

## Tradition and The Individual Approach In Anglo-American Social Criticism : Arnold and Eliot

Dr. Ahmad TAHA\*

(Accepted 13/10/1997)

### □ ABSTRACT □

*This essay studies the concept of "Individual" and "Tradition" on Arnold and Eliot in a critical analytical study and the relation between them. The "Individual" is studied through what both critics present of different, new concepts of what provided in the past. When the concept of (Individual) was connected with concept of group, party, tribe, and sector which the individual considered himself a part of it or belonged to it. thus, Arnold and Eliot reverse this concept and considered the individual an effective tool in making heritage, not in making tribe kindred. The more sharing in creating movement and adds to it, the more making his individuality and expressing his personality which must not mix with other characters of authors, creators and individuals, to show his creative fingerprints on heritage generally. This heritage which forms its regulative and the mirror which reflects obviously its different sides of habits, tradition, concepts and science of different kinds. This research also deals with Arnold's and Eliot's heritage concept, and how they treat with concept which becomes including the mechanism of ideational society performance, socially, politically and the operation of communication between the man past and his present. This communication which connects the present with the past on the basis of keeping what useful of the past and leaving what is harmful and depressing of the present determination. Then the operation becomes a choice of what is suitable of the past, to push the present forward, instead of holding by the whole past. Therefore, Arnold presents a new operation to understand the heritage which continually renewed with the influence of creators through what they present of artistic literary creation able to create new ideational movements change the society view to life and individual. This research also deals with different points of views of Arnold and Eliot about the individual and the heritage, and their influence on the movement of the modern criticism through the obvious fingerprints which they left on this kind of criticism, which represent by its movements different opinions for critics differentiate by their opinions, starting from Frank Kermoud and finally by Leonil Tryling. This research deals to expose the role of Arnold and Eliot in creating new critical history has its special and distinguished characteristic of the prevailed critical movements. Also, this study leads to determine the above mentioned critics sharing level in reaching the critical view through what they have presented by new ideas contribute to ideational construction of humanity, and play an important role in fixing the human existence and establishing his value and ideation, and supporting his continuity.*

---

\* Lecturer at the Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Tishreen University, Lattakia, Syria.

## التراث ومنهجية الفرد في النقد الإنكليزي الأمريكي "أرنولد وإليوت"

الدكتور أحمد طه\*

(قبل للنشر في 1997/10/13)

### □ ملخص □

تدرس المقالة دراسة نقدية تحليلية مفهوم "الفرد" و"التراث" لدى أرنولد، وإليوت، والعلاقة بينهما. يُدرس "الفرد" من خلال ما يقدمه الناقدان من مفاهيم جديدة مغايرة لما كان سائداً في الماضي، عندما كان مفهوم الفرد يرتبط بمفهوم الجماعة، أو الحزب، أو العشيرة، أو الطائفة التي كان الفرد يعدّ نفسه جزءاً منها أو ينتمي إليها. فأرنولد وإليوت يقلبان هذا المفهوم، ويعتبران "الفرد" أداة فاعلة في صنع التراث، وليس في صنع القبيلة، أو العشيرة. فهو كلما ساهم في الحركة الإبداعية وأضاف إليها، كلما حقق فرديته وعبر عن شخصيته التي لا يجوز لأن تختلط مع شخصيات غيره من الكتاب والمبدعين والأفراد، وذلك لإظهار بصماته الإبداعية يف التراث بشكل عام، ذلك التراث الذي يشكل الإطار التنظيمي له، والمرأة التي تعكس بوضوح جوانبه المختلفة من عادات، وتقاليد، ومفاهيم، وعلوم بشتى أنواعها.

كما يتطرق البحث لمفهوم "التراث" لدى أرنولد وإليوت، وكيفية معالجتهم لهذا المفهوم الذي أصبح يشمل آلية عمل المجتمع الفكرية، والاجتماعية، والسياسية، وعملية التواصل ما بين ماضي الإنسان وحاضره، هذا التواصل الذي يربط الحاضر بالماضي على أساس المحافظة على ما هو مفيد من الماضي، والتخلي عما هو ضار ومثبط لعزائم الحاضر، فالعملية تصبح عملية إنقاء واختيار لكل ما هو مناسب من الماضي، لدفع الحاضر إلى الأمام، بدلاً من التشبث بالماضي برمته، ومحاولة تطبيقه على الحاضر الذي قد يتناقض في مقوماته وجوانبه مع الكثير من مقومات وجوانب هذا الماضي. وبالتالي يطرح أرنولد آلية جديدة لفهم التراث الذي يتجدد باستمرار بتأثير الأفراد المبدعين من خلال ما يقدمونه من إبداع فني وأدبي قادر على خلق تيارات فكرية جديدة تغير نظرة المجتمع للحياة والفرد.

كما تطرق البحث لإظهار وجهات النظر المتباينة لأرنولد وإليوت حول الفرد والتراث، وتأثيرهما على حركة النقد الحديث، من خلال البصمات الواضحة التي خلفها على هذا النوع من النقد والتي تمثل بتياراتها آراء مختلفة لنقاد يتمايزون بأرائهم بدءاً من فرانك كيرمود وانتهاء بليونيل تريلنغ.

ويخلص البحث إلى إبراز دور أرنولد وإليوت في خلق تاريخ نقدي جديد له طابعه الخاص وامتياز عن التيارات النقدية السائدة على الساحة الأدبية، كما تؤدي هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد درجة مساهمة الناقلين المذكورين في إعناء النظرة النقدية من خلال ما قدموا من أفكار جديدة أسهمت في البناء الفكري للبشرية، وأدت دوراً مهماً في تثبيت بقاء الإنسان، وترسيخ قيمه وفكره، ودعم استمراريته.

\* مدرس في قسم اللغة الإنكليزية - كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية - جامعة تشرين - اللاذقية - سورية.

Much of the most interesting work in contemporary cultural studies concerns the relation between the individual and the historical. Some of this work aims, for example, to devise interpretive paradigms capable of foregrounding the historical significance of the individual as the origin of meaning, knowledge and action. By the term individual here, it is not meant the concrete individual who participates in and sustains social relations; rather, the term designates a specific way of conceiving the individual in terms of its potentials of cognition. T.S. Eliot's and Matthew Arnold's theoretical assumptions which can be considered as historically important in both the ascendancy and assimilation into modern discourse of Romantic critical theory at the time of Capitalist triumph, are -the object of this study. The concept of individualism as a defining characteristic of the Romantic movement has widely determined Anglo-American critical -thinking since the beginning of the nineteenth century<sup>1</sup>. In this context, the line of discussion to be sought here will be the dominance in criticism of this trend as an ideological response to the sociological changes that accompanied the development of capitalism. Further more, Eliot's valorization of the individual in his criticism and Arnold's liberal concept will be exposed in the light of the Romantic Critical tradition which they initiated, and its relation to "bourgeois individualism". In Arnold's and Leslie Stephen's *Criticism, when the ideology of the individual was institutionalized*, for example, in *Belle Lettres Criticism*, it achieved a cultural tradition supporting the bourgeois individualistic and liberal ideology. As such, the Romantic critical discourse had to play into the hands of the capitalist captor whom it was initially designed to conquer.

The crucial problem, to start with, for Eliot was the nature of the relationship between the individual genius and the medium he inevitably employed. To be a poet or a novelist implies the pre-existence of such literary modes as the poem or the novel. In 1919 the "distinguished individual" could almost, be taken for- granted in any account of the artistic process. Criticism, in spite of Arnold's efforts, at, its Romantic stage - with the distinguished individual (or genius) and his "potency as a Conduit of urgent life"<sup>2</sup>, were common places ever since the preface to *Lyrical Ballads*.

---

<sup>1</sup> For further illustration of this point, see Lillian Furst's *Romanticism In Perspective*, especially pp. 60-100.

<sup>2</sup> The above remarks have been made by F.E. Leavis in his essay "Anna Karenina" and other essays in *TLS*, No.30, November 1987. In the essay Leavis attacks "Tradition and the Individual Talent" as "notable for its ambiguities, its logical inconsequence, its pseudo-precisions, its fallaciousness, and the aplomb of its equivocations".

Unlike Arnold's Romantic critical discourse, with its utopian aspirations, Eliot's critical discourse puts forward several theoretical points that appear truly anti-Romantic in their opposition to the Romantic valorization of the individual. But, his formulations of them, however, seem to have a number of contradictions, as his "impersonal" theory of poetry unfolds itself gradually. In "Tradition and the Individual Talent", for instance, Eliot displays ambivalence by his distinction between "individuality" and "personality" as antithetical. If the latter possesses ambivalent value, the former is openly fatuous at best, and destructive at worst. This is so because praiseworthy poetry rests upon "aspects" of a poet's work "in which he least resembles anyone else". So, individuality is conceived as achievable through others. Thus, the artist becomes the source of the continuous progress in the arts, which may not be immediately clear, unless "continued self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality" has continuously been made (*The Sacred wood* 53). Apologists for Eliot's method, however, such as F.O. Matthiessen, characterize it as "spare and economical", and some of his essays as capable of presenting "in clearest outline the segment of the curve from which the complete circle can be constructed" (*The Achievement of Eliot* 7). In this argument, however, Matthiessen omits to mention the gaps which occur where there might be some specific articulations of how the dynamic between extinction of personality and emphasis of true individuality operates. On the other hand, this is not to suggest that such illustration is completely foregrounded.

Eliot appears to have formulated his theory of tradition in his "Tradition and the Individual Talent". His main concern in the essay seems to be in the idea of the past and its effect on the present, which is a common idea discussed earlier by the neo-classicists. But Eliot adds to the neo-classicists' concerns a new dimension, that of how the past may be changed by the present. Secondly, the interaction between the present and the past procures "Conformity between the old and the new" (*SM* 50). Eliot, confesses in "To Criticize the Critic" that he drew largely on Irving Babbitt and Ezra Pound, in formulating his concept of tradition and the individual (17). But, he refrains from admitting that Arnold had any influence upon his theory of tradition in spite of the latter's peculiar imprint upon Eliot's ideology of tradition. Eliot's refusal to do so stems from his general anti-Victorian attitude. Eliot, for example, unconsciously, echoes Arnold's idea of modernity, in the sense of its relevance to the present. Arnold raises the idea in "On the Modern Element in Literature", where he refers to Greek literature as modern in terms of its relation to the present. Eliot underlines the need for placing one relation in relation to other literatures in order

properly to evaluate it, exactly as Arnold earlier did. Arnold confirms that "no single event, no single literature is adequately comprehended except in its relation to other events, to other literatures" (Selected Prose 59). Similarly, Eliot remarks that "no poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone.... You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead" (SW 49).

Eliot's attitude to the present naturally brings up his use of the past, a matter which badly needs the historical perspective.

Eliot's use of Dante in a line like "I had not thought death had undone so many" in *The Waste Land* points to Eliot's allusions to past literature which helps confirm the reader in his sense of possessing a spiritual enlightenment. To provide a critical Justification for poetry of this kind of new criteria had to be found, and it was in the two major essays, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" and "The Function of Criticism". His argument had two aspects ; Firstly a discussion of the process of artistic creation; and, secondly, a definition of tradition and an assertion of the need for authority. In this context, it seems, that Eliot suggests that man must develop an awareness of tradition, and "a reception not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence". Here Arnold opposes Eliot because Arnold considers the historical estimate as an insufficient criterion in Judging literary works' validity. From this perspective one can reach the conclusion that the importance of Eliot's theoretical arguments does not depend on their ultimate validity, but rather upon the nature of their influence.

Eliot and Arnold alike sum up in their respective writings, as poets who were also critics, the fine points of the literary consciousness of their age; and to consider them in Juxtaposition is to consider the different sensibilities of an age, as much as that of individuals. But the most striking similarity is not in the details, but in the self-conscious standpoint from which these were seen. Arnold was, for example, a professor of poetry at Oxford where he found a platform to propagate for his critical canons, as Eliot puts it in *The Sacred Wood* (XIII). He started his career in criticism by examining the qualities of contemporary Homeric translation and ended, by considering the spiritual anarchy that threatened a nation. Similarly, Eliot becomes the editor of *The Criterion* which had the aim of bringing together the best in new thinking of the age to contribute to the common good. For Arnold "the safeguard is never to let oneself abstract" (*Essays* 20) .... As such, one may conclude that these two poets' concerns with language and tone which greatly express the individual talent and tendencies of a writer, are the factors to remind us of their roles as social critics and poets. Eliot's lapse, however, is elsewhere where he always fails to express, what he moat

valorized in "Tradition and the Individual Talent", namely, in his incapacity to deeply reflect on his own practice as a poet. He continuously encouraged with purpose and principle the role of the man of letters and his individual talents to constructing strong familial ties in society, but, curiously, when he was doing so he was converting his art into petrified ethics. The same tendency is manifested in Arnold, especially when he writes poetry<sup>3</sup>. What distinguishes Arnold's ethical Concept. *from* Eliot's, however, is a minute boundary drawn *respectively* by each or them between poetry and religion. Eliot insisted that there is a delicate boundary between religion and poetry in so far as religion cannot be replaced by poetry as Arnold claims in "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time", although Eliot was not sure where such a boundary lies, Eliot's confusion concerning this boundary grows even deeper when he speaks of culture and tradition. At one stage, for example, in the *Notes* he declares that "a culture' is conceived as the creation of the society as a whole" (37); at another, he points out that "in -the past -the repository of this culture has been the 'elite, the major part of which was drawn from the dominant class of the time"(42).

The problem presented in the previous argument can be related to other discourse formulated by the contributions of "individual" talent. It is true that the nature of the individual talent has not been defined in Eliot's works, and, thus, it becomes rather a difficult to say precisely what he means by the "individual", In "The Imperfect Critics", for instance, Eliot uses the word "individual" to mean a person who is not "a member of a family or of a caste or of a party or of a coterie, but simply and solely himself" (*On Poetry* 106). Eliot attempts to establish a subtle relationship between tradition and a poet's individual talent, through the mutual relationship between the two concepts, namely, by alienating the one to enrich and to be enriched by the other; and it, is from their correlation that they draw their meaning and significance. In literature Eliot draws out such a concept on the basis of his organic view of tradition itself of which literature constitutes the major part. Eliot is of the view, unli-ke Arnold , that individual writers have their respective course of creativity which depends on the extent to which they are able to modify the direction of the stream of tradition. But such a course for Eliot should be part of the stream of tradition which simply produces it. In *After Strange Gods'*, for example, Eliot develops his concept of tradition to include aspects other than the literary ones. He speaks of social, theological,

---

<sup>3</sup> For clarifications on this point, see Eliot's *The Waste Land* "The Hollow Men", and *Murder in The Cathedral*; and prose works, see *The Idea of a Christian Society*, *Notes Towards The Definition of Culture* and *The Metaphysical Poets*. Also see Arnold's "The Scholar Gypsy", "Dover Beach", "Obermann Once More" and "Balder Dead".

and political considerations, *In Notes towards the Definition of Culture* he elaborates the relationship between tradition and culture, and in *what is a Classic ?* his main contention is to show how much tradition is enriched by the classics. In *Poetry and Poets* he relates the idea of tradition to the Church of England.

However, a number of critics attacked severely Eliot's concept of tradition and considered it invalid and personal. In this context one can mention Stephen Spender who contends that Eliot's fault is in his incapacity to differentiate between the traditional and the untraditional, because he makes such a distinction on the basis of good and bad, Edmund Hilson accuses Eliot of being "unhistorical critic", one who treats literature as though it co-existed simultaneously in one period; in other words, one can judge and compare different works of art written at different stages in history as if contemporary to each other (Axel's Castle P.121) . Since Eliot's main concern is the individual and authoritarian concept of tradition, he seems to sympathize with the anxiety provoked by the social status of the bourgeois. Eliot's wish to prevent the loss of class differences by preventing the lower class from approaching the social status of the middle class, confirms his concerns about the individualistic values which he believed to be on wane (*The Dial* 451). He laments "-the complexity of Causes, which Seems to make the English poet take refuge in Just those sentiments, images, and thoughts which render a man least distinguishable from the mob, the respectable mob, the decent middle class mob"; Eliot approves the independent way of looking at things which cannot be sorted out under any title whether religious or political (*The DIAL* 72, 511); moreover, he promotes the concept of "the individual man, the free man", who does not conform to a world of mass production to enhance the autonomous subject (*The Dial* 70, 451)<sup>4</sup>.

Arnold's insistence on "seeing the object as it really is" (CPW III 110), echoes Eliot's valorization of the critic's role to "Correct the taste" (*SE* 30) by distinguishing himself from "the mob". Arnold maintains that only that part of tradition which may serve humanity may be preserved. He refers to religion, for example, and holds this phenomenon in human philosophy and thinking to have digressed too far, thanks to Man's inadequacies. He suggests that such a kind of tradition should be replaced by poetry, because of the immense future in sustaining mankind and

---

<sup>4</sup> For further illustration of this point see Eliot's "London Letter", published in *THE DIAL* NO. 70 and No. LXXX (March 1927). especially pp. 451, 511, 70, 72).

superiority over religion and philosophy (Essays 30). Wimsatt and Brooks heard in Arnold only a threat to didacticism and tradition, and declared that the counterattack against humanism in 1330 "announced *the end*" of this threat (*Literary Criticism* 451).

Arnold's promotion of tradition and the ideology of the individual lies elsewhere, particularly in the imprint he left on the works of such writers as I.A. Richards, F. R. Leavis, Trilling, and Geoffrey Hartman<sup>5</sup>. He created by his anti-religious campaign a new tradition in criticism which continued into new criticism in spite of the counterattack against his humanism launched by Brooks and Wimsatt. The title of Hartman's *Criticism in the Midwestern*, for instance has been taken from Arnold's prophecy that looks ahead to a poetic promised land, though Harfeniari 's belief is that critics " shall die in the wilderness" . I.A. Richards in his *Science and Ideology* (1926) quotes the Arnoldian prophecy; and the new Anglo-American critics in their concerns seem to have carried on the Arnoldian critical tradition in different ways, such as F.R. Leavis, Richards, Trilling and Eliot.

Moreover, the prophecy of literature's triumph over religion, philosophy and science continues to be relevant to such works as that of Frank Kermode in hermeneutics (*The Genesis of Secrecy*, 1973), Hayden White in Philosophy of history (*Metahistory*. 1973), and Richard Eorty in epistemology (*Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, 1979). Such a continuation of literary and critical traditions into New Criticism is what brings us to the issue of Arnold versus Eliot as opposing banners for this tradition.

Eliot's critical theory asserts that individual poets must surrender themselves to the authority of the literary tradition in order to achieve self-mastery. This presentation in Eliot's critical theory appears -to be . rather paradoxical , as the tradition which Eliot promotes turns out to be solely literary firmly related to individual authors and texts. This is so, because there is something outside *of* the artist to which he owes allegiance, a devotion to which he must surrender and sacrifice himself in order to earn *and* to obtain his unique position" (*SE* 13) .

These last sentences, however, denote that Eliot's critical canons may be taken as, sweeping generalizations, lacking support by specific examples, You either agree with him, he says, or you demonstrate your inferiority"<sup>6</sup>. Eliot's suggestion reflects these ideas promoted by the "new humanists", and

---

<sup>5</sup> For more discussion on this point, see Arnold's "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" in; *Essays in Criticism*. first Series. London; Everyman's Library, p.20-4.

<sup>6</sup> For more clarification of this point, see Eliot's NOTES, TOWARDS the Definition of Culture. (London,1948), especially PP. 70-102.



all those who were in opposition to individualism in poetry. The poet lives in a tradition to which he should surrender himself, because "The emotion of art is impersonal". In "The Function of Criticism" Eliot repeats his convictions that not only the poet but the critic as well should subordinate his personal prejudices to the common pursuit of true Judgment, He must support objective standards of value which find firm grounds in the complete, adult and orderly classicism. The true critic, as such, must conform to orthodoxy, because these are common principles, which it is his business to seek out. He must also have a highly developed sense of fact, because fact cannot corrupt taste, while opinion and fancy can.

To make clearer the relation of this process of depersonalization to the sense of tradition, Eliot gives as an analogy What happens When a piece of platinum is introduced into a gas chamber containing sulphur and carbon dioxide. The two gases then formulate sulphurous acid, but platinum itself remains unchanged. The mind of the poet is the platinum. The emotions and the feelings are the gases . The more perfect he is as a poet the less his own personality is involved. His mind forms the new compounds, but he remains separate from what he creates. In great art, "the difference between art and the event is absolute". Eliot in both Essays "The Function of Criticism" and "Tradition and The Individual Talent" tries to attack the Romantic notion that the poet should express his personality through "the inner voice"<sup>7</sup>. Thus, his concept of emotions and tradition collide with the other concepts generated by poets held as Romantic, such as Words worth, Coleridge and Shelley. HordsMorth's approach to genuine poetry, for example, which holds the "emotions recollected in tranquillity" to be the main source for true poetry, cannot be accepted by Eliot<sup>8</sup>. This is so, because for the latter, it is the concentration of a very great number of experiences that work up emotions, rather than emotions or recollections. To achieve his goal, the poet, however, has to be conscious of his work. Otherwise, his poetry 'nay tend. to be bad, if he makes himself conscious when he ought to be unconscious, and unconscious "hen he ought to be conscious: "poetry", for Eliot "is not a turning loose of emotion but an escape from emotions; it is not expression of personality, but an escape from personality. But, of course,

---

<sup>7</sup> For Eliot's attack on the romantic notion, see SELECTED ESSAYS (London, 1951), especially pp. 20-30.

<sup>8</sup> For further illustration of Wordsworth's idea about poetry, see his PREFACE TO LYRICALL BALLADS (London, 1802), passim.

only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want -  
To escape from those things" (SE 21)<sup>9</sup>.

In "*After Strange Gods*" Eliot brings out the same point when he treats tradition as the conscious and an unconscious life in a social continuum ; "what I mean by Tradition", he contends, "involves all those habitual actions, habits and customs, which represent the blood kinship of 'the same people living in the same place", (18). One may, without paradox sympathize with this position and yet be grateful for Eliot's discussions, for the influence they had left upon modern criticism, Eliot's remark, for example that "poetry is an escape from personality" has a similar importance : it, introduced a fresh current of ideas, and it provoked among other things the very trenchant attack that we see in Dr. Leavis's essay on Eliot<sup>10</sup> Even Eliot himself in *The Use of Poetry and The Use of Criticism* is of the view that new theories in criticism may stand the test of time, and be influential. He mentions I.A. Richards' case as an example, and suggests that "even if his criticism proves to be entirely on the wrong track,... (he) will have done something in accelerating the exhaustion of the possibilities" (125).

The case that, Eliot, is fighting here is a large one, and its nature is well defined in a passage in *The Use of Poetry*:

From time to time, every hundred years or so, it is desirable that some critic shall appear to review the, past of our literature, and set the poets and the poems in a new order. This task is not one of revolution but of adjustment.(108).

Arnold's tone in "The Function of Criticism" can be closely paralleled to that of Eliot as the latter shows direct asperity towards the former in the course of time. Eliot, for instance, shone a reverence for a free play of intelligence which is said to be characteristic of Arnold's mind. In both one finds fondness for imagining cultural development as an organic growth towards maturity; and both insist on viewing the European tradition as a whole. What is being attacked in the person of Arnold is the view of English literature that he had established in which Milton and Wordsworth were central examples of the ultimate criterion of great poetry. Eliot finds great poetry elsewhere in Marlowe or John Donne where the very transparency of their style is completely revealed in the pattern of impersonality used in their poetry (SE 217),

---

<sup>9</sup> For further illustration of this point, see Eliot's *Selected Essays* (1932; 1951), particularly his essay *Tradition*, pp. 13- 22

<sup>10</sup> For Leavis's opinion on Eliot's idea that "poetry is an escape from personality", see Leavis's "T.S. Eliot's Stature as a Critic", in *Commentary* XXVI (1955), p.401.

It is perhaps the problem posed by personality that leads Eliot always to be very cautious in his approach to symbolist idealism. He says in "The Function of Criticism" that "Men cannot get on without giving allegiance to something outside themselves, and that authority is to be found in ' Tradition and the accumulated wisdom' of time"(SE 34).The essential problem is one of order, and this can only be solved by regarding literature as "organic wholes' as systems in relation to which, individual works of literary art, and the works of individual artists , have their significance" (*After Strange Gods* 33). It is this subtle interaction between tradition and the individual talent, that Eliot has advocated throughout his criticism.

In this sense, Arnold and Eliot may be found to have striking similarities, Like Eliot's tradition, therefore, Arnold's modernity is a matter of what is relevant to the present. It is in relation to the present that the Greek literature of the 5<sup>th</sup> Century B.C. is found to be modern, "no single event" , says he, "no Single literature is adequately comprehended except in its relation to other events, to other literatures" (Selected Prose 59) .

Nevertheless, there are basic differences between Arnold's and Eliot's attitudes. First, there is no such emphasis in Arnold on the individual writer or work as we find in Eliot. And, secondly the idea of organic unity that is basic to Eliot's theory of tradition is missing from Arnold. Arnold advanced "anti-theoretical tendencies" which may perhaps be considered as his great, legacy to criticism, and part of his signature on the modern critical tradition, Here we find the complex ends for which both Arnold and Eliot give particular importance, where tradition and individualism meet; and where the distinction between inner and general process, private responses and public responsibilities break down. And thus, it is on this basis the literary and cultural studies are reoriented in relation to one another.

## WORKS CITED

- Arnold, Matthew (1970), "On the Modern Element in Literature" , in: Selected Prose, ed P.J. Keating- Harmondsworth; Penguin Books', p. 59.
- ..... Selected Poems. New Delhi. Unique Publishers, 1970.
- ..... (1970)• Selected Prose, ed. P.J .Keating : Harmondsworth; Penguin Books, P. 59 .
- ..... (1865). "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time", in: Essays in Criticism, First series. London: Everyman's Library"
- Eliot, T.S.(1934). After Strange Gods. London: Faber and Faber.
- ..... (1963). Collected Poems: 1909-1962. London: Faber and Faber.
- ..... (March 1927). "Literature, Science, and Dos-ma". Dial. LXXX, PP. 451, 70, 72.
- ..... (1921 ), "London Letter", The Dial. 70, P.551.
- ..... (1948). Notes Towards the Definition of Culture. London: Faber and Faber
- ..... (1939). The Idea of a Christian Society. Faber and Faber.
- ..... (1928). "Tradition and the Individual Talent", in The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism. 2nd ed., Prt. New York: Barnes and Noble,1960. P.93.
- .....((,951, 1961). Selected Essays. London; Faber and Faber.
- Furst, Lillian (1969). Romanticism in Perspective. New York; St. Maritain's Press, PP.. 60-100.'
- Hyman, S.E. (1946). The Armed Vision. London: Faber and Faber.
- Leavis, F.R. (1987), "Anna Karenina" TLS No. 30 (November ) . P. . 214.
- ..... (1955), "T.S. Eliot's Stature as a Critic", Commentary, XXVI, P., 401.
- Mathiessen, F.O. (1947). The Achievement of T.S. Eliot: an Essay on the Nature of Poetry. NewYork .Oxford University Press.p7',
- Spender, Stephen (1962). T.S. Eliot: A Selected Critique by L.unger, PP., 279-283.
- Super. R.H. (ed. 1972-77). The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold. Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press.
- Wilson, Edmund (1971). Axel's Castle. London; Collins, Fontana.
- Wimsatt, Williams K. and Cleanth Brooks (1957) Literary Criticism: A Short History. New York, Knopf, P. 451.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES:

- ARNOLD, MATTHEW (1970), "On the Modern Element in Literature", In Selected Prose, ed. P.J. Heating. Haraondaworth ; Penguin Books.
- ..... (1970) . Selected Poems. New Delhi: Unique Publishers.
- ..... (1970). Selected Prose, ed. P.J.Kealing : Harnondsworth; penguin Books.
- .....(1865). "The function of Criticism at the present time", in: Essays in Criticism. First Series. London: Everyman's Library.
- ..... (1882), "Literature and Science". Nineteenth Century 12 (August).
- Anderson, Barren D.(1988). Matthew Arnold and the Classical Tradition. America: University of Michigan Press.
- Eliot, T.S. (1934). After Strange Gods . London: Faber and Faber.
- ..... (1963). Collected Poems: 1909-1962. London: Faber and Faber
- .....(March 1927). "Literature, Science, and Dogma", Dial. LXXX.
- ..... (1921), "London Letter". The Dial, 7o.
- ..... (1948). Notes Towards the Definition of Culture. London: Faber and Faber.
- ..... (1939). The Idea of a Christian Society. Faber and Faber.
- ..... (1928). "Tradition and the Individual Talent", in The Sacred Wood. New York; Barnes and Noble, 1960.
- ..... (1961). Selected Essays. London; Faber and Faber.
- ..... (1957). on Poetry and Poets. London: Faber and Faber.

### SECONDARY SOURCES

- Aldigton, Richard (1987). Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot. London:. Journevman Press.
- Baldick, Chris (1987). The Social Mission of English Criticism: 1848-1932. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chaiker, John (1970). Authority and Personality in Eliot's Criticism: A Symposium (ed.Graham Martin).London: Macmillan and Co.
- Crews, Frederic (1980), "Analysis Terminable", Commentary, 70.
- Furst, Lillian (1969). Romanticism in Perspective. New York; St. Maritain's Press.
- Hyman, S.E. (1946). The Armed Vision. London; Faber and Faber.
- Leavis, F. R. (1987), "Anna Karenina" TLS No.30 (November).
- (1955). "T.S. Eliot's Stature as a Critic",

Commentary XXVI .

Lucy, Sean (1948). T.S.Eliot and the Idea of Tradition. London: Cohen and West.

Mathiessen, F.O. (1947). The Achievement of T.S.Eliot. New York: Oxford University Press.

Spender, Stephen (1962). T.S. Eliot :(A Selected Critique by L. Unger). London: Faber and Faber.

Stange, Robert (1967). Matthew Arnold: The Poet as Humanist. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stead, C.K. (1967). The New Poetic: Yeats to Eliot. London: Penguin Books.

Super, R.H. (ed.1972-77). The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold. Ann Arbor; university of Michigan Press.

Svarny, Erick (1988), Eliot and Tradition. London: Open University Press.

Wilson, Edmund (1971). Axel's Castle. London: Collins, Fontana.

Wimsatt, Williams K. and Ceanth Brooks (1957). Literary Criticism: A Short History. New york.

Wolff, Janet (1990). Essays on Women and Culture. Cambridge; Polity Press.