PREFACE

Ronald Schuchard

The essays in this timely collection represent a significant new turn to the arts in the work of T. S. Eliot, facilitated by the ongoing appearance of long-awaited editions of his poems, prose, letters, and plays commissioned by the late Valerie Eliot. The lifting of restrictions on these several genres now provides scholarly access to Eliot's lifetime engagement with the arts in both popular and high culture, showing him to be far removed from tired allegations of cultural elitism, continuously educating himself not only in literary but in visual and performance traditions, seeking friendships in artistic circles, and vigorously defending the arts from censorship as critic and editor. The authors of these new studies in the several arts have begun to mine the wealth of previously uncollected and unpublished archives, building upon David Chinitz's *T. S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide* (2003) and expanding the range and depth of the Asian, Renaissance, Victorian, and modern art forms with which Eliot enriches the cultural texture of his oeuvre.

As a Harvard student, Eliot educated himself in the arts both informally as a voracious reader and concertgoer, and formally in the classroom, including Fine Arts 20b: Italian Renaissance Artists, which he took during the 1909–10 academic year. In this course, taught by Edward Forbes, Director of Harvard's Fogg Museum, Eliot took copious notes on the paintings, frescoes, and altarpieces of Uccello, Castagno, Veneziano, Fra Filippo Lippi, Fra Angelico, Botticelli, Donatello, and Michelangelo, among others, with frequent visits to the Fogg. He continued his exploration of the arts and architecture during the 1910–11 academic year at the Sorbonne in Paris, which included a journey to Italy for visits to museums and cathedrals, as chronicled by Nancy D. Hargrove in *Eliot's Parisian Year* (2009), in her separate study of Eliot's Italian notebook,¹ and here in her delineation of Eliot's encounters with Asian and African art in Paris and London. Frances Dickey's first essay in this volume shows the importance to Eliot and his early poem "Mandarins" of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in 1909, a time when the enterprising student was beginning to seek the friendship of leaders and patrons in the arts, including Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, a supporter of the Museum of Fine Arts and the builder of her own magnificent collection under the guidance of Bernard Berenson, a connoisseur of Italian Renaissance art.

Fenway Court, as she called her museum when it opened in 1903, contained 2,500 paintings and more than 3,000 books on art, architecture, and music; in the Music Room she hosted concerts and recitals by prominent musicians. Though Eliot's signature does

not appear in her guest book before two recorded visits in the autumn of 1912, he was surely visiting Fenway Court earlier as an undergraduate, probably in 1909–10 while taking Forbes's course on early Italian painters (Mrs. Gardner held the *Virgin and Child* by Botticelli and *The Death and Assumption of the Virgin* by Fra Angelico, whom Eliot studied closely). One of Forbes's exam questions required students to describe paintings seen in four art galleries.² Eliot may have been taken to Fenway Court and introduced to Mrs. Gardner by her longtime friend George Santayana, whose advanced course on "Ideals of Society, Religion, Art, and Science in their Historical Development" Eliot was taking at the same time. Perhaps before he left New England, or subsequently in Paris, Eliot was introduced to a member of her circle, her close friend since 1904 Okakura Kakuzō, Curator of Chinese and Japanese Art at the Museum of Fine Arts, a former student of Ernest Fenollosa, and one of Japan's foremost art critics and connoisseurs. Eliot later misremembered that Okakura introduced him to Matisse in 1910, for as John Morgenstern shows in his fascinating study of Eliot and Matisse, they were introduced by Matthew Prichard, colleague of Okakura and former assistant director of Boston's Museum of Fine Arts, in Matisse's Paris studio in 1911. Okakura was also away in Europe in 1911 and looking for an opportunity to meet Matisse himself; in Eliot's memory, Okakura was probably present at that meeting.

In the event, Mrs. Gardner already owned a Matisse, the first in an American museum, *Nude Seated on the Ground*, which she loaned to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts for the first American exhibition of his works in 1911. In the following year a friend gifted her Matisse's *The Terrace, Saint-Tropez*, thereby moving her collection (Eliot would have applauded) toward the cutting edge of modernist art.³ In the Early Italian Room, the Dutch Room, the Gothic Room, and in rooms named after Titian, Veronese, and Raphael, Eliot would also have encountered such paintings as Titian's *Europa*, Piero della Francesca's *Hercules*, Mantegna's *Sacra Conversazione*, Van Dyck's *A Woman with a Rose*, Reubens's *Portrait of the Earl of Arundel*, Rembrandt's *Self-Portrait*, Vermeer's *Le Concert*, and Michelangelo's *Pietà* (a black chalk study presented to Vittoria Colonna, c. 1540), to name but a few that would have stopped him on his visits. "In the room the women come and go/Talking of Michelangelo": when Eliot began to write "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" in 1910–11, the gallery rooms that he brought into the poem may well have been those of Fenway Court, just as memories of Okakura and the Titian Room may have inspired the presence of "Hakagawa among the Titians" in "Gerontion."

By the summer of 1914 Eliot was primed to return to his European adventure in philosophy and the arts with a Sheldon Traveling Fellowship to Marburg University in Germany. As his friendship with Mrs. Gardner developed, Eliot maintained a correspondence with her about his discoveries abroad. When in August 1914 the outbreak of World War I diverted him from Marburg to Merton College, Oxford, he met in London during the Christmas vacation Ezra Pound, who showed him some of Wyndham Lewis's drawings and the first number of *BLAST*, which commingled manifestos, poems, and striking designs by their Vorticist friends. Eliot soon befriended Lewis and visited his rooms when he was "at home" to the artists in his circle: "I remember Bomberg, Etchells, Roberts, Wadsworth, Miss Saunders and Miss Dismorr as being present," he recalled.⁴ "I wonder if you would care for a brief word from London," he wrote to Mrs. Gardner in April 1915 after his continental museum experience and friendships with London artists had expanded. Informing her of his recent travels in

Ostende, Bruges, Ghent, and Antwerp, and conscious of her collections of Rubens and Van Dyck, he wanted her to know that he was “extraordinarily impressed by Flemish art, especially van Eyck.”⁵ Telling her of meeting an American friend of hers who attracted him “by mentioning Mr. Okakura” (who had died suddenly in 1913), he went on to tell her that he had “been seeing a good deal of some of the modern artists whom the war has so far spared”:

One of the most interesting of the radicals—Gaudier-Brzeska—do you know of him?—is in the trenches, (as is the interesting T. E. Hulme); cubism is still represented by Wyndham Lewis, by Jacob Epstein, and a man whose work I like exceedingly, Edward Wadsworth. There has been an exhibition . . . at the Goupil gallery. . . . I do not know whether you have heard of a certain infamous soi-disant quarterly called *Blast*. . . . I am thinking of sending you a copy . . . incidentally because it promises to contain a few things of my own.⁶

Eliot evidently sent her the second and final issue of *BLAST: Review of the Great English Vortex* (July 1915), containing his first poems published abroad, “Preludes” and “Rhapsody on a Windy Night,” set among numerous Vorticist and Cubist prints and a photograph of Gaudier-Brzeska’s sculpted “Head of Ezra Pound” in a periodical devoted to avant-garde arts. He also sent her a copy of “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” in *Poetry* (July 1915), to which she subscribed.⁷ Eliot would remain a lifelong friend of Lewis and Epstein, both of whom made him the subject of their separate arts. His last extant letter to Mrs. Gardner of December 7, 1918 is on display with paintings in the Gothic Room at Fenway Court, near the striking portrait of her by John Singer Sargent from 1888.

Eliot soon made his way into the company of another hostess and patron of the arts, Lady Ottoline Morrell. Eliot was introduced to her by his mentor (and her sometime lover) Bertrand Russell at a Soho restaurant in March 1916, followed by a gathering the next day in her Bedford Square salon, where he met the painters Dorothy Brett, Dora Carrington, Mark Gertler, and Bloomsburyites Dora Sanger and Molly MacCarthy.⁸ In early April he was invited to Garsington, where he became acquainted then and afterward with the Bloomsbury writers Aldous Huxley, Lytton Strachey, the Woolfs, and with the artists, art critics, and interart editors, Duncan Grant, Clive and Vanessa Bell (Vanessa would design the cover for Eliot’s *Homage to John Dryden*), and Mrs. Gardner’s friend Roger Fry, who welcomed Eliot to meetings of the Omega Club, an offshoot of his Omega Workshops. It was Clive Bell who took copies of *Prufrock and Other Observations* to a Garsington Easter Party and distributed them to guests, including Middleton Murry, who would eventually coax Eliot, recently appointed assistant editor of *The Egoist*, into becoming a major contributor of *The Athenaeum: A Journal of Literature, Science, and the Arts*. Murry’s journal and Sidney Schiff’s *Art and Letters* provided Eliot the opportunity to write his first reviews of Elizabethan drama (“Hamlet and His Problems”), his first of performances in London theaters (“‘The Duchess of Malfi’ at the Lyric: and Poetic Drama”), and his first notice of the Phoenix Society, its history and importance to Eliot recovered here in Anthony Cuda’s essay. These were important steps leading to his invitation from Bruce Richmond to review for the *Times Literary Supplement* in 1920 and to his support from Lady Rothermere to establish *The Criterion* in October 1922, its first issue announcing in *The Waste Land* a multicultural vision of the arts in a

polylingual, polyphonic poem infused with lowbrow and highbrow allusions to a music-hall song, Wagnerian operas, a bawdy wartime ballad, Renaissance plays and paintings, Asian religious texts and voices, and a nursery rhyme. Behind the new editor, who would use his journal in part as a bully pulpit for promoting the arts and protesting censorship against them, stood the circles of his necessary mentors: Forbes at Harvard, Gardner in Boston, Lewis in London, Morrell at Garsington.

Eliot's eight "London Letters" that he wrote for *The Dial* in 1921–22 became the basis for his regular "Commentary" editorial in *The Criterion*. The "London Letters" informed his American audience of productions by noncommercial theater companies, such as the Everyman Theatre and the Phoenix Society; the comedians of the music hall and revue; the new exhibition of Wyndham Lewis and his restoration of English caricature in painting; piano recitals by Arthur Rubenstein; the proposed demolition of City churches; and orchestral performances of Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du printemps*, directed by Eugene Goossens in Stravinsky's presence and danced by Lydia Sokolova: "To me the music seemed very remarkable—but at all events struck me as possessing a quality of modernity which I missed from the ballet which accompanied it. The effect was like *Ulysses* with illustrations by the best contemporary illustrator."⁹

Eliot would continue to promote the arts in his *Criterion* "Commentaries," informing the London public that it would soon have "the inestimable privilege" of a two-month season of Serge Diaghilev's Ballets Russes, and hoping that the Coliseum would again present ballet performances by Léonide Massine and Lydia Lopokova. In proudly announcing the Diaghilev Ballet, however, Eliot did not hesitate to reveal his impatience, even exasperation at having

to induce our London audiences to sit through the performance of the greatest mimetic dancer in the world—Massine—to the music of one of the greatest musicians—Stravinski. The writer of these lines recalls his efforts, several years ago, to restrain (with the point of an umbrella) the mirth of his neighbours in a "family house" which seemed united to deride [Lydia] Sokalova at her best in the *Sacre de Printemps*. May we at least tolerate a part of what Paris has appreciated!¹⁰

The diminishing character of the City of London under the grand schemes of financiers and the dubious tastes of their architects is a recurring theme of the Commentaries as Eliot is moved to ask, "why are the City men pulling down good bank buildings, all sorts of buildings, and erecting grander banks, grander insurance buildings" at the cost of architecturally attractive shops and vanishing courts and passages? "Those who can remember the City as long ago as 1920 must feel very sad. . . . Even the policemen . . . have no City lore and no City curiosity. And what has become of the City barmaid who knew good whisky from bad?"¹¹ But no subject raised Eliot's editorial ire as much as the censorship of books and paintings.

Eliot had his first taste of censorship as assistant editor of *The Egoist*, when he learned that the October 1917 issue of Margaret Anderson's *Little Review*, containing Wyndham Lewis's story "Cantelman's Spring Mate," was suppressed on grounds of obscenity by the US Post Office and upheld by the US District Court of New York in relation to the definition of obscenity in the US Criminal Code, that it has "a tendency to excite lust." "The case is closed," reported a dismayed Eliot to English readers. "In America the small number of people who are sensitive to good literature are now forbidden to read one of the finest pieces of prose in the language. And America is not so far away that we need feel no concern in the matter."¹² Awaiting Eliot's editorial

concern in the 1920s were the provisions of the English Obscene Publications Act of 1857 and its determined upholder, Conservative Home Secretary William Joynson-Hicks, known as “Jix,” who, inspired by the *Sunday Express*, brought obscenity charges against Radclyffe Hall’s lesbian novel *The Well of Loneliness* (1928) and subsequently Nora James’s *Sleeveless Errand* (1929) under the provision that a work may be banned if it has “a tendency . . . to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall.” But Eliot had other than the Obscene Publications Act to indict in his vigorous defense of these works: “what we should like to be able to gauge, is the extent to which public action is *hustled* by a certain section of the daily press. We have lately seen the daily press . . . direct its readers to ‘obscene’ books and ‘obscene’ picture shows, and then exult in their condemnation.” He further attacked the “tyranny” behind religious charges of immorality in censorship cases in Ireland and Boston:

The tyranny of religion is bad; if religion should prosper, it should not prosper by such means. But the tyranny of “morality” with some wholly vague religious backing, or wholly divorced from any exact religion is still worse. . . . Censorship has made impossible a critical estimate of Joyce’s *Ulysses* for at least a generation; by setting up a false relationship between art and morals it has obstructed the efforts of all those who recognize the true relationship between art and morals.¹³

Eliot was equally on the attack against English magistrates who unjustly and inconsistently brought charges of obscenity against painters. After the opening of an exhibition of twenty-five paintings and watercolors by D. H. Lawrence at the Dorothy Warren Gallery on June 15, 1929, the *Daily Express* reported “shock” at the “intimate nudes” that would “compel most spectators to recoil with horror,” leading to thirteen paintings being seized by a detective inspector of Scotland Yard. “Mr. Read the magistrate,” wrote an incensed Eliot, “has meanwhile exhibited the British sense of fair play, by ordaining that Mr. D. H. Lawrence’s paintings shall no longer be exhibited, but need not be destroyed. Some reproductions of these paintings are to be destroyed, but not the paintings themselves. Here again, we are not interested to decide whether Mr. Lawrence’s paintings are masterpieces or daubs. We learn that features of these paintings were ‘unnecessarily developed.’” When the inspector who seized the pictures was asked by the defense attorney whether the legal proceedings were started by a private individual or the authorities, the magistrate ruled that “he need not answer that.” Eliot insisted that the public had a right to know the answer:

Because the same news-sheet which first informed us that there was an exhibition of shocking paintings by Mr. Lawrence had previously informed us of another shocking exhibition by a famous foreign painter [Spanish painter Federico Beltrán-Massés] of whom we had never heard, so shocking that the Ambassador of the country to which that painter belonged . . . did not visit the show until the more shocking of these passionate canvasses had been removed. Yet neither Mr. Mead nor [the inspector] was called upon to judge these paintings. We have not seen either these or Mr. Lawrence’s. Mr. Lawrence is a British subject, one of half a dozen writers whose work commands respect in foreign countries.

In concluding the report in disgust, Eliot quoted Matthew Arnold: “Occasionally, the uncritical spirit of our race determines to perform a great public act of self-humiliation. Such an act it has recently accomplished.”¹⁴

It must be admitted that Eliot, while vehemently opposed to literary censorship, was not wholly opposed to some censorship of plays and films, having written in his "Commentary" of September 1928: "The general question of censorship is, we think, a question of expediency rather than principle, when it is not the censorship of a Church. The censorship of the theatre, so far as we know, seems to work pretty well; the censorship of films might be better indeed if it were more severe." This statement brought a letter of rebuke from Alan Boase, lecturer in French at the University of Sheffield, stating that

one may agree that there is too much vulgarity and suggestiveness which deserves the film-censor's blue pencil . . . but heaven forbid that you should encourage [the censors] in their activities until their personnel has been greatly changed, or at least, until they have been "re-educated." The more intelligent film-going public would probably be shortly robbed of what little good foreign stuff they can at present see, if you stimulated these gentlemen's "moral sense."

Replying that he had expressed himself badly, "not being very much interested in the cinema," Eliot asked and received Boase's permission to print his letter in the correspondence section:

I am quite ready to admit that probably the good films are suppressed (censorship has always much more to do with politics, moral prejudice and fear, than with religion); but I should have been glad if several I have seen, and others I have heard about, had been suppressed too. . . . What I should have said, perhaps, is that the film censorship always prohibits the wrong things, and lets by the things which ought to be prohibited. Anyway, I am sure that the stricter the literary censorship, the greater will be the sale of really salacious books.¹⁵

After his conversion to Anglo-Catholicism in 1927, and in the midst of censorship controversies, Eliot was moving toward a communal vision of the arts in the Church, a vision born of multinational cathedrals and museums visited, musical and theatrical performances attended, as far back as his visit to Toulouse during the Christmas break at the Sorbonne in 1910. In a previously unrecorded essay titled "If I Were a Dean," commissioned in February 1931 by Bishop George Bell for the *Chichester Diocesan Gazette*, Eliot described how he as dean would use the arts to transform his cathedral for the modern religious community. Having visited old and beautiful churches where parishioners seemed afraid to alter in any way the style in which they were built, Eliot declared that he preferred "a church which shows the loving attempts of generation after generation, each according to its own notions of beauty, to leave visible testimony of its devotion. I should like to be able to encourage the best contemporary artists in stone, metal, paint and wood, to apply themselves to the decoration of my cathedral; and the best musicians to make music for its offices."¹⁶ Stating his "one heretical notion" that the organ is not an indispensable instrument, he declared that at least he would want to supplement it with

a small orchestra, of strings and woodwind, assembled from local talent (and I am sure that there is plenty of musical talent in rural England). . . . Anyone who has heard instrumental music in certain continental churches knows that the organ is by no means the only medium for church music. And everything that engages more individuals in the responsibility and pride of beautifying the church service, is an encouragement to communal life.

He would have the interior richly decorated with modern religious paintings, “with tapestries (as, for example, they hang around the bases of columns in the cathedral of Toulouse)”; he would pay particular attention to the performance of religious drama: not only to the revival of mediaeval miracle plays and interludes, but to religious plays by contemporary authors. “Should not the resources of art be devoted to God,” he asked, “instead of merely to the palaces of the rich and finally to museums? I hold also the theory, that it is chiefly in the life of such a centre as a cathedral that art can vitally affect us.” Prophetic of Eliot’s vision, Bishop Bell had in December 1930 commissioned him to write a religious pageant, *The Rock* (1934), “Written for Performance on Behalf of the Forty-Five Churches Fund of the Diocese of London,” and a religious drama: “And for such activities as religious drama,” Eliot wrote, “I should want to have them performed, as far as possible *within* the cathedral itself.” On Bishop Bell’s provision for the Canterbury Festival, that is exactly what happened. The first production of *Murder in the Cathedral* took place in the Chapter House of Canterbury Cathedral in May 1935, with the voices of Eliot’s first experiment in the choral arts resounding—all of his previous life in the arts seemingly flowing into that symbolic performance, all afterward flowing out of it.

Notes

1. Nancy D. Hargrove, “T. S. Eliot’s Italian Trip, Summer 1911: Museums, Cathedrals, Palaces, and Landscapes,” *South Atlantic Review*, 76.3 (summer 1911), 7–32.
2. Edward Forbes, Fine arts 20 b Final exam (1910), Harvard University Archives, HUG FP 139.62 box 1.
3. By the spring of 1914 Eliot was incorporating modern art into his philosophical papers for Josiah Royce’s graduate seminar. In an essay titled “Suggestions toward a Theory of Objects” (May 1914), Eliot alludes to Marcel Duchamp’s Cubist-inspired *Nude Descending a Staircase*, No. 2 (1912) in stating that with certain objects, “the point of view of knowing and of being constantly shift before our attention like the staircase in the illusion” (*Complete Prose* 1, 130–35; here 131). The painting was extensively covered by the press when it was exhibited as part of the Armory Show in New York (February–March 1913): the International Exhibition of Modern Art, the first large exhibition of modern art in America, organized by the Association of American Painters and Sculptors. Mrs. Gardner, a member of the organizing committee, attended the exhibition in New York before it was moved to the Copley Society of Art, Copley Hall, in Boston from April 28 to May 19. Eliot doubtless attended, though there is as yet no direct evidence beyond the allusion to Duchamp that he did.
4. “Wyndham Lewis,” *The Hudson Review*, X.2 (summer 1957), 167: painters David Bomberg, Frederick Etchells, William Roberts, Edward Wadsworth, Helen Saunders, and Jessica Dismorr.
5. *LI*, 103.
6. The French sculptor Henri Gaudier-Brzeska; T. E. Hulme, poet, philosopher, and art critic; Jacob Epstein, American sculptor, naturalized British citizen. Several Vorticists were represented in the Second London Group Exhibition at the Goupil Gallery, London, in March 1915. The Vorticists then held their one and only exhibition at the Doré Gallery from June 10 to mid-July 1915, featuring Gaudier-Brzeska, Etchells, Dismorr, Lewis, Saunders, and Wadsworth. Five days before the opening, Gaudier-Brzeska was killed in France. On May 19, 1918, after attending the private showing of Gaudier-Brzeska’s pictures, Aldous Huxley wrote to Morrell to say that the “glorious company” of poets and painters present included Robert Graves, W. H. Davies, and Eliot, “not to speak of . . . Gertler . . . and so forth.” *Ottoline at Garsington: Memoirs of Lady Ottoline Morrell, 1915–1918*, ed. Robert Gathorne-Hardy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), 209.

The publication of the first issue of *BLAST* (July 1914) was celebrated in a painting by William Roberts, showing most of the contributors in *The Vorticists at the Restaurant de la Tour Eiffel: Spring 1915*. Eliot further informed Mrs. Gardner that the second issue would contain, in addition to the painters' designs, "some poems by a girl named Jessie Dismorr, which I think might interest you" (*L1*, 100–3).

7. Douglass Shand-Tucci, *The Art of Scandal: The Life and Times of Isabella Stewart Gardner* (New York: HarperCollins, 1977), 265.
8. Eliot certainly knew of Morrell much earlier from Russell, who was planning their introduction, evident in a letter to him of October 11, 1915: "I am planning to see you at Garsington, when I come to Oxford, or better on a separate expedition, as I shall probably try not to stay the night at Oxford" (*L1*, 131).
9. Eliot, "'London Letter': September, 1921," *The Dial* 71 (October 1921); 452–55; in *Complete Prose* 2, 369.
10. Eliot, "A Commentary" (October 1924), *Complete Prose* 2, 545. Eliot had become a serious student of ballet in relation to ritual, evident in his review of *The Dance: An Historical Survey of Dancing in Europe* in the *Criterion* of April 1925 (*Complete Prose* 2, 581–4): "anyone who would contribute to our imagination of what the ballet may perform in the future—should begin by a close study of dancing amongst primitive peoples—*vide* the Australian ceremonies described by Spencer and Gillen and Hewett; of dancing amongst developed peoples, such as the Tibetans and the Javanese. . . . He should have studied the evolution of Christian and other liturgy. (For is not the High Mass—as performed, for instance, at the Madeleine in Paris—one of the highest developments of dancing?). And, finally, he should track down the secrets of rhythm in the (still undeveloped) science of neurology" (581–82).
11. Eliot, "A Commentary" (December 1928), *Complete Prose* 3, 537.
12. Eliot, "Literature and the American Courts," *The Egoist* 5 (March 1918): 39; in *Complete Prose* 1, 677.
13. *Complete Prose* 3, 535–36.
14. Eliot, "A Commentary" (October 1929), *Complete Prose* 3, 748. Eliot would later give a legal deposition for the defense in the 1961 obscenity trial against Penguin for their unexpurgated edition (1960) of Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928) from charges of obscenity under the Obscene Publications Act of 1959. Though Eliot was not called to testify, he wrote in "To Criticize the Critic" (1961): "I felt then, as I feel now, that the prosecution of such a book—a book of most serious and highly moral *intention*—was a deplorable blunder, the consequences of which would be most unfortunate whatever the verdict, and give the book a kind of vogue which would have been abhorrent to the author. . . . It was noticeable in the Chatterley case, that some witnesses for the defence defended the book for the moral intentions of the author rather than on the ground of its being important as a work of literature." *To Criticize the Critic* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965), 24–25.
15. *L4*, 371–73.
16. *Complete Prose* 4, 296–99.