states: "If you don't like it you can get on with it.../ Other's can pick and choose if you can't.../ If Albert makes off, it won't be for lack of telling" (58). These lines suggest that she must provide sex for Albert, lest he leave her. It appears that she has little desire

to do so, but if she cannot provide for him, "there's others will" (58).

We then see the relevance of the woman's appearance: "You ought to be ashamed, I said, to look so antique./ (And her only thirty-one)." Earlier in the vignette we were told that Albert gave her some money to "get [her]self some teeth," because "he said... I can't bear to look at you" (58). This suggests the importance of her appearance in her relationship to Albert, which suggests the superficiality of love in the waste land. Lil defends herself: "I can't help it... It's them pills I took to bring it off.../ (She's had five already, and nearly died of young George)" (59). She attributes her pre-mature aging to an abortion. Life appears to have taken its toll on her appearance, and it has affected her relationship as well.

The situations of the third section of The Waste Land, "The Fire Sermon," also takes place between men and women. These situations are explicitly sexual -- instances of sex without love. Advancing Eliot's tragic view, they suggest that sex is also void of fulfillment and meaning. In this section the speaker identifies himself as "Tiresias, old man with wrinkled dugs," and continues to describe the human encounters he sees in the waste land.

He "foretells" a scene between a typist and a young man carbuncular. Tiresias sees the "young man" as he "endeavours to engage her in caresses/ Which still are unreproved if undesired." The man's "Exploring hands encounter no defence;/ His vanity

requires no response/ And makes a welcome of indifference" (61). These lines demonstrate the selfishness of a man who cares nothing for his partner, and only wishes to gratify his own animalism and vanity.

After the encounter the woman states: "Well now that's done: And I'm glad it's over," indicating her dissatisfaction with the experience. We are told that she is "hardly aware of her departed lover; [and] Her brain allows one half-formed thought to pass" (62). As she "paces about her room again, alone,/ She smoothes her hair with automatic hand,/ And puts a record on the gramophone" (62). Eliot's use of the term "automatic" suggests a mechanical nature to the sex act, and we see the thoughtlessness of her encounter when she barely notices the man is gone. The repercussions of her act are feelings of emptiness and boredom. "When lovely woman stoops to folly" there is nothing more than these feelings (63). Her sexual encounter is an act without love -- an act which demonstrates the futility of sex in the waste land.

In "Death by Water," the poet reminds the reader of life's brevity. This portion of the poem, with its suggestion that all life shall one day end, most closely echoes the tragic view of Johnson. Here, we are told of Phlebas, the Phoenecian sailor, who was carried out to sea and drowned. Phlebas's death has taken him away from such earthly things as "the cry of gulls, the deep sea swell,/ And the profit and loss" (65). While the cry of gulls is something Phlebas may have remembered fondly, the profit and loss were probably remembered less fondly. At the end of this section,

the speaker warns: "Consider Phlebas, who was once handsome and tall as you" (65). Here the speaker suggests that all individuals, even the strong and handsome, will come to this end. All shall forget the cry of gulls and the profit and loss. This encounter demonstrates the brevity of human life and Eliot's tragic view that beauty, strength, and life are fleeting. Much as the imagery of this poem establishes futility and infertility, so do the human encounters establish emptiness and a lack of growth.

Section III.

The Argument for a Christian Society

With its proposal of eternal salvation, Christianity posited hope in the face of these tragic views. Johnson and Eliot's belief in the emptiness of human life was accompanied by the idea of spiritual fulfillment in eternity. Ultimately, the laws and ideas of Christianity proposed a means of ordering society. This philosophy attracted both men, who viewed it as a method of ordering what they deemed the fallen world of human chaos. Both Johnson's Sermon 5 and Eliot's The Idea of a Christian Society argue this position and propose its benefits.

The purpose of Sermon 5 is clear: to demonstrate the many social benefits Johnson believed were offered by a Christian society. As is the case with much of Johnson's proposal, its success would depend largely upon the efforts of each individual to live up to the standards set by society. In Johnson's view, the discipline and sacrifice this required would be rewarded in eternal life. Johnson argues that these qualities, while difficult to practice, foster greater interior satisfaction, and states: "he is very ignorant of the nature of happiness who imagines it to consist in the outward circumstances of life" (467). Even the vast benefits of his proposed society would not provide total earthly fulfillment for humanity. Therefore, it should "not be very solicitous about [its] present condition" and should instead "press onward toward the eternal felicity" by adhering to Christian principles and remaining "accountable to God" (467).

To comprehend Johnson's desire to embrace Christianity, it is important to consider the influences and events of his life.

One aspect of his life which should be considered is the hardships and tragedies he faced. I believe that these events influenced his tragic view of life, as well as his desire for a Christian orthodoxy. Despite the tremendous progress which took place in his age, Johnson's belief in human limitations (and in humanity's fallen nature) remained steadfast. His antipathy towards progress may, of course, have been influenced by the adversity he faced throughout his life.

Johnson's very birth brought adversity when he was "afflicted with the scrofula, or king's evil, which disfigured a countenance naturally well-formed, and hurt his visual nerves so much that he did not see at all with one of his eyes" (Boswell 13). His youth was also difficult as his father, Michael, who spent much of his life in "a state of gloomy wretchedness," was one of his primary influences. Boswell speculates that Johnson inherited from his father "a vile melancholy" (Boswell 4). This hindrance to the writer's life also affected his views: "to this [depression] we may ascribe his aversion to regular life" (10). Boswell's statement suggests that this problem of depression affected Johnson's tragic view. This melancholy was "a dismal malady [from which] he never afterwards was perfectly relieved" (10). Because he suffered from depression throughout his life, the influence of this disorder on Johnson's view of life is evident. Although he had "such a manly fortitude, that he did not trouble [his] company with his complaints," the impact of this depression can be seen in the hopelessness of a work such Rasselas, or The Vanity of Human

Wishes. Johnson believed all that is "certain is the unhappiness of human life" (Boswell 527). One can see where the idea of eternal life would bring him solace.

Johnson's views on religion were also influenced by the fact that he was born and raised in a family which had long embraced Christianity: "baptism is recorded to have been performed on the day of his birth" (3). His parents played a major role in the development of his faith, as did his education. Johnson was raised with a strong sense of the need for discipline. He was whipped by his school-master who warned: "This I do -- to save you from the gallows" (6). Such "wrong-headedly severe" discipline, Johnson acknowledges, was delivered by "an excellent master... and [one of] the best preachers of his age." Johnson argues that fear is a very effective form of disciplining: "I would rather have the rod to be a general terror to all, to make them learn" (7). This attitude became one of the premises for his religious beliefs.

Throughout his life, Johnson had "a momentous anxiety of eternity, and of what he should do to be saved" (12). His fear of eternal damnation may be traced to those events of his early childhood. Boswell points out: "with the just sentiments of a conscientious Christian, he [Johnson] lamented that his practice fell far short of what it ought to be" (12). Johnson was always mindful of his own short-comings, perhaps more so than the average "conscientious" Christian. On his death bed he prayed for "such a

sense of my own wickedness as may produce true contrition and effectual repentence, so that... I may be received among sinners to whom sorrow and reformation have attained pardon" (503). Even after a long life of defending Christianity from its critics and adversaries such as Rousseau and Voltaire, Johnson maintained a tremendous fear of eternal damnation.

Prior to examining Johnson's proposal of a Christian society, it is relevant to consider that at times he found it difficult to adhere to the principles he upheld as a Christian. Boswell points out that "like many other good and pious men... Johnson was not free from [un-Christian] propensities... and that in his combats with them, he was sometimes overcome" (244). Particularly as a young man in London, "his conduct was not so strictly virtuous." He acknowledged that he was not always a church-goer, and Boswell tells us that "his amorous inclinations were uncommonly strong" (502). Fornication and the failure to attend Church on the Sabbath would both constitute mortal sins in Johnson's religion, and Boswell insinuates that Johnson was guilty of both sins at this point in his life. Johnson's own failure to live up to his beliefs may partially account for his tremendous fear of eternal damnation.

Johnson's certainty that Christianity would be good for humanity was influenced by the fact that he viewed his own nature as sinful. He believed this external authority provided him with a means of attempting to improve his fallen nature, and argued

that this would be beneficial to society at large. The fact that Johnson had a hard time being a Christian also made him aware that achieving a Christian society would be difficult.

We are told that Johnson never changed his beliefs and remained loyal to the Church of England, yet despite his failure to adhere to them, it should not be suggested that Johnson was "an hypocrite, or that his principles were not uniformly comparable to what he professed" (244). Johnson himself argued that the fallen nature of humanity caused individuals to become weak and constantly fall from Christianity's duties. And Boswell argues that Johnson always believed in these principles, "but an immediate inclination strengthened by indulgence, prevail[ed] over that belief influencing his conduct" (244).

Because Johnson believed in the fallen nature of humanity -- and that humankind was frequently given to sin -- he maintained that intellectual fidelity to its principles was of the utmost importance. By intellectual fidelity I mean the principle that one should never attempt to re-define the rules of his religion based on the course of their action. To Johnson, Christianity had established moral truth for all humanity through its use of divine reason. One could never change this moral truth, and a person's "actions" should be "the result of [these] reasonings" (468). Johnson feared that "their reasonings [were] generally the result of their actions" and that people often tried to justify their actions by attempting to re-define right and wrong (468).. Johnson

believed this was often the result of "a man already corrupted in his impieties." He maintained that the recurring process of giving in to "sin" would "at least retard their information [regarding moral truth], if not entirely obstruct it" (469). To Johnson, this was the "most heinous" sin. It was the infidelity of a "man to his maker" (376). In comparison, "a husband's infidelity [to his wife] is nothing" (376).

To Johnson, the only means of avoiding this corruption was by not associating with "avowed enemies of religion," for he believed that "every man's mind may be more or less corrupted by evil communications" (Boswell 376). By the "avowed enemies of religion" Johnson specifically meant all those of a different orthodoxy than his own. While his statements may seem more geared toward Rousseau and Voltaire, who opposed Christianity at large, he states that Roman Catholicism (from which his own religion had derived) "is wrong. . . in everything in which they [Roman Catholics] differ from us," (375). This attitude of intolerance for those who differed, even slightly, from his version of Christianity brings to mind critics like Nicholas Hudson, who argues that Johnson had a "sturdy prejudice" against non-Anglicans.

Johnson even argued that people should be wary of literature which "had not the advantages of the Christian religion" (58). In Boswell we see that Johnson attempts to point out "the absurdity of copying that which is inconsistent with Christianity," and warns against "echoing the songs of ancient bacchanals, and

transmitting the maxims of past debauchery" (33). Johnson would seem to be referring to the work of some ancient Greeks and Romans. He would be particularly opposed to the study of those who were influenced by Epicurus and Democritus, whose works argue very strongly for materialism. Johnson believed such philosophies led to hedonism. One critic points out that "Christianity played no small part in causing Johnson to break from neo-classical tradition" (Brown 50). While these statements might indicate that Johnson's staunch Christian view prevented him from appreciating work that was not Christian in its influence, he certainly owes a debt to the ancients (many of whom are pre-Christian) for their impact on his style. Many of Johnson's early poems are imitations of these authors who "had not the advantage of the Christian religion."

Johnson's strong defenses of the English Church have justly defined him as a Christian literator, and perhaps even apologist. Much of his writing is devoted to the defense of Christian view points, or what may be defined as Christian apologetics. As we saw earlier, the most prevalent criticism of Christianity was due to its intolerance of free thought. Furthermore, critics frequently pointed out that Christians had often imposed corporal punishments (when the Church of England had no such authority) on those who dissented from their line of thinking. Some even argued that these actions opposed the "turn the other cheek" philosophy which Jesus himself had espoused.

When faced with these difficult questions, Johnson would acknowledge that "you cannot answer all objections to Christianity," but would attempt to address the matter at hand (458). In responding to the above question of Church authority, Johnson responded by agreeing "that the Church had once power for public censure is evident because that power was frequently exercised." However, Johnson attempted to exonerate his Church from blame by arguing "That it borrowed not its power from civil authority is justifiable because it [the civil authority] was at that time its enemy" (458). While the claim that the Church and State were enemies may seem somewhat absurd to a twentieth century historian as they were more closely aligned than in contemporary society, Johnson's arguments were often (perhaps unreasonably) rooted in such premises. Johnson's refusal to accept criticism of the Church, combined with his desire to defend religion at all costs and promote its agenda, demonstrate his efforts to act as a Christian apologist.

Ultimately, Johnson believed that Christianity was the most effective means of influencing society. In addition to his personal desire for eternal salvation, Johnson viewed Christianity as a means of preserving a societal order, structure, and discipline. The desire for these motivated Johnson's Sermon 5, which portrays the benefits of a society organized by Christian standards and ideals. To Johnson, Christianity exacted rules of human behavior which were necessary to avoid chaos and establish order. Sermon 5 contrasts with his earlier work in that its tone

is one of hope for the world (if it were to embrace his ideas). To Johnson, a society governed by Christianity (in which all of its laws [particularly the Ten Commandments] were followed by all of its people) would be practically flawless. Sermon 5 also presents an almost utopianistic view of the benefits Christianity would bestow upon a society (Bate 351).

The idea that all people should wish to adhere to the principles of this society would seem to conflict with Johnson's opposition to the optimistic view. Aside from his argument for austere Christian discipline, Johnson's optimism towards a man in a Christian society would seem to differ very little from Rousseau's optimism towards human nature. However, Johnson acknowledges that "reason and experience assure us that they [physical and moral evil] will continue," but believes they will be minimalized if this sense of order -- and fear -- are established (471). Perhaps the idealism of his sermon conflicts, and even contradicts his view of humanity, but the tone of this sermon (and all of his sermons) is naturally one of fervor and zeal for his religious beliefs.

At the root of Johnson's proposal is the idea that human sin is what causes humanity's lack of interior fulfillment. He states: "To avoid misery we must avoid sin" (469). He believed that sin is responsible for human suffering and emptiness; and believed that "through a calm and unpartial attention to religion and to reason," humanity might avoid this misery, and establish

order (470). To Johnson reason and religious faith could co-exist, whereas with contemporary thinkers, these words are antonymns.

His proposed society is "a community in which virtue should generally prevail" (470). His notion of virtue is rooted in a whole-hearted obedience to the "two greatest commandments" as presented by Jesus in the New Testament: "to fear God with your whole heart, and love your neighbor as yourself. Therefore, Johnson stated "every member should fear God with his whole heart, and love his neighbor as himself" (469). He believed that if each member of society were to adhere to these commandments, society could establish peace and order. The idea that one should love his neighbors seems clearly oriented towards this end. The idea of fearing God is more vague in how it should benefit society. Given Johnson's fear of eternal damnation, it would seem that his wish is to create a similar sense of dread for the consequences of one's actions. It would appear that Johnson here acknowledges that not all "sins" have earthly consequences, but to Johnson, if all people were fearful of the eternal repercussions of sins, they would be less inclined to commit them.

Johnson argued that if humanity were to "imitate the divine justice... Every man should labour to make himself perfect" (475). The idea that man could imitate God's justice on earth further suggests the importance of fear as a means of moderating human action. As we saw through his statement about being whipped by the schoolmaster, Johnson believed that fear was the greatest

motivator. This sense of fear should foster a constant struggle for happiness which is crucial to the existence of Johnson's society. If unhappiness was the result of corruption and sin, then fear was necessary as a means of motivating humanity to avoid sloth and "endeavour after merit" (474). In addition to the motivation of fear, he adds, "merit would always be rewarded" (474). This too was necessary so as to reward those who adhered to the principles of society. Idleness and sloth, he believed, were certain to create sin; therefore, they must be avoided at all costs. Fear, he believed, was necessary to maintain order among the people.

Perhaps because of the premise that everyone would love his neighbor, the human relationships in this society are also presented as ideal. He believed that "every friendship and relation would not be subject to be broken," and that "Differences of opinion would never disturb this community because each man would dispute for truth alone" (471). Johnson believed that because this society would have Christian principles and ideas at its core, all people would agree upon truth, and arrive at the same conclusions. He fails to mention how dissenters from this "truth" would be dealt with. Because of his faith in the potential goodness of the people of this society, he believed that when disagreements did occur, the people would "look upon the ignorance of others and reclaim their errors with modesty" (472). Clearly, those who agreed upon the basic tenets of Christianity would have an easier time with this than those who did not. There seems little room for disagreement on these principles.

Johnson also believed that the unity of the family would be insured in this society: "Children would honor their parents because all children would be obedient. . . [and all] parents would be virtuous" (471). There would be neither pride nor obstinacy, which would further destroy the possibility of division among families or friendships. Perhaps this is the closest Johnson comes to addressing the problem of dissent from Christian principles. As we saw in an earlier statement on Rousseau, those who dissented from this "truth" were guilty of "talking nonsense." To Johnson, denunciations of Christianity stemmed either from self-deceit or obstinacy. Johnson believed all would agree upon these basic tenets, and no one would be so obstinate as to dissent from them which would suggest that this is Johnson's only solution to this problem. Again, his optimism towards the people of this society would seem to contradict many of his previous attitudes. But the hopeful tone of this sermon, and also its audience, must be considered here as well. His audience was the Church of England, and Johnson had little need to consider the arguments of his opposition. This optimism even suggests that Johnson was something of a Christian utopianist, which perhaps both balanced his tragic view and informed his social criticism.

Christian hope continues when he states that "even death, though not wholly prevented, would be much more moderate than in the present state of affairs" (469). The idea of eternal redemption would bring solace to the bereaved, and those who had

suffered from loss would never "want a friend, and his loss would therefore be less." Furthermore, he argues: "[man's] grief, like his other passions, would be regulated by his duty" (470). As I mentioned earlier, much of his proposal is rooted in the belief that all of the inhabitants of this society would wish to dedicate their lives to Christianity.

While Johnson remains vague in his attempt to define the social structure of his ideal society, he points out that the "Governors would have yet a harder task" than that of the common man (472). The administrators of government would be responsible not only for their own duties and actions, but also for those of the populace over whom they rule. Performing this grand task would require that they keep their own faults in accordance with the law, as well as "prevent or punish" the faults of the common people. Johnson believed that only through the "ceaseless encouragement of virtue" could the government gain respect and power, and help to "advance this happiness" (472).

This government (which he never thoroughly defines, except to say that there are Governors, and common people) must remain "opulent without luxury, and powerful without faction" (473). Johnson believed that "its counsels would be steady because they would be just, and its efforts would be vigorous because they would be united." Because this government would insure that the people were "in no danger of seeing their improvements torn from them" the people would have greater motivation to "be industrious."

And while Johnson concedes that "the encroachment of foreign enemies they could not always avoid," he points out that "scarce any civilized nation has been enslaved till it was first corrupted" (474). So long as the government and its people remained virtuous, it would be safe.

The existence of this society, Johnson acknowledges, would require "a universal reformation." He states: "he that does not promote, retards it" (474). There must be "concurrence in virtue and moral good," and only through each individual's "strict performance of his duty to God and man," and "endeavours to make the world happy" can the "mighty work. . . be accomplished" (475). These are Johnson's arguments for a Christian society, and his proposal of the benefits humanity may reap from it.

* * * *

Eliot also viewed Christianity as a hopeful means of ordering society. His Christian views, however, were arrived at through a much different process than those Johnson's. As we have seen, Johnson was born and raised in the Anglican church. The images of eternal salvation and damnation were placed in his consciousness at a very young age. This may partially account for the strength of his belief in eternal damnation and "felicity." Eliot's views were arrived at through a long process of thought. He rejected the religion of his youth, and contemplated several different views of life prior to embracing Christianity. While this failure to wholeheartedly embrace Christianity at a young age

may seemingly qualify Eliot as one with whom Johnson would not have associated, he could hardly have called Eliot an infidel or dissenter.

Despite Eliot's refusal to hastily embrace religious orthodoxy at a young age, he upheld religion as he believed it had been largely responsible for establishing Western civilization. This caused Eliot to defend religious tradition even before he embraced an orthodox faith. Eliot had "a great concern with order, tradition, and hierarchy," and had a "constant perception of disorder, or of unknowable orders" (Blackmur 71). As we see in The Waste Land, Eliot is constantly aware of chaos and its effects on civilization. These perceptions, combined with his pre-Christian spiritual longings (which can also be found in that poem), indicated an early inclination "towards some kind of escape in religious belief" (Ackroyd 51). Like Johnson, Eliot too suffered personal tragedies which may have made him more aware of human limitations, and apt to embrace something which posited hope and order against his perception of life's hardships and brevity.

As a boy Eliot was described as bookish and sensitive. He was particularly close to his grand-father, William Greenleaf Eliot, and was saddened by his death (Ackroyd 52). Eliot was also close to his mother who instilled in him a love of poetry. His relationship with his father was less steady, but Eliot was greatly hurt when his father deemed him "a complete failure" upon his permanent departure for London where he planned to pursue a career

as a poet. Neither of his parents could comprehend his desire to remain in London and would have preferred he remain in the states (Ackroyd 54). While his mother was able to more clearly identify with his aspirations as a poet, she argued that his career could be as effectively launched in New York as it could in London. As his mother understood his desire to remain in Europe and he continued to maintain a close correspondence with her, his father was less understanding.

Eliot's first marriage was also a dissatisfying and troublesome experience to the poet. Vivien Haigh Wood, six months his senior, was "rather nervous, subject to worry and depression but with sudden changes of mood that would release her in exuberant and unexplained high spirits" (Ackroyd 62). She has also been described as "bright and vivacious" (63). Eliot's wife suffered from severe menstrual disorders which placed her in hospitals on several occasions and forced Eliot to borrow money from his friends. There are also intimations that Vivien engaged in an extra-marital affair with his close friend Bertrand Russell, an affair which most critics believe Eliot was at least sub-consciously aware. Their entire marriage together is described as miserable, and Eliot speaks in his "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" of "irrevocable decisions -- this certainly was one" (Ackroyd 68).

Eliot's own disposition was also one of depression and melancholy. He was said to be tense and nervous, and found his

adult life filled with hardship and sadness. Towards the end of 1921 he became ill and almost suffered from a nervous break-down. He took a much needed break from London and spent it at Margate -- where he completed the final portion of "The Fire Sermon." Biographer Peter Ackroyd speculates that at this time his marriage was falling apart, which ultimately led him to the nervous break-down he suffered in the early part of the next year (57). He then entered a sanitarium at Lausanne where he completed the last two sections of The Waste Land. Although Eliot eventually recovered, and continued on with his wife, it was a difficult and painstaking task for him to do so. Like Johnson, he too developed an aversion for ordinary life. Because Eliot was at this time without a religious view, he had not yet gained the sense of hope of his later life. He found himself in a difficult situation, one that he could not escape. Considering such circumstances, it is easier to understand his desire for something which posited hope against this chaos -- something like Christianity. As I mentioned earlier, he was not hasty to embrace this religious viewpoint, for he had rejected that aspect of his upbringing.

His family belonged to a sect of New England Unitarians, and "Eliot was completely indifferent to Unitarianism by the time he reached Harvard" (Akroyd 31). He described this religious view as "bland and insufficient." Eliot pointed out: "They proclaimed as their tenet that they insisted on no doctrine, but taught the means of leading a virtuous, useful, unselfish life [which] they held to be sufficient for salvation" (Gordon 31). Someone of

Eliot's position was in need of something more doctrinal. To him, this religion seemed to "resist too much of life" (37).

To Eliot, Unitarianism failed to answer the questions he had about life's hardship. He states: "For them, difficulties might be ignored, doubts were a waste of thought." As a graduate student at Harvard he pointed out: "The Unitarian code, with its optimistic notion of progress (onward and upward forever) glossed over the unpleasant aspects of American life" (Gordon 14). The hardships and suffering of his own life were too much to ignore, and this made Unitarianism difficult for him. Eliot felt that this optimism and lack of orthodoxy were not deep enough to satisfy his yearnings. In his criticisms of this religion, Eliot was not alone. Other members of the literati had found similar difficulties in subscribing to its views and voiced similar complaints. Ralph Waldo Emerson had resigned from his Unitarian pulpit to protest the "corpse cold Unitarianism" he had come to know. Philosopher William James categorizes the religious fervor of Unitarianism as a "religion of healthy-mindedness" (59). To someone of Eliot's circumstances, this would not suffice. He needed something more spiritually oriented, and more concious of the sinful nature of humanity. In Eliot's view, failing to do so was to ignore the truth of the human experience.

Eliot believed that Unitarianism lacked a conciousness of human sin and capacity for evil. He "was always acutely sensitive to the sinister power of evil, but was taught a practical common

sense code of conduct" (Gordon 198). The religion of Eliot's parents did not expose him to such views, and rather than speaking of good and evil, they talked of "what was done and not done." This lack of distinction between right and wrong, or good and evil, greatly bothered Eliot, and he rejected this religion as a result. As Lyndall Gordon points out, "In abandoning Unitarianism, Eliot rebelled against those tepid, unemotional distinctions" (198). This desire for clearly established lines of human action and knowledge of an absolute morality helps not onlyto explain his rejection of Unitarianism, but his desire to embrace traditional Christianity as well.

Eliot's close friend John Middleton Murray points out that "the intellectual part of Eliot desired an ordered universe." Murray suggested to Eliot that he "should make a blind act of faith and join the Catholic Church. There he would find authority and tradition" (Ackroyd 55). Eliot acknowledged his "necessity for an allegiance to an external order which will silence what he called the inner-voice," but he resisted such suggestions as he was apparently not yet ready for such a step. He explored a number of religious view points before embracing Christian belief. The Waste Land documents his exploration of the ideas of Eastern religions such as Buddhism; however, he found that they too did not suit him. Gordon points out: "Caution and self-distrust kept him at a stage of intimidation rather than surrender and conviction" (127). This biographer intimates that because Eliot rejected Unitarianism, he questioned all religions and was slow to commit himself to one.

At this point in his life Eliot began to read the work of St. Thomas Aquinas. He became particularly fond of Aquinas's work, and its influence can be seen in his later (post-conversion) poetry. He described Aquinas's work as "intelligible" and became very interested in re-interpereting it for a contemporary audience. Eliot states, "Aquinas's work embodied the unity of a European culture in the thirteenth century." He found this work appealing for this reason and "believed an examination of that culture to be the best possible training for the contemporary mind" (Ackroyd 112). Most critics attribute Eliot's conversion to the slow influence of Eliot's persistent reading of Aquinas's work. It seems to have been a major factor in his development as a Christian thinker.

Eliot once stated, "religious emotion without God as the object of faith is really a pathological condition" (Ackroyd 138). As I intimate earlier, Eliot had always had this religious emotion, and in 1927 he sought to escape this "pathological condition" through conversion. The religion he selected was the High Church of England (also the church of Johnson) which combined the Anglo-Catholic tradition Eliot much admired with the strong civilizational traditions of England. Eliot, who had already achieved some stature in the literary world, was taken to the Bishop's private chapel to be baptized. To some his decision appeared somewhat rash. However, those who knew him were not surprised. His intellectual influences and his temperament suggested that this may

have been indeed a wise choice for the poet (Kirk 102). Within the Church Eliot found a social establishment which advocated discipline over one's own nature.

Eliot's audience was somewhat fearful that such a decision would be destructive of the power of his poetry. If he had found order, no longer would he be able to chronicle the chaos of his century. Eliot, however, did not foresee a problem. He told Bertrand Russel, "in that [his poetry] I am completely unconverted" (Ackroyd 163). Perhaps the greatest fear was that his poetry could no longer capture the darkness and isolation of a lost soul, and that he may settle for trite answers to life's questions; or worse, attempt to convert his audience. While his later work such as Choruses of the Rock does contain a certain religious fervor, it is seldom viewed as trite, and does not appear an attempt at a mass conversion of his audience (Ackroyd 175). Nonetheless, most critics feel that his conversion did, at least to some extent, hamper his poetry.

His post Christian poetry retains its tragic element, and his view of life is perhaps even more tragic than in his earlier work. As we saw in The Waste Land, there is an abstract hope for fulfillment in a land that is awaiting rain. Eliot seems to say that while humanity is vain and bestial, it has the possibility for renewal through the re-birth of love. This hope for renewal suggests a possibility for fulfillment on earth. His later work, however, is more closely aligned with Johnson's tragic view that

life on earth can never provide fulfillment and happiness, and that such things can only be hoped for in eternal life.

Upon his conversion Eliot's belief in religious tradition as a means of establishing order to human civilization's anarchy became even stronger. At a time when "intellectuals were infatuated with the abstract charms of collectivism," Eliot upheld religious tradition which valued the individual (Kirk 114). Eliot's objections to Marxism and Communism were largely rooted in this belief. His fear was that these political philosophies undermined Christianity's belief in the individual's will, and would cause free will to become subjugated to the will of a political system. He feared this tradition was being lost to the rapid growth of these political systems. Through his social criticism, with its defense of Christianity, Eliot made "an heroic attempt to re-capture that tradition" (Kirk 173). It is with this attempt that Eliot's work takes on a tone similar to Johnson's, who I earlier term a Christian apologist.

In contrast to the hope-filled, and somewhat paradoxical Sermon 5, Eliot's The Idea of a Christian Society was written for a secular audience. The book rose from a series of lectures Eliot delivered at Cambridge University. Perhaps because his own age was more secular than that of Johnson, Eliot has a much greater concern for his opposition. In his proposal he attempts to address opposing arguments, unlike Johnson, who would appear to ignore them. In essence, the proposed societies are similar. Both are abstract and somewhat vague in their social definitions.

Eliot was dissatisfied with the organization of contemporary society. He believed that by "destroying traditional social habits [and] dissolving the collective conciousness into individual constituents" society had taken to "licensing the opinions of the most foolish. . . and encouraged cleverness rather than wisdom" (Idea 39). To a large degree he blamed this process on liberalism and its earlier-mentioned philosophers.
He believed that while Christianity did have an impact on his society, the contemporary state is Christian "only negatively; its Christianity is a reflection of the Christianity of the society it governs" (Idea 42). He feared that "we [Christians] have no safeguard against its proceeding from un-Christian acts, to action on implicitly un-Christian principles, and thence to action on avowedly un-Christian principles" (44). Ultimately he feared that "we have no safe-gaurd for the purity of our Christianity." However, in his view if the social structure were "rooted in Christian philosophy," this would simply not be the case (44).

Eliot believed that while the society itself would be Christian, the Church "can and should be in conflict with the state in rebuking derelictions in policy or in defending itself against the encroachments of the temporal power." The Church and state would need to achieve "the proper harmony and tension" (55). The Church would also be responsible for "shielding against tyranny and asserting its neglected rights," and must contest heretical opinion or immoral legislation and administration." As I mention earlier,

the political definitions of Eliot's proposal remain vague. Even he could not define the political system on which his society would be run. While he is often considered a Tory, he refuses to be specific as to whether his society would be a Monarchy, a Democracy, or Parliamentary. Ideas in later paragraphs indicate that his organization would be most closely aligned with that of a Parlaimentary government, but he remains very vague and proposes only to seek whatever organization is "most compatible with a Christian state" (47).

Eliot believed there was a need for "reliable behavior on fixed principles." Such principles could only be derived from "a reliable external authority" such as the Christian Church. The Church had established laws based on Scripture and adhering to Aquinas's principles of natural law which Eliot believed had "practical results." However, to attain such results society would need to treat Christianity with "a great deal more intellectual respect than is our wont" (37). Eliot argued that Christianity was a "matter of thought, not of feeling" (34). He acknowledges that ultimately his society could only be achieved if there were a greater "respect for religious life." He states that "a Christian state can be satisfied with nothing less than a Christian organization of society -- which is not the same thing as a society of devout Christians" (34). In fact he argues against the establishment of a "community of devout Christians" and believes that while Christianity should be at the core of this society, the

society itself must avoid becoming an "ecclesiastical despotism" (97). By this he means that a Christian society may have a tendency to be overbearing with an overly-optimistic view of life and death, and provide trite Christian answers for many of life's unknowable questions. Eliot's own distaste for these things led him to advocate a Christianity which was rooted in a strong intellectual tradition.

Such a position against an overbearing Christian community would seem to be evidence against claims that Eliot was intolerant of other religions, particularly Judaism. However, while Eliot seems willing to tolerate the practice of other religions in his state, he argues that their dissent must remain "marginal" (59). This would indicate that Eliot was tolerant of the individual's rights; however, he was opposed to a pluralism of government.

He believed that for this government to be effective, it must derive its laws from the earlier-mentioned "fixed principles" of Christianity. These laws would be based on the Ten Commandments of Scripture, and Eliot's proposed social morality would closely echo that of the Catholic Church. Therefore, while he acknowledges that "immoral" practices could never wholly be stopped, the government would never give them sanctions through legalization (Tate 57). In Eliot's view, to legalize was to condone. He argued that government sanctions of immoral acts led people to believe these action were right, despite the fact that they may not comply

with the laws of Scripture. He believed that the law must be the teacher of morality, and must therefore be derived from Scripture.

Eliot's "Community of Christians" which he describes as "a body of very nebulous outline," would constitute the higher level of his hierarchical society. This would contain "both clergy and laity of superior and/or spiritual gifts and it would include some of those who are ordinarily spoken of, not always with flattering intention as 'intellectuals'" (42). It is this aspect of his proposal which seems influenced by the idea of a Parliamentary government. This community would perform a similar task to Johnson's "Governors" in that their ideas and legislations would influence the masses.

The Community of Christians would uphold the ideas of the Church and their efforts would prevent the Church from becoming "a mere department of state." They would also be responsible for "defending the Church from encroachment." The authority of the Church remains unquestioned in Eliot's society: "In matters of dogma, matters of faith and morals, it will speak as the final authority within the nation; in more mixed questions it should speak through individuals" (47). It would be the job of the Community of Christians to see that this was the case.

In this society "education must be religious, not in the sense that it will be administered by ecclesiastics, still less in the sense that it will exercise pressure, or attempt to instruct everyone in theology, but in the sense that its aims will be

directed by a Christian philosophy of life." As with Johnson, Eliot here stresses the importance of the Christian idea of loving one's neighbor as one's self. This idea is at the core of what Eliot proposes for the organization of this society. He believed that "you cannot expect continuity and coherence in politics, you cannot expect reliable behavior on fixed principles persisting through changed situations, unless there is an underlying political philosophy" (103). In his view, this should be Christianity, and it should be at the root of education in this society.

In his proposal Eliot was conscious of the history of the Church, and, therefore, states that the Church must avoid becoming a "class Church." Such warnings appear to be an attempt to warn against the many religious abuses which took place during the Middle Ages. He also warns that the Church must avoid becoming a "nationalistic Church" and must instead remain universal (83). Even in his proposed society he realizes that the various Christian religions will face some conflict, and he believed that though they should strive to achieve some harmony, they must avoid becoming a "superficial League of Nations" (79).

As with Johnson's proposal, Eliot's society would also be "a society in which the natural end of man -- virtue and well-being in a community -- would be acknowledged for all." And "for those who had the eyes to see it," saint-hood, or "beatification" would be "the super-natural end of man." The ultimate purpose of Eliot's society is "for the Glory of God and the sanctification of souls"

(92). Morality, however, is "only a means" of attaining these goals, it is "not an end in itself."

Perhaps in an attempt to distinguish his society from being compared to the communism which was rampant in his day, he states, "I have tried to restrict my ambition of a Christian society to a social minimum: to picture, not a society of saints, but of ordinary men whose Christianity is communal before being individual" (87). Eliot was also conscious of the fact that he, perhaps like Johnson, may be trying to portray a perfect society which would differ very little from that of a secular utopia. He states: "It is very easy for speculation on a possible Christian order in the future to tend to come to rest in a kind of apocalyptic visions of a golden age of virtue. But we have to realise that the Kingdom of Christ on earth will never be realised" (Idea 91).

Despite his most noble intellectual efforts, he believes that "whatever reform or revolution we carry out, the result will always be a sordid travesty of what human society should be." He acknowledges that "in such a society as I imagine, as in any that is not petrified, there will be innumerable seeds of decay" (84). It is through statements such as these that we can begin to see how Eliot, whose poem The Waste Land appeared to have some hope for human society, arrived at a tragic view of life much similar to Johnson's. Both men believed that Christianity would be the most effective means of governing society. However, neither man

believed total fulfillment or happiness could be attained until the life hereafter.

Conclusion

Clearly, the religious views of T.S. Eliot bear strong resemblance to those of Samuel Johnson. As I demonstrate in the first section of this paper, their respective ages saw an increase in philosophies which broke from Christian tradition by espousing an optimistic view of humanity. Neither Johnson nor Eliot agreed with such views, and both men opposed these ideas in their writing.

In contrast to the doctrine of optimism, Johnson and Eliot re-iterated the traditional view of Christianity by arguing for a fallen humanity incapable of perfect fulfillment on earth. I have termed this belief of Johnson and Eliot's a tragic view of humanity. While Johnson held this tragic view throughout his life, the youthful Eliot harbored some hope for human fulfillment on earth, as demonstrated in the final section of The Waste Land. The post-conversion Eliot, however, abandoned this hope and later arrived at Johnson's conclusion.

While ascribing reasons to their views and religious sentiments must remain speculative, one should consider the upbringing and circumstances of each man's life in that this may provide some insight into their positions on such issues. Both Johnson and Eliot suffered considerably for various personal reasons, a fact which suggests an understanding of human limitations. Lest they should be without hope altogether, their tragic view of humanity warranted a need for eternal optimism. Both men sought this in the philosophies of Christianity.

While Johnson and Eliot maintained that Christianity had played an integral role in the development of Western Civilization, neither man believed his society Christian. Christian philosophy, therefore, became the root of each man's similar proposal for structuring society. Both men believed the most effective method of ordering the chaos they witnessed to be the establishment of a society governed by Christian principles. Despite acknowledged human flaws, each man believed this was the closest to a perfect society humanity could achieve.

In spite of their earnest attempts, neither proposal was given much consideration. The lack of available criticism on these pieces of writing indicates the intellectual community's general rejection of their mutual premise. This may be partially attributed to the vagueness with which they attempt to define the governments of their proposed societies. Their arguments, however, are generally persuasive and should be given consideration.

The similarities between Johnson and Eliot have also never been thoroughly explored. The similar intellectual movements of their respective ages establish a contextual framework in which to examine their work. The work itself, however, contains similar ideas, sentiments, and arguments which should also deserve exploration. This thesis constitutes the beginning of this exploration.

Works Cited

Ackroyd, Peter. T.S. Eliot: A Life. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

Babbitt, Irving. Rousseau and Romanticism. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1947.

Bate, Walter Jackson. The Achievement of Samuel Johnson. New York: Oxford Press, 1955.

Bedient, Calvin. He Do The Police in Different Voices: The Waste Land and its Protagonist

Bentley, Mary Ann. Reading The Waste Land. Massachussets: University of Mass. Press, 1990.

Boswell, James. The Life of Samuel Johnson. London: Sands and Co., 1900.

Brown, Ivor. Dr. Johnson and His World. New York: Henry Walck Inc., 1966.

Daiches, David. T.S. Eliot: The Waste Land. New York: Woodbury, 1966.

Damrosch, Leopold Jr. Samuel Johnson and the Tragic Sense. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Eliot, T.S. Essays From the Southern Review. London: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich., 1931.

Eliot, T.S. The Collected Works. London: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich., 1936.

Eliot, T.S. The Idea of a Christian Society. London: Faber and Faber, 1939.

Gish, Nancy. The Waste Land: A Poem of Memory and Desire. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1988.

Gordon, Lyndall. Eliot's Early Years. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Hudson, Nicholas. Samuel Johnson and 18th Century Thought. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Random House, 1902.

Johnson, Samuel. The Collected Works. edited by Donald Green. New York, Oxford Univesity Press, 1979.

Johnson, Samuel. Literary Club Edition:Book of Devotions. New York: Pafraets Press, 1903.

Kirk, Russell. Eliot and His Age. New York: Random House, 1971.

Nathanson, Bernard. The Life and Times of John Dewey. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.

Sambrook, Richard. A Cultural Context of the 18th Century. New York: Longmann, 1989.

Tate, Allen. The Waste Land. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Weaver, Richard. Ideas Have Consequences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Works Consulted

Barzun, Jacques. Romanticism and the Modern Ego. Boston: Atlantic Press, 1944.

Bloom, Harold., ed. Modern Critical Veiws: Dr. Johnson and James Boswell. New York: Chelsea House, 1986.

Brack, O.M. ed. The Early Biographies of Samuel Johnson. Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1974.

Brooks, Cleanth. The Well-Wrought Urn. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Burton, Raffel. T.S. Eliot. New York: Continuum Press, 1991.

Clifford, James L. Young Samuel Johnson, New York: McGraw Hill, 1955.

Damrosch, Leopold Jr. The Uses of Johnson's Criticism. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Edinger, William. Samuel Johnson and the Poetic Style. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Eliot, T.S. Murder in the Cathedral. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1935.

Eliot, T.S. The Sacred Wood. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1937.

Eliot, Valerie., ed. The Letters of T.S. Eliot. London: Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich, 1988.

Frazer, James G. The Golden Bough. New York: MacMillan, 1923.

Hay, Eloise Knapp. T.S. Eliot's Negative Way. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Hibbert, Christopher. The Personal History of Samuel Johnson, New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Holloway, John. The Victorian Sage. London: Archon Books, 1962.

Houston, Percy Hazel. Doctor Johnson: A Study in 18th Century Humanism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Kenner, Hugh. T.S. Eliot: A Collection of Critical Essays. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1962.

Knoll, Robert E. The Storm Over the Waste Land. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1964.

Kojecky, Roger. T.S. Eliot's Social Criticism. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1972.

Martin, Jay. ed. Samuel Johnson: A Collection of Critical Essays. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1968.

Mathiessen, F.O. The Achievement of T.S. Eliot. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.

McGreevy, Thomas. Thomas Stearns Eliot. Penn: Folcroft Press, 1976.

McIntosh, Carey. The Choice of Life: Samuel Johnson and the World of Fiction. New Haven: Yale Press, 1973.

Moody, A.D. The Waste Land in Different Voices. New York: University of New York Press, 1974.

Page, Norman, ed. Dr. Johnson: Interviews and Recollections. New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1987.

Raleigh, Walter. Six Essays of Johnson. New York: Russell and Russell, 1965.

Roscoe, E.S. Aspects of Dr. Johnson. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1928.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. The Social Contract. New York: Prometheus Books, 1988.

Sachs, Arieh. Passionate Intelligence: Imagination and Reason in the Work of Samuel Johnson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

Skoff, William. The Philosophy of T.S. Eliot. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Schwartz, Richard B. Samuel Johnson and the Problem of Evil. Wisconsin: University of Madison Press, 1975.

Spender, Stephen. T.S. Eliot. London: Fontana Press, 1976.

Stephenson, E.M. T.S. Eliot and the Lay Reader. London: Fortune Press, 1946.

Vesterman, William. The Stylistic Life of Samuel Johnson. New Jersey: Rutgers Press, 1977.

Weston, Jessie L. From Ritual to Romance. New York: Doubleday and co., 1920.

Winsott, W.K. The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

Williamson, George. A Readers Guide to T.S. Eliot. New York: Octagon Press, 1981.