

The Helpfulness of T.S. Eliot's Critical Ideas in Understanding his Own Poetry



Literature

Keywords: English literature; Poetry; Modern poetry; Literary Criticism; art of poetry; Metaphysical Poets.

Salvador Montaner-Villalba

Online English Language Tutor at CUID-UNED
Online Teacher in MA in Teacher Training at Compulsory Secondary Education, A-level and Official Language Schools, English Faculty of Education (VIU, Valencian International University) C/Virgen de la Salud, 7, Xirivella 46950, Valencia, Spain

Abstract

At the present paper, we aim at explaining T.S. Eliot's own poetry considering his own essay on the art of writing poetry. Thomas Stern Eliot (1888-1965) was a British essayist, publisher, playwright, literary and social critic, being regarded "one of the twentieth century's major poets" (Bush, 1999) in the English language. Eliot's poetry was seen as representative of the Modernist movement, beginning with *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* (1915) and followed by some of the best-known poems, including *The Waste Land* (1922), *The Hollow Men* (1925), *Ash Wednesday* (1930) and *Four Quartets* (1943), among others. He was also known for his work as a playwright, although he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1948 due to his pioneer contribution to nowadays poetry. T.S. Eliot also made significant contributions to the field of literary criticism, strongly influencing the school of New Criticism. It is, in fact, this arena of the literary criticism the main topic which will be dealt throughout the whole paper. In the current essay, we will explain Eliot's critical ideas, in other words, what he conceives of poetry and the art on writing poetry, and how his own critical ideas influence on his own poetry. The poet introduces the idea that the value of a work of art must be viewed in the context of the artist's previous works. He also covers the idea of an objective correlative which shall be dealt with in this paper. We should also consider that Eliot revived, when writing his own poetry, the interest in the Metaphysical Poets as well as in Shakespeare and, specifically, in *Hamlet*. After having explained the existing relationship between his own criticism and his own poetry, we will conclude the current paper by explaining what Eliot conceives of the concept of communicating.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to understand T.S. Eliot's poetry taking into account his own critical ideas. We have actually entitled this essay *The helpfulness of T.S. Eliot's critical ideas in understanding his own poetry* since scholars have agreed that there is some type of relationship between the essays written by T.S. Eliot and his own poetry. Therefore, we will try to explain, throughout the current paper, Eliot's critical ideas in order to understand later his own poetry. Firstly, both the concept of tradition and the concept of poet will be discussed. Next, we will try to explain Eliot's thoughts on the Metaphysical Poets since they have significantly influenced Eliot's poetry in order to continue, in the third place, with some considerations related to one of the best-known poems by T.S. Eliot, *The Waste Land*. Fourthly, the concept of art, from Eliot's perspective, will be covered. After this, it is important to comprehend T.E. Hulmes' critical ideas in order to understand Eliot's essays and, thus, his own poetry since Hulmes represents one of the main influences on Eliot's poetry. Next, both the concepts of image and nature will be dealt with to continue with Eliot's own essay on *Hamlet*, being the next section dedicated to explaining some criticism against T.S. Eliot's poetry in order to conclude the current paper by explaining what Eliot conceives of the concept of *communicating*.

2. Concept of Tradition and Poet

In order to explain both concepts, we should mention one of the earliest essays written by himself: *Tradition and the Individual Talent* (T.S. Eliot, 1917), where the poet is trying to define throughout all the essay two relevant concepts: *tradition* and the concept of *poet* as there is a relationship between both terms. Related to the concept of *poet*, T.S. Eliot explains mainly his nature and his conditions, which a good poet should fulfill. According to T.S. Eliot (1917, 1977), the concept of *poet* might be formed by his predecessors, in other words, the work of the poet always has some influence and, obviously, some predecessors who help to define the concept of the *poet* because the poet cannot be defined alone but in relation to the dead poets and artists. As far as dead poets are concerned, we believe that T.S. Eliot refers to his own ancestors because, in a way, each poet always has his influence on his poetry; for example, Eliot in person received the influence of T.E. Hulme (1883-1917), that is to say, Eliot as a critic received his influence. Moreover, the concept of the *poet* can also be defined in relation to his own contemporaries, so we consider that his habits in poetry depend, in a sense, on the way that his contemporaries write, that is, the use that Eliot and his contemporaries, as his friend Ezra Pound (1885-1972) can make of the various metaphors, similes, etc. Next, we should try to understand the concept of *tradition* before the concept of the *poet* as tradition might lead to the concept of the *poet* at the time that tradition involves historical sense, which makes a writer traditional. T.S. Eliot defines tradition in the following way:

“Tradition is a matter of much wider significance. It cannot be inherited, and if you want it, you must obtain it by great labour. It involves, in the first place, the historical sense...and the historical sense involves a perception, not only the pastness of the past, but of its presence...”. (Eliot, 1977, p.14) in other words, according to T.S. Eliot, the “traditional” is to be part of tradition, and to make one’s special contribution to that tradition rather than simply to uphold or defend the values of the past.

The reason that Eliot concentrates on tradition as his major critical principle lies on that he considers that the sense of the past (or tradition) are necessary for both creation and criticism. Firstly, the sense of the past (or tradition) is adequate for creation because the poet is usually influenced by his own ancestors and, therefore, his own poetry will be similar to his predecessors concerning with thematic. Secondly, tradition is necessary for criticism because poetry can be considered the starting point of criticism, in other words, if we want to understand Eliot’s critical ideas on his own poetry, we have to explain his criticism on his ancestors since they are, to certain extent, the main influence on Eliot. When we talk about his criticism on his own ancestors, we are referring to his own critical ideas- reflected in his articles and essays- where the poet explains what he conceives of other poets who have influenced, to certain extent, his own poetry. It is obvious then that we have to explain his criticism, firstly, on the metaphysical poets, as Eliot understands that they might have influenced him. Understanding his own criticism on the metaphysical poets as predecessors on Eliot will lead us to conceive how his own critical ideas are shaped in his own poetry.

3. The Metaphysical Poets

If we consider that “The Metaphysical Poets” were an important influence on T.S. Eliot, we should then understand, in the first place, the comparison which Eliot makes between John Donne (1572-1631) and the rest of the metaphysical poets, although we do not really understand this comparison as Donne is actually a metaphysical poet. There is, probably, a difference of style, which might be based on the use of the metaphors and the language. However, Eliot is trying to define these poets as a group, but he concludes saying that “it is difficult to find any precise use of metaphor, simile, or other conceit, which is common to all the poets and, at the same time, important enough as an element of style to isolate these poets as a group”. (Eliot, 1921, p. 282)

From our point of view, we do not really know to what extent it is difficult to find any stylistic element in order to define them as a group because we feel that, at the moment they are called metaphysical poets, they have to be considered as a group and, obviously, they might have something in common which gives them an identity. T. S. Eliot also suggests that the difference between Donne and the other metaphysical poets is based upon the difference between the intellectual poet and the reflective one. For example, “Tennyson and Browning are poets and they think, but they do not feel or, rather, they do not feel their thought”, (Eliot, 1921, p. 287); while in Donne’s poetry “a thought was an experience, it modified his sensibility” (Eliot, 1921, p.287). In our view, Eliot’s point seems to be the Donne- unlike Browning, Tennyson, etc. – respects mainly on some kind of experiences, self-consciously and his own thinking.

We shall also refer in a concise way to the concept of *dissociation of sensibility*. The poet concludes his essay, trying to express the difference by a theory which sets the idea that poets of XVII century had a mode of sensibility that enabled them to express any kind of experience and feeling, in other words, they had a mode of sensibility being a form of understanding and feeling. Might we suggest that the reason that Eliot says that the concept of *dissociation of sensibility* exists even now lies on that Eliot is conscious that he has inherited it, but his poetry could be read as an ethon to reassociate his outlook.

If Eliot is conscious that he inherited the concept of *dissociation of sensibility* in his poetry, we might then ask, in what ways might the concept of *dissociation of sensibility* be shaped in his own poetry? Firstly, we should try to understand what T.S. Eliot refers to as he mentions this concept. The concept of *dissociation of sensibility*, Eliot suggests, comes from the metaphysical poets when he says of them that “they possessed a mechanism of sensibility which could devour any kind of experience” (Eliot, 1921, p. 287), in other words, there was such a great sensibility that probably caused, in a sense, the same kind of dissociation, therefore we consider that, due to this *mechanism of sensibility*, the concept of *dissociation of sensibility* might be seen in Eliot’s poetry in the way that he expresses emotions and feelings.

In order to understand the concept of *dissociation of sensibility*, we should try to study how this concept is shaped in Eliot's own poetry. Nevertheless, we will not deal with this point now as it has been suggested that there are some confused discussions of Eliot's poetry due to the comparison which Eliot has made between John Donne and the other metaphysical poets.

Before continuing, we shall try to explain what Samuel Johnson (1709-1784) thinks of the metaphysical poets and, of course, John Donne. When Johnson talks about the metaphysical poets, Eliot (1921, p. 283) underlines this sentence belonging to Johnson: "the most heterogeneous ideas are yoked by violence together", in other words, we consider that Eliot is referring to the fact that these poets try to work in detail the various ideas that they have in mind, so that, when expressing their own ideas in poetry, these ideas are being worked together and in a violent way, because, in that way, we will know about their feelings and emotions. Johnson might have thought that the contrasts and juxtapositions of the metaphysical and metaphoric writing were "violent" in the incognity. Might we suggest that Eliot disagrees with Johnson in the sense that both of them have a different way of defining the metaphysical poetry, although Eliot recognizes that his own point of view may not have success.

4. The Waste Land

We said above that, due to the comparison between Donne and the other metaphysical poets made by T.S. Eliot, Stead (1964) suggests that there have been some confusions of Eliot's poetry; therefore, we will pay special attention to an example mentioned by Stead (1964). Stead (1964) suggests that there are three statements made by critics of *The Waste Land*, although we would only highlight Richards' theory (1926, 2001) because we have a plea of Eliot on *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*. The following remarks remain an accurate description of the poem:

"Mr. Eliot's poetry has occasioned an unusual amount of irritated or enthusiastic bewilderment. The bewilderment has several sources. The most formidable is the unobtrusiveness (...). We can, of course, make a "rationalization" of the whole experiences, as we can of any experience. If we do, we are adding something which does not belong to the poem". (Richards, 1926, pp. 584-585)

We would like to develop this point because it seems a rather promising idea. At first, we might consider a dilemma as far as the way of seeing the poem is concerned because both Richards and Eliot understand *The Waste Land* in different ways, and T.S. Eliot might disagree with Richards. We shall explain then Richards' theory and why Eliot disagrees with him. Richards (1926) might criticize Eliot's poetry since there is, for him, some confusion. Richards distinguishes between two types of confusion in Eliot's poetry: "irritated and enthusiastic" so that, at the same time, they are difficult to understand probably because there seems to be certain contrast between these confusions. We should say that this confusion in Eliot's poetry might be caused by the usage of metaphors, similes, etc. on Eliot's part.

On the one hand, we would also underline Richards' words (1926, p. 584) when he describes "the quietness as the most formidable source that the bewilderment has" because, might we suggest, in all the confusion there might be "apparently" some kind of calmness which might be shaped in his poetry.

The Waste Land is a poem mainly focused on any kind of experience. The reason, why we state this, might be based on the idea that Richards (1926) suggests that it could be possible to "make a *rationalization* of the whole experiences as we can of any experience" (Richards, 1926, 584), in other words, we consider that Richards is trying to explain how and why these experiences might be seen by the reader but, however, he concludes saying that "we are adding something which does not belong to the poem" (Richards, 1926, 584) in case we try to justify them. Therefore, we should believe that Richards (1926) does not actually get to any conclusion, but he just criticizes the style that Eliot uses in his poetry and, finally, the great and incomprehensible confusion which persists in Eliot's poetry.

We would highlight the idea that, according to Richards (1926), T.S. Eliot's poetry is, broadly speaking, characterized by a certain kind of confusion which seems, to our impression, rather difficult to understand. It seems to us confused the idea that Richards (1926) has set the unobtrusiveness as a source of the bewilderment since we do not really understand what criteria Richards (1926) has followed in order to establish this statement.

On the other hand, Eliot tries to reply due to the statement that Richards pronounces as far as *The Waste Land* is concerned. He says of *The Waste Land* that the poem effects "a complete severance between poetry and all beliefs" (Richards, 1933, Eliot, 2015, p. 575). At first, Eliot admits that either Richards is wrong, or he does not understand what Richards means with his statement. Nevertheless, the poet tries to understand what Richards means. Eliot finds out two possible theories which we do not intend to explain here in detail, however, we would underline, at least, the second meaning because, to us, it seems important the idea that *The Waste Land* seems to be also in Eliot's view the first to reply to the modern situation.

The question to be made next is, what should we understand when Richards makes this comment on *The Waste Land*? At first, we should say that we do not really agree completely with Richards because, from our point of view, there has to be in a sense a relationship between poetry and belief, so that we can express some kind of belief, which might imply, at least, certain emotions and feelings. We think that we should underline the need of a relationship between poetry and belief in order to understand Eliot's poetry and, therefore, there would not be any necessity of severance between poetry and belief. Taking into account Eliot's ideas, we might disagree with him in that Eliot should justify and try to explain his opinion in relation to the statements which Richards states as he should have considered himself as the better qualified to argue against Richards' point of view, so it is Eliot as a poet who wrote *The Waste Land*, and he is supposed, from our point of view, to have certain arguments so as to explain what he intended to mean when he wrote *The Waste Land*.

5. The concept of art

Next, we would like now to talk about Eliot's criteria on his conception of art. Eliot insists on that "art is not an *expression* of emotion but a kind of *escape* from it: the artist is a catalyst and he/she expresses not a feeling but a *medium*" (Eliot, 1917, p. 19). However, what does it mean, to say that great art is impersonal?

On the one hand, we would try to explain Eliot's point of view. We consider that should understand, in the first place, the task that poetry should have according to Eliot. In Eliot's words, "The business of the poet is not to find new emotions, but to use the ordinary ones and, in working them up into poetry, to express which are not *actual emotions at all*" (Eliot, 1917, p. 21), in other words, Eliot suggests that poetry should be made only with the most ordinary emotions in order to express feelings, this implies that the poet has only to be based upon the simple, cruder and, probably, this might be the origin of the feeling, although we do not feel sure about it.

Therefore, the poet does not have to base upon personal emotions in order to express the feeling. We do not agree, in a sense, with Eliot because, if there are no personal emotions, what should we understand by poetry? The poet conceives poetry without any based on personal emotions but, on some certain emotions that he considers as the ordinaries ones, so that they seem to be the only useful emotions which tend to express the feeling.

On the other hand, we disagree with him since we consider that, without personal emotions, the poet cannot express any kind of feeling. Might we suggest, therefore, that poetry should be the expression of personal emotions which, from our point of view, are the most convenient in order to express the feeling.

We would underline the idea that, in Eliot's words, "the artist is a catalyst and he/she expresses not a feeling but a medium" (Eliot, 1917, p. 19-20), in which impressions and experiences might imply the personality, where, we consider, the feeling might be based, in other words, personality is thus based upon the expression of some kind of emotions and the feeling might be based on these emotions since we consider the feeling necessary to express some emotions and, at the same time, these emotions might express the feeling and, finally, both feeling and emotions can be combined in order to express the personality.

To conclude with this point, we will try to explain what the idea that *great art is impersonal* might mean. T.S. Eliot conceives the art of poetry, explaining that poetry is the expression of certain kind of emotions which might be shaped in an ordinary way, in other words, Eliot tries to make it clear that the poet does not have to invent new emotions, but the poet must only use ordinary emotions to express some ideas which might form what we might call, in our personal points of view, personality because these emotions are supposed to be expressed, in a sense, by what we call the feeling.

When T.S. Eliot says that “poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality”(Eliot, 1917, p. 21), we would like to highlight **an escape from personality** because, might we suggest, that if Eliot considers poetry an “escape from personality”, to us it seems obvious and logical to think that great art is impersonal since the poet does not really need to express any emotion with the help of the feeling because, if we did it, then we consider that we could define poetry as the sum of certain emotions combined with the feeling and, therefore, poetry could be defined in a personal way, in other words, it would imply the personality.

We conclude this issue explaining that we do not completely agree with Eliot because we consider that, by defining poetry as some kind of impersonality, there is no feeling since it implies, in our personal point of view, personal emotions.

6. T.E. Hulme’s influence

Before continuing with T.S. Eliot, we are going to talk next about one of his main influences, T.E. Hulme. The way that Hulme conceives poetry might be similar to Eliot’s conception. This conception of poetry is based on the form and content because the form helps to make the content. Hulme was actually the main influence on English and American poetry since *Speculations* was the first published in 1924. We should underline what Davie (1995) tries to explain. He suggests that, according to Hulme’s(1908) point of view of poetic language (Roberts, 1938); there is no place for syntax.

Davie (1995) proposes that we should try to comprehend the philosophy of Bergson in order to establish the idea that he is trying to concentrate through the article because it seems to him important in order to explain more firmly his idea. He draws his own conclusion beginning with a text which Hulme(1911-192) writes in *Romanticism and Classicism*, where the poet discusses Coleridge’s (1772-1834) use of the word *vital*. We should underline that the philosophy of Bergson “is all based on the clear conception of these vital complexities which he calls *intensive*, and the recognition of the fact that the intellect can only deal with the extensive multiplicity” (Hulme, 1922, pp. 310-312). In other words, we have to make a difference between two terms: extensive and intensive manifolds. Davie (1995) concludes, on the one hand, explaining that syntax is an extensive manifold and, on the other hand, syntax is no useful for poetry since poetry must deal with intensive manifolds. In relation to this, we should say that there is no reason for not being syntax used in poetry. On the one hand, syntax needs some kind of explanation which, at the same time, is unfolding whereas, on the other hand, intensive manifolds cannot be explained.

We might ask logically next question, what is Davie trying to explain in his work? He is probably trying to make an enquiry related to syntax in poetry. We consider that the reason of the enquiry might have been caused by a certain kind of relationship between syntax and rhyme.

We do not agree with Davie since we consider syntax a relevant aspect, so that we can give a sense to any poem; in other words, we might refer to, for example to Latin or Greek poetry in order to comprehend better what we are trying to explain and then it might be a good idea to try to analyze a poem because it would be easier probably to find any metaphors, similes, etc.

It is true that, like Davie (1995) suggests, syntax requires some kind of explanations because we need to know why and how the different words in a sentence might function in order to identify the different metaphors, similes or what we consider the most important aspect: the rhyme.

We mentioned above that there is a certain kind of relationship between syntax and rhyme. We believe, to make syntax, in other words, to make clear the *form* and, thus, syntax might help to make rhyme. If Hulme (1908) conceived poetry by the terms of *form* and *content*, then we strongly believe that we need syntax in poetry in order to explain how the *form* has been conceived and, then, we will also understand the content because, as we said above, form helps to make the content in Hulme's view of poetry.

To sum up with this issue, whereas Davie (1995) considers that there is no place for syntax, we regard that we must have place for syntax in poetry since it mainly helps to make comprehensible the form and, thus, the content of a poem.

7. The concept of image and nature

It seems next, to us, such an interesting idea to deal with a rather important term which Eliot (1933) talks about. We are referring to the term of the *image*, and mainly its *nature*. Firstly, Eliot (1933) refers to his own poetry whose style he does not think that it is the best which he has ever written and, thus, we could say that no critics have understood perfectly his poetry. In order to talk about the term *image*, Eliot needs to refer to Shakespeare (1564-1616), since this term is the most important aspect in poetry's history, from the very beginning until now. Might we suggest that, according to Eliot's view, before making use of the *image*, we have to express our ideas with the correct words in a repetitive way, if needed, because we will only express the right image in this way. Therefore, we consider that it could be important to try to discover the nature of the significant *image* in Eliot's point of view, and to what extent it can be helpful in understanding Eliot's poetry beginning with the nature of the concept of *image*.

We should say that we completely agree with Eliot when he says that "we need both organization and inspiration in order to create poetry" (Eliot, 1933, p. 147), although we consider *inspiration* more important because it is the main source if we want to create poetry, so that the poet will talk about any subject which has something special in his own mind. The need of organization is not so important as *inspiration* so far as we know in good poetry because, in Eliot's view, the organization does not really reach at all a level.

T.S. Eliot (1933) suggests that the poet is worried about the social uses of poetry in that it is not easy to understand social poetry whose image tends to confuse the reader. We agree with the poet when he says that imagery could have some personal saturations value because the nature of the concept of *image* relates, at least, to a great symbolism; in other words, it seems to us that image is due to different interpretations that we can have depending on the meaning of the words, thus we will have various types of images depending on the interpretation that we have in mind.

In this sense, Eliot might conceive the concept of *image* in emotional terms, in other words, the significant of *image* is based on some kind of metaphors, similes, etc. which might express certain emotions. To conclude with this matter, we should agree with Eliot in that the concept of *image* has to be defined in relation with the different emotions that the poet expresses because the emotions are usually expressed by any kind of metaphors or similes.

8. Eliot's essay on *Hamlet*

The next point to be discussed in this paper is Eliot's essay (1919) on Hamlet. But, what relationship might we see between Eliot's essay on Hamlet and his own critical ideas on his own poetry? First of all, we consider that Eliot is criticizing, in a sense, the way that Shakespeare describes Hamlet. Eliot considers that Shakespeare cannot be totally subjective when he describes Hamlet. We observe that everything seems, to a certain extent, organized, although Hamlet can be seen in a confused way because he has some emotions. We might know that Hamlet has some kind of confused emotions because he has been revealed that it was his uncle who killed his own father and, therefore, though he wants to make revenge on his own uncle, he cannot express at the beginning his own emotions and feelings.

It is thus logical that we state the following question: to what extent can we identify emotions and feelings, and try to understand them? Eliot (1919) tries to explain that we need the concept of objective correlative in order to express some emotions which come from any events, certain kind of objects; but we cannot really know to what extent and how we should objectify these emotions because Hamlet in person cannot express his own emotions.

In fact, we consider that we are referring to what Eliot criticizes of Shakespeare: the idea that he tries to objectify Hamlet as a character when he should not, because we completely agree with Eliot in that Hamlet, being a character with some confused emotions, cannot be objectified.

Eliot concludes his essay on Hamlet asking himself what Shakespeare wanted to communicate by Hamlet as a character because he thinks that "we should have to understand things which Shakespeare did not understand himself" (Eliot, 1919, p. 146). Since these emotions are inexpressible, we agree with Eliot when he concludes saying that we cannot objectify them in any sense.

As far as Eliot's own poetry is concerned, we consider that there might be a relationship between his essay on Hamlet and his own poetry because his poetry is focused on emotions. These emotions might not necessarily belong to the poet. Eliot, as a poet, expresses some emotions which come from different objects or events; and he takes them and, next, he combines them in his own poetry and, therefore, we could say that the poet does not really feel any concrete emotion.

9. Criticism against T.S.Eliot

The last issue to be talked about, in this paper, deals with some brief but sharp points against several of his critical ideas. Casey (1966) is interested in Eliot's theory (1919) on the *objective correlative*, adumbrated in detail, of course, in his own essay on Hamlet, and implied in many arguments of *The Use of poetry and the Use of Criticism*.

Citing Casey (1966, p. 92), "there is, then, a complete disparity between the writer's creation and understanding of his own work, and the readers response on it". The difficulty with Eliot's theory seems to him that his image as *correlative*, is asked to *stand for* or *represent* certain kinds of feelings, rather than to explore, explain, clarify: we think that there is a connection here with Eliot's characteristic poetic method of juxtaposition.

The poet also learns from the Metaphysical poets the dramatic power of collision and contrast ("A bracelet of bright hair about the bone"), but he does not take the dialectical or explanatory organization of their poems: his own work, *The Waste Land*, *The Hollow Men* and, to some extent, in *Ash-Wednesday*, proceeds by fragments, picking up images that rub against one another. In short, Eliot might be confident that his words express a particular emotion, but the form into which he casts them might make the reader's understanding purely contingent.

10. Conclusions

Having explained throughout the present paper several considerations on Eliot's critical ideas to understand his own poetry, such as the concept of *tradition* and the concept of the *poet*, how the Metaphysical Poets have influenced on the poet's work, Richards' critical analysis (1926) on *The Waste Land* and Eliot's reply to Richards' comments, how Eliot conceives the art, T.E. Hulme's influence on Eliot's poetry, the concept of *image* and *nature* according to Eliot, Eliot's critical ideas related to the play *Hamlet* by Shakespeare and, finally, having learnt some criticism, such as Casey (1966), against Eliot's ideas; we will conclude this paper explaining the concept of *communicating* from Eliot's point of view.

Eliot probably concedes as much as possible when he says that poetry can communicate before it is understood, but what is poetry communicating? In Eliot's point of view, the fact that he expresses some emotions which he has to define or, we should say, express these emotions by the theory of *objective correlative*, so that the poet might communicate some kinds of emotions, we believe.

Therefore, might we suggest, *communicating* might be defined by several emotions that the poet is trying to express by the theory of *objective correlative*, although Casey (1966, p. 93) suggests that “there is no intrinsic connection between the emotion and the object”, in other words, this could be the main objection that Casey suggests but, if there is no connection between the emotion and the object, what should we then consider by *communicating*? To us, we strongly believe that we should define the concept of *communicating* in a similar way than T.S. Eliot does, since we consider that *communicating* might be expressed by some kind of emotions which the poet expresses, in other words, a good poet, according to us and, totally agreeing with T.S. Eliot, should communicate by expressing, at the end of the process of the poem, any kind of emotion.

References

- Bush, R. (1999) T.S. Eliot’s life and career, in *American National Biography*, edited by John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Casey, J. (1966) Art and Feeling 2- T.S. Eliot, in *The Language of Criticism*, California: Methuen
- Davie, D. (1995) Syntax as Unpoetical: T.E. Hulme, in *Articulate Energy. An enquiry into the syntax of English Poetry*. London: Routledge
- Eliot, T.S. (1933) Conclusion to *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, London: Faber & Faber, 143-156
- Eliot, T.S. (1977) Tradition and the Individual Talent, 1917 in *Selected Essays*. London: Faber & Faber, 13-22
- Eliot, T.S.(1977) Hamlet, 1919, in *Selected Essays*. London: Faber & Faber, 141-146
- Eliot, T.S. (1977) The Metaphysical Poets, 1921 in *Selected Essays*. London: Faber & Faber, 281-291
- Eliot, T.S. (2015) *The Annotated text. The Poems of T.S. Eliot, Volume 1: Collected and Uncollected poems*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University
- Hulme, T.E. (1938) Lecture on Modern Poetry, in Michael Roberts (ed.)(1908) London: Faber and Faber, 258-270
- Hulme, T.E. (1924) Romanticism and Classicism. In *Speculations. Essays on Humanism and the Philosophy of Art*. Read, H. (ed.) 1911-1912, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner; New York: Harcourt, Brace, pp. 113-140.
- Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/SpeculationsEssaysOnHumanismAndthePhilosophyOfArt> on 26th December 2017
- Hulme, T.E.(1922) The Notebooks of T.E. Hulme, in *The Modernist Journals Project, The New Age. A Weekly Review of Politics, Literature and Art*, 310-312
- Richards, I.A. (1926) Mr. Eliot’s Poems, in *New Statesman* 26 (20th February 1926), 584-585.
- Richards, I.A. (1933) *Basic Rules of Reason*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Richards, I.A. (2001) *Principles of Literary Criticism*, London: Routledge.
- Roberts, M. (1938) T.E. Hulme, London: Faber and Faber, 258-270.
- Stead, C.K. (1964) The poetry of T.S. Eliot, in *The New Poetic, Yeats and Eliot*, New York: Harper, 148-180.