T. S. Eliot: The Significance of The Cocktail Party

By Naoko Morita

PREFACE

T. S. Eliot has been called the most outstanding poet and has been praised most influential critic in twentieth-century English literature. But we cannot ignore the importance of the fact that he has chosen to devote the major part of his creative energies in his later years to the theater. In fact, he has presented a number of the plays to the public.

His career as a dramatist, begins with Sweeney Agonistes (1926-27) in which Eliot approaches what is to be the central theme of his later plays: the contrast between the Hero and the Chorus, between the man who sees and the rest who are blind. We find the same pattern in the history of Christian mysticism that there are two ways by which the soul may arrive at the experience of the Godhead: the Negative Way and the Affirmative Way. Followers of the Negative Way believe that God may be reached by detaching the soul from the love of all things that are not God, or in the terms Eliot most frequently chose to use, by following the advice of St.John of the Cross to divest oneself of the love of created beings. This is the way of the Eliot heroes: Becket in Murder in the Cathedral, Harry in The Family Reunion, and Celia in The Cocktail Party. It may safely be said that essentially the Negative Way was the way of Eliot Plays.

But in The Cocktail Party there is the implication that the Affirmative Way is a possibility, that the way of the Chamberlaynes is as acceptable as that of Celia. In The Cocktail Party the ordinary life is presented and valued in new way. The Cocktail Party deals with the different levels of spiritual experience of the saint and of the ordinary man who is helped to establish his life by the power of the saint's sacrifice. In The Cocktail Party Eliot is particularly interested in the way of the ordinary man and the exceptional individual is no longer in the center of his design. In other words, the emphasis is placed not on the salvation of an individual, but on the salvation of the group centered on Edward and Lavinia Chamberlayne.

Throughout most of his career as a dramatist, Eliot has been preoccupied with the theme of spiritual election. The purpose of this paper is to try to explore how the two ways of Christian living are described in The Cocktail Party and to try to understand the reason why Eliot moved from the dramatic poetry to the poetic drama.

Outline

I. Introduction to The Cocktail Party
   A. The Plot
   B. The Principal Characters
II. Two Levels of Choice
   A. The Affirmative Way: The Way of Edward and Lavinia Chamberlayne
   B. The Negative Way: The Way of Celia Coplestone
III. The Central Theme: The Salvation of Man
VI. The Keys to the Central Theme:
   A. Awareness of Solitude
   B. Guardian
   C. The Problem of the Free Will
V. Conclusion

The Cocktail Party deals with the problems that each one of the principal characters makes a sudden great discovery of oneself and has to make a decision. Going through the same process that they suddenly awake from the dream and they feel a sad disillusionment, they reach the recognition of the realities of life and at the same time they begin to realize their real selves, and at last they choose their ways according to their abilities.

Of the principal characters, Edward Chamberlayne, a barrister, is alienated from his wife, Lavinia. She is in love with a young film writer, Peter Quilpe. Peter is in love with Celia Coplestone, who writes poetry. Celia is Edward's mistress and in love with him. But the real situation is that Edward loves nobody, and nobody loves Lavinia. Of the above-said four characters two of them are men and other two are women. They are paired so that each has an opposite of his own sex, an opposite in temperament and in what is crucial to this play: the ability to love and be loved. By nature Edward and Lavinia are very much alike being dispassionately conservative; their inertia triumphs over their will and imagination. Celia and Peter are imaginative and rebellious. They resemble each other not simply in the detail of being creative artists, but in their common ability to commit themselves through love for another.

The first dramatic event in the play occurs when Edward and Sir Henry Harcourt-Reilly, whose role is a psychiatrist-priest, break the subject of Lavinia's departure. The phrases used by Reilly: "You no longer feel quite human/You are suddenly reduced to the status of an object/A living object, but no longer person."[1] show Edward's state that the event made his habitual feelings insensitive to reality. It is described a loss of personality by Reilly. Reilly's image of the Pruflocklike patient stretched on the table clarifies the state of Edward's soul: "You are a piece of furniture in a repair shop."[2] Reilly is the craftman who is able to restore Edward's shattered personality.

EDWARD. To what does this lead ?
UNIDENTIFIED GUEST (Reilly). To finding out
What you really are. What you really feel.
What you really are among other people.
Most of the time we take ourselves for granted,
As we have to, and live on a little knowledge
About ourselves as we were. Who are you now ?
You don't know any more than I do,
But rather less. You are nothing but a set
Of obsolute responses.[3]

Here we are approaching one of the basic problems of the play. Though Reilly works no wonders, he conceals the power of the spiritual surgeon as a ″masked actor″[4]: a metaphor which Eliot has already applied to Christ.

Edward's emotional bankruptcy arises from Lavinia's having withdrawn her role from the marriage. Lavinia's departure is sufficient to make Edward realize that he wants his wife back, that his relation with Celia can lead to nothing. He says:″ •••I must get her back, to find out what has happened / During the five years that we've been married./I must find out who she is, to find out who I am."[5] He realizes that the dificiency Lavinia has left him is not made up by Celia. Now he understands he did not love Celia. He begins to realize how much he had been depending on his wife. His existence is being bound up with her. He would like to think that he does love Celia. By accepting Celia's gift of herself he was able to have the assurance that he could love her. It has been only a desire. And now he has "lost/The desire for all that was most desirable."[6]

In the scene in which he rejects Celia, he comes to terms with himself; he is beginning to realize himself not only as middle-aged man, but one who has "indomitable spirit of mediocrity":[7]

I see that my life was determined long ago
And that the struggle to escape from it
Is only a make-believe, a pretence
That what is, is not, or could be changed.[8]

He is being frank with what he is and he is beginning to see his real self.

Lavinia came back. But what they did was to accuse each other and misunderstand each other again. Eliot observes in Notes toward a Definition of Culture,by way of analogy to misunderstandings among culture, that "it is a human, who cannot understand another human being, and cannot ignore him, to exert an unconscious pressure on that person to turn him into something that we can understand: many husbands and wives exert this pressure on each other."[9] In the relation of Edward to Lavinia, he shows a man to yield to such a pressure, and to make of his wife a kind of supernatural power.

EDWARD. And then you came back, you
The angel of destruction—just as I felt sure.
In a moment, at your touch, there is nothing but ruin.
O God, what have I done? The python. The octopus.
Must I become after all what you would make me ?[10]

She only strengthened his sense of isolation describing his mental state on a secular level: "I think you're on the edge of a nervous breakdown !"[11]

In the consulting room Edward describes his dilemma:

EDWARD.
The whole oppression, the unreality
Of the role she had always imposed upon me
With the obstinate, unconscious, sub-human strength
That some women have. Without her, it was vacancy.
Then I thought she had left me, I began to dissolve,
To cease to exist. That was what she had done to me !
I cannot live with her—that is now intolerable;
I cannot live without her, for she had made me incapable
Of having any existence of my own.[12]

He diagnoses his own sickness as "the death of spirit."[13] But he sees his problem only in isolation. Reilly's task is to make him see that it is part of a "total situation."[14] He brings Edward his wife, Lavinia, strips them of their last pretences, and shows them "how much they have in common. The same isolation. A man who finds himself incapable of loving/And a woman who finds that no man can love her."[15] Edward and Lavinia both yielded to tougher selves by following the advice of Sir Henry Harcourt-Reilly. They have too much spirit of mediocrity to become saints. So they choose the "make the best of a bad job."[16] He has reconciled them to the human condition.

REILLY. They may remember
The vision they have had, but they cease to regret it,
Maintain themselves by the common routine,
Learn to avoid excessive expectation,
Become tolerant of themselves and others,
Giving and taking, in the usual actions
What there is to give and take. They do not repine;
Are contented with the morning that separates
And with the evening that brings together
For casual talk before the fire
Two people who know they do not underdtand each other,
Breeding children whom they do not understand
And who will never understand them.[17]

The speech of Reilly which I have quoted above expresses the way of the Chamberlaynes; the Affirmative Way, which seems to be concrete expression of "the

Catholic philosophy of disillusion"[18] which Eliot found exemplified in Dante's Vita Nuova, and which is summed up in these words: "not to expect more from life than it can give or more from human beings than they can give; to look to death for what life cannot give."[19] This philosphy demands high degree of resignation. But if one could reach it, it would soften the bitterness of disappointed expectation from life.

The Chamberlaynes return to the life they have known with the added knowledge that every moment is a fresh beginning. This thought is an extension of the Heraclitean conception of ubiquitous physical change which Eliot uses in the realm of psychology. This thought can be summed up this way: we cannot step twice into the same river, not only because the water has flowed on, but because we have become different persons in the meantime. But we cannot face this thought steadily, because this is not a comfortable knowledge to live with. Reilly puts it this way:

> We die to each other daily.
> What we know of other people
> Is only our memory of the moments
> During which we knew them. And they have changed since then.
> To pretend that they and we are the same
> Is a useful and cenvenient social convention
> Which must sometimes be broken. We must also remember
> That at every meeting we are meeting a stranger.[20].

Reilly says of the Chamberlayne's way that "It is a good life. Though you will not know how good/Till you come to the end,"[21] but he worries about returning the couple "To the stale food mouldering in the larder, /The stale thoughts mouldering in their minds."[22]

Celia Coplestone has been Edward's mistress. She has been happy whenever she was with him. When she knew that Lavinia had left him and that he would be free, she suddenly discovered that the dream was not enough and that she wanted something more. But he rejected the suggestion that he would take advantage of Lavinia's departure to divorce her and to marry her. The shock of losing him destroyed her illusions about herself and her way of life. Her first reaction was the realization that she had been living in an essentially unreal world, though it seemed real enough while it lasted. Moreover the emergence of the new Edward made her understand that the unreality of their love was partly due to her having made him a substitute for a very different sort of lover. Celia discovered the truth about herself and confessed.

CELIA. . . .

> I see you as a person whom I never saw before.
> The man I saw before, he was only a projection—
> I see that now—of something that I wanted—

No, not wanted—something I aspired to—
Something that I desperately wanted to exist.
It must happen somewhere—but what, and where is it ?[23]

She could see Edward as a human being again divested of her illusion and her disillusion. For her, too, as well as Edward and Lavinia, it is only by giving up the search for the supernatural in the natural that the natural can be seen for what it is.

She comes to Reilly in a desperate situation. Life cannot be the same for her. She lays bare her spiritual problem before Reilly. Not only Edward, but everyone seems a delusion, so that it seems to her that "It no longer seems worth while to speak to anyone !"[24] She has had glimples of a deeper reality, has dreamt a dream which is more real than ordinary reality, a dream in which the solitude is transcended by a love that gives the sense of reality upon the dreamer:

I have thought at moments that ecstasy is real
Although what happened is remembered like a dream
In which one is exalted by intensity of loving
In the spirit, a vibration of delight
Without desire, for desire is fulfilled
In the delight of loving. A state one does not know
When awake. But, what, or whom I loved,
Or what in me was loving, I do not know.[25]

Celia is the person who puts the central problem of the play: "Can we only love/ Something created by our own imagination? Are we all in fact unloving and unlovable?"[26] Explaining herself to Reilly, she says:

What has happened made me aware
That I've always been alone. That one is always alone
Not simply the ending of one relationship
Not even simply finding that it never existed
But a revelation about my relationship
With everybody.[27]

Thus the first symptom of her illness is this "awareness of solitude."[28] The second symptom is "a sense of sin."[29] But in her case a sense of sin goes deeper than the sense of personal wrong-doing. Celia says:

It's not the feeling of anything I've ever done,
Which I might get away from, or of anything in me
I could get rid of—but of emptiness, of failure
Toward someone, or something, outside of myself;
And I feel I must—atone—is that the word?[30]

This is not a delusion, but a sense of sin. She tells the psychiatrist that she does not feel immoral. She took nothing from Lavinia that she wanted. Her sense of sin, therefore, is very different from the conventional ideas of bad form or psychological maladjustment which she has been brought up to believe in. Why has she begun to feel a sense of sin? We get a hint from the words of Kristian Smidt: "We must also remember that the sexual imagery of Eliot's poem stand for a number of other things besides physical eros, especially for his view of spiritual isolation or communion."[31] It is not because she feels guilty in her affair with a married man, but because the very affair was a wonderful experience to stir her into a spiritual awakening. She feels the existence of something superior which she has failed to recognize before and failed to live up to. She is able to guess it because the existence of love itself was a vision and an ecstasy: "I abandoned the future before we began/And after that I lived in a present/Where time was meaningless, a private world of ours, / Where the word "happiness" had different meaning/Or it seemed."[32] Celia has had almost a visional experience of timeless love—a dream, though it may have been.

Reilly offers the two ways, the ordinary man's way of life which was chosen by the Chamberlaynes and the saint's way. But the ordinary way is no longer possible for Celia: "I think it would really be dishonest/For me, now, to try to make a life with anybody!/I couldn't give anyone the kind of love—/I wish I could—which belongs to that life."[33] When she rejects that possibility, he presents another way:

> The second is unknown, and so requires the faith—
> The kind of faith that issues from despair.
> The destination cannot be described;
> You will know very little until you get there;
> You will journey blind. But the way leads toward possession
> Of what you have sought in the wrong place.[34]

So Celia chooses the second way, the sanatorium which Reilly talks about. A few minutes earlier in the play, Reilly has explained that the sanatorium is not for the Chamberlaynes. Edward was comforting Lavinia, that they must make the best of a bad job. Reilly says: "The best of a bad job is all of us make of it—/Except of course, the saints—such as those who go/To the sanatorium."[35] Celia's choice as we learn at the last act, has led to a painful death.

At the second cocktail party, two years later, the condition has been changed: the brief last act conveys that each has learned to love the other and blame himself. The two movements in the play have crossed: Edward, and Lavinia have found their way to humanity; Celia has found her way to divinity.

The Chamberlaynes' way has led to a cocktail party at which the news of Celia's death reached them. When Peter heard of her death, without his realizing it, his talk in telling of his grief for her is all about his plans, about himself: "And now it's all worthless. Celia is not alive."[36] He thought that his concern was all for Celia, he planned to get her into films, now that he had a success himself in them. Lavinia suggests that he has loved something created by his own imagination.

> Lavinia. No, it's not all worthless, Peter. You're only just begun.
> I mean, this only brings you to the point
> At which you must begin. Yoy were saying just now
> That you never knew Celia. We none of us did.
> What you've been living on is an image of Celia
> Which you make for yourself, to meet your own needs.
> ••• perhpas what I've been saying
> Will seem less unkind if I can make you understand
> That in fact I've been talking about myself.[37]

He recognizes this as the truth, and while Lavinia and Edward go on to explain that they can understand it because it has been their experience, he comes to realize that he has only been interested in himself, and that is not good for Celia.

Talking about her death, Reilly calls it "A happy death."[38] We are likely to share the Chamberlaynes' doubt that Celia's death is a waste and not a triumph. In this point lies one of the difficulties to understand the play. Is there any clue for solving this problem ? The clue is involved in Reilly's words: "Go in peace. And work out your salvation with deligence."[39]

This play is concerned with the serious matter of the salvation of man. Of the two ways Reilly presented, the first way is the way of an ordinary and good life. If one fulfils his duty according to his own ability, he will be able to save his soul. Reilly says: "It is a good life. Though you will not know how good / Till you come to the end....In a world of lunacy,/Violence, stupidity, greed... it is a good life."[40] This is the ordinary man's life. Writing in 1940 of The Idea of a Christian Society, Eliot spoke of "natural end of man—virtue and well-being in community—...for all, and the supernatural end—beatitude— for those who have the eyes to see it."[41] The Cocktail Party is the first play of Eliot's to present the natural end of man as a valid consideration.

Celia chooses the second way; in Reilly's words, the way to the sanatorium. The sanatorium is a place from which some people return, to "lead very active lives. Very often, in the world,"[42] but it is also a place where others remain to proceed from illumination to contemplation of the Dark Night to mystical union. As Reilly warns her, this way is a horrible one. It is God himself that divests the soul of foul elements and works upon the soul so that it might prepare itself for the way of salvation. Julia explains neatly the idea of the purification following the thorny path: "But what do we know of the terrors of the journey?/You and I don't know the process by which the human is/Transhumanized: what do we know/Of the kind of suffering they must undergo/On the way of illumination ?"[43] The books of Christian mystics say that even at the height of intense sufferings, such a soul experiences a joy equivalent to a harbinger of the ecstasy in the heavens. Thus the second way is the way of illumination, in other words, the process by which the human is transhumanized. This is the way which Celia chose. Celia was a woman who without knowing it has been trying to find, in an affair with the ordinary man, a way to dedicate herselt to the divine. For the conviction of sin the remedy is penitential; through action and suffering Celia may find her atonement. To atone is to reach at oneness with Godhead, and this is the goal of the mystics. She is to enter the state of the contemplative mystic. Eliot's previous use of St. John of the Cross explains the meaning of Celia's sacrifice:"Hence the soul cannot be possessed of the divine union, until it has divested itself of the love of created beings."[44] The passage from Murder in the Cathedral explains Celia's martyrdom and its ultimate meaning: "Beloved, we do not think of a martyr simply as a good Christian who had been killed because he is a Christian.... A Christian martyrdom is never an accident, for saints are not made by accident. Still less is a Christian martyrdom the effect of a man's will to become a Saint, as a man by willing and contriving may become a ruler of men. A martyrdom is always the design of God, for His love of men, to warn them and to lead them, to bring them back to His ways. It is never the design of man; for the true martyr is he who had become the instrument of God, who has lost his will in the will of God, and who no longer desires anything for himself, not even the glory of being a martyr."[45] If we understand that what had happened to Celia was in the design of God, Celia's death, as Reilly says, was a happy death. She was one of the chosen. The words of Becket in Murder in the Cathedral clarify the meaning of martyrdom: "We have fought the beast/And have conquered. We have only to conquer/Now, by suffering. This is the easier victory./Now is the triumph of the Cross..../I am here. /No traitor to the King. I am a priest, /A Christian, saved by the blood of Christ./Ready to suffer with by blood./ This is the sign of blood. Blood for blood./His blood gives to pay for His death./My death for His death."[46]

What is the true significance of Celia's death to other people? Let us consider her relation to the others, especially to the Chamberlaynes. While Edward and Lavinia were trying to find a way of mutual understanding and happiness, Celia had to suffer for them. She is the vicarious sufferer. She submitted to the tougher self and accepted suffering through action. Through her death she affected the lives of others. Edward and Lavinia are sustained by the self-sacrifice of Celia. Not only Edward and Lavinia, but also Peter is carried beyond his own egotism by her self-sacrifice. She had the power to nourish the lives of others. Sainthood finds various forms, and whichever way of realization is chosen, the character which elects remains unaltered. Celia changes her mind, but the character which drove her to choose the Negative way is fundamentally consistent. She was particularly sensitive, she must have suffered more than the ordinary. This thing has been suggested by Reilly in the talk with Edward and Lavinia at the last act.

I have been describing the salvation of man as the central theme. Several keys to the central theme are woven in the plot of the play. One of them is the key of "an awareness of solitude." It is expressed by Edward, Reilly, and Celia. Of them Celia most adequately expresses it: "I mean that what has happened has made me aware/That I've always been alone. That one is always alone./Not simply the end of one relationship, /Not even simply finding that it never existed—/But a revelation about my relationship / with everybody. Do you know—/It no longer seems worth while to speak to anyone!....No, it isn't that I want to be alone, / But that everyone is alone... or it seems to me. /They make noises, and think they understand each other./And I'm sure that they don't."[47] Edward recognizes it as a kind of hell: "What is hell? Hell is oneself, /Hell is alone, the other figures in it / Merely projections. There is nothing to escape from / And nothing to escape to. One is always alone."[48] The Chorus of Murder in the Cathedral expresses hell with these words: "Emptiness, absence, separation from God;/The horror of the effortless journey, to the empty land / Which is no land, only emptiness, absence, the Void, /Where those who were men can no longer turn the mind/To distraction, delusion, escape into dream, pretence, /Where the soul is no longer deceived, for there are no objects, no tones, /No colours, no forms to distract, to divest the soul/From seeing itself, foully united forever, nothing with nothing,...."[49] When Celia talks about aloneness or solitude, she says, "That is the hell I have been in."[50] And Reilly answers, "It isn't hell/Till you become incapable of anything else."[51] Both of the two ways of life, have a special spiritual solitude or communion and they will save man from the hell of solitude. The concept of solitude is in harmony with that of salvation.

According to the doctrine of Christianity, we human beings have within us the capacity for God, the endless impact for God, the emptiness that makes us feel an awareness of solitude. Even if we try to satisfy this emptiness with someone, or something except God, after all we will end up with failure, we will feel lonelier more than ever. And we will begin to know that we are in hell and that hell is ourselves.

We get a hint of a special symbolism in Edward's description of his two selves: "The self that can say 'I want this or want that'—The self that wills —he is a feeble creature;/He has to come to terms in the end/With the obstinate, the tougher self; who does not speak/Who never talks, who cannot argue; /And who in some men may be the guardian—."[52] The speech of Edward which I have quoted above provides another key to the theme of the play: the concept of the guardian. In some meaning, Reilly, his two helpers; Julia and Alex, may be the guardians. Throughout the play, there are indications that not only Reilly, but also Julia and Alex are supernatural figures whose business is with lives of the humans around them. These indications are Celia's "There isn't much that Julia doesn't know,"[53] or the toast that Celia makes to the guardians:"It may be that even Julia is a guardian./Perhaps she is my guardian."[54] In the libation scene at the end of Act II, when Reilly, Julia and Alex pray "The words for the building of the hearth,"and then "The words for those who go upon a journey,"[55] the special nature of the three characters is emphasized. And the important thing about the guardians is that they initiate Celia and the Chamberlaynes into vocations according to their potentialities. In another meaning, the guardian might be an angel guardian. According to the Christian creed, each of us has his own angel guardian who protects him, so that he may walk the right path of life or rather work out his salvation. As Becket in Murder in the Cathedral was about to be murdered, he prays:"Now my good Angel,whom God appoints,/To be my guardian, hover over the swords points."[56]

The third key to the central theme is concerned with the function of the free will in one's action. As not only Celia, but the Chamberlaynes, were forced to choose with the help of Reilly, so one is sometimes forced to make his decision according to his free will on the way to his life. Once we have chosen, the inevitability will follow us. And we cannot reject freely a train of events that issue from our own free choice. Edward had decided with his free will that he had made a deliberate choice. Reilly says to him: "but you are not free./Your moment of freedom was yesterday./You made a decision. You set in motion/Forces in your life and in the lives of others/Which cannot be reversed. "[57] This thought is most forcibly expressed in Julia's final words at the end of Act III: "Everyone makes a choice of one kind or another, /And then must take the consequences. Celia chose/A way of which the consequence was Kinkanja./Peter chose a way that leads him to Boltwell, /And now the consequence of the Chamberlaynes' choice/Is a cocktail party./They must be ready for it. "[58] The question of the free will seems always to be entangled with that of sin. In the volitional order, no one can sin except by an exercise of his free will. It is like this: there is an ideal pattern or design, a divine plan for every human life, but we are free to conform to it or reject it at our own risk.

We see that Eliot is not merely concerned with the exceptional person or the saint in isolation, but also with his relationship to the ordinary men and women. It is particularly noteworthy in The Cocktail Party because Eliot began to put emphasis on the way of ordinary man. Eliot wanted to help the ordinary people so that they might have "some awareness of the depths of spiritual development."[59] That is,he is trying to make the ordinary people open their eyes to vital realities of which he thinks they are unaware. That is why he has sought as large an audience as possible. And he wrote for an audience of ordinary people about the kind of life they knew. When we realize that the themes of the later plays are in fact religious themes, Christian themes, we begin to guess whv Eliot chose to hide their real nature behind a vague and obscure imagery.

FOOT-NOTES

1 T. S. Eliot, "Cocktail Party," Collected Plays (London: Faber & Faber, 1962), p. 134.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 135.

4 T. S. Eliot, "East Coker," Four Quartets (London: Faber & Faber, 1961), p. 29.

5 Eliot, Collected Plays, p. 136.

6 Ibid., p. 153.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 T. S. Eliot, Notes towards the Definition of Culture (London: Faber & Faber, 1954), p. 64.

10 Eliot, Collected Plays, p. 170.

11 Ibid., p. 169.

12 Ibid., p. 175.

13 Ibid., p. 176.

14 Ibid., p. 177.

15 Ibid., p. 182.

16 Ibid., p. 182.

17 Ibid., p. 189.

18 T. S. Eliot, "Dante," Sellected Essays (London: Faber & Faber, 1958), p. 275.

19 Ibid.

20 Eliot, Collected Plays, pp. 156 f.

21 Ibid., p. 189.

22 Ibid., p. 192.

23 Eliot, Collected Plays, p. 154

24 Ibid., p. 186

25 Ibid., p. 189.

26 Ibid., p. 188.

27 Ibid., p. 186.

28 Ibid., p. 185.

29 Ibid., p. 186.

30 Ibid., p. 188.

31 Kristian Smidt, *Poetry and Belief in the Works of T. S . Eliot* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961), p. 195.

32 Eliot, *Collected Plays*, p. 151.

33 *Ibid*., p. 190.

34 *Ibid*.

35 *Ibid*., p. 182.

36 *Ibid*., p. 207.

37 *Ibid*., p. 208.

38 *Ibid*., p. 209.

39 *Ibid*., p. 183. & p. 192.

40 *Ibid*., pp. 189 f.

41 T. S. Eliot, *The Idea of an Christian Society* (London: Faber & Faber, 1954), p. 34.

42 Eliot, *Collected Plays*, p. 191.

43 *Ibid*.,p. 193.

44 from St. John of the Cross, Eliot's epigraph for "Sweeney Agonistes," *Collected Poems 1919-1935* (London: Faber & Faber, 1961), p. 117.

45 Eliot, *Collected Plays*, p. 33.

46 *Ibid*., pp. 46 f.

47 Eliot, *Collected Plays*, p. 189.

48 *Ibid*., p. 169.

49 *Ibid*., p. 44.

50 *Ibid*., p. 191.

51 *Ibid*.

52 *Ibid*., p. 153.

53 *Ibid*., p. 127.

54 *Ibid*., p. 155.

55 *Ibid*., p. 194.

56 *Ibid*., p. 31.

57 *Ibid*., p. 156.

58 *Ibid*., p. 211.

59 quoted by D. E. Jones. *The Plays of T. S. Eliot* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul), p. 123.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS

Eliot, T. S. Collected Poems 1909-1935. London: Faber & Faber, 1961.

________. Four Quartets. London: Faber & Faber, 1959.

________. Collected Plays. London: Faber & Faber, 1962.

________. Selected Essays. London: Faber & Faber, 1958.

________. The Idea of a Christian Society. London: Faber & Faber, 1954.

________. Notes towards the Definition of Culture. London: Faber & Faber, 1954.

Critical Studies

Donoghue, Denis. "The Cocktail Party," T. S. Eliot: A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. by Hugh Kenner. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. :Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962.

Gardner, Helen. The Art of T. S. Eliot. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1959.

Jones, D. E. The Plays of T. S. Eliot. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

Maxwell, D. E. W. The Poetry of T. S. Eliot. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.

Mattiessen, F. O. The Achievement of T. S. Eliot. New York & London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Robbins, R. H. The T. S. Eliot Myth. New York: Henry Schuman, 1959.

Smidt, Kristian. Poetry and Belief in works of T. S. Eliot. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

Smith, Carol H. T. S. Eliot's Dramatic Theory and Practice. Princeton, N. J.:Princeton University Press ,1967.

Unger, Leonard. T. S. Eliot: Moments & Patterns. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.