The Contrasting Transmedia Influences of Visual Artists Wyndham Lewis and R.B. Kitaj on T.S. Eliot's Legacy

Jaron Murphy

In *T.S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide* (2003), David E. Chinitz presents 'a new narrative of Eliot's career'[1] which challenges the dominant image of Eliot in 20th-century literary history as 'the hero or antihero of a losing battle to defend a pristine and sacralized high art from the threatening pollution of 'lower levels' of culture'.[2] He traces instead a 'culturally elastic'[3] Eliot whose 'actual relations with popular culture were far more nuanced and showed a far greater receptivity'[4] than previously acknowledged. Ultimately, Chinitz suggests that critical recognition of a transgressive Eliot who 'liked a good show, a good thriller, a good tune, as well as a 'great' poem'[5] is necessary to sustain Eliot's legacy into the 21st century: 'This Eliot is needed today… if Eliot is to matter at all.'[6] Relatedly, in his Preface to *The Edinburgh Companion to T.S. Eliot and the Arts* (2016), Ronald Schuchard hails 'a significant new turn to the arts in the work of T.S. Eliot' which avails itself of much-anticipated editions [of the Letters] commissioned by Valerie Eliot, builds upon Chinitz's thesis, and expands 'the range and depth of the Asian, Renaissance, Victorian, and modern art forms with which Eliot enriches the cultural texture of his oeuvre'.[7] However, while plentiful evidence from Eliot's life and work of his engagement with the visual arts is highlighted to advance understanding of 'the significant inter[-]art dimension of a foremost exemplar of

[1] David E. Chinitz, *T.S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 13.
[2] Ibid., 5.
[3] Ibid., 6.
[4] Ibid., 4.
[5] Ibid., 18.
[6] Ibid., 189.
[7] Ronald Schuchard, 'Preface', in *The Edinburgh Companion to T.S. Eliot and the Arts*, ed. Frances Dickey and John D. Morgenstern (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), xi.

modernism',[8] consideration of the relation between Eliot, the visual arts and his legacy has not been – but should be, this article argues – extended to the reverse: visual arts engagement with Eliot.

As this article will show, prominent and enduring association of Eliot with the visual arts into the 21st century, and the striking kinds of images we can receive of him across media in our digital age, owe much to positive and negative portrayals of Eliot through works by Wyndham Lewis and R.B. Kitaj respectively. This article will foreground several powerful and contrasting representations of Eliot by Lewis and Kitaj, who were both highly controversial visual artists and writers. These representations have not received due recognition as remarkable generators of impressions and shapers of perceptions of Eliot in the increasingly complex multimedia environment of the 21st century, to which they have been so readily adaptable. This article will also argue that these representations of Eliot, which can be encountered across canvas, print and online (including websites and social media), are major driving forces of Eliot's transmedia visibility, and therefore of continued and even increased public attention to him as a world-renowned literary figure. It is hoped this article will stimulate further scholarship on visual artists' creative responses to Eliot and their importance to his legacy in the digital age.

Critical attention to the arts in Eliot's work is, of course, essential and nothing new. In *The Art of T.S. Eliot* (1949), for instance, Helen Gardner reflects on the signposted debt Eliot 'owes to the art of music'[9] in *Four Quartets* (1943) and how his 'experiments in drama are closely related'[10] to his poetic development. The novelty of the 'new turn' lies, rather, in its explicit concentration on the arts at a time of reinvigorated scholarship and re-evaluation of Eliot's legacy into the 21st century. As acknowledged in the *Companion*, various general studies since the 1970s have broadly illuminated Eliot's engagement with the visual arts: from Gertrude Patterson's *T.S. Eliot: Poems in the Making* (1971) to Charles Altieri's 'Visual Art' in *T.S. Eliot in Context* (2011). This has made it possible for

[8] Ibid., ix.
[9] Helen Gardner, *The Art of T.S. Eliot* (1949; London: Faber and Faber, 1985), 36.
[10] Ibid., 129.

'more focused studies' on Eliot to be undertaken concerning 'individual movements and artists'.[11] Whereas Altieri's chapter appears midway in 'Part Two: Forms'[12] before chapters on dance, drama, music and radio, attention to these same forms is collectively scaled up in the *Companion*. It situates Eliot's engagement with the visual arts – through a clutch of chapters upfront on topics such as Asian and African art in Paris and London museums, Italian painting, and Matisse – within Eliot's multifaceted, lifelong interest in the wider arts 'in both popular and high culture'[13] which is further explored in multi-chapter sections on performance arts and media.

Such direct and intensive scrutiny of Eliot's relation to the visual arts, effectively fleshing out Chinitz's conception of a more relatable and relevant Eliot who was a 'culturally elastic' connoisseur of the arts, becomes even more compelling when viewed against the backdrop of biographies which, understandably, trace other important aspects of Eliot's development. For instance, in *Young Eliot: From St Louis to The Waste Land* (2016), Robert Crawford's narrative 'attends to Eliot's graduate student interests in philosophy' and 'intellectual brilliance' while counteracting what he describes as excessive treatment of Eliot 'over the last two decades… as a thinker more than a poet'.[14] The dichotomy of poet and thinker is also evident in Lyndall Gordon's revised *The Imperfect Life of T.S. Eliot* (2012) where, in her coverage of Eliot's sojourn in Paris in 1910/11, she writes that he 'came to Paris to be a poet; he left a philosophy student'[15] – an intellectual departure, as it were, which is rebalanced within

[11] Frances Dickey and John D. Morgenstern, eds. 'Introduction', *The Edinburgh Companion to T.S. Eliot and the Arts* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 3.
[12] Jason Harding, ed., 'Contents', *T.S. Eliot in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), viii.
[13] Schuchard, 'Preface', xi.
[14] Robert Crawford, *Young Eliot: From St Louis to The Waste Land* (London: Vintage, 2016), 7.
[15] Lyndall Gordon, *The Imperfect Life of T.S. Eliot* (1998; London: Virago, 2012), 62.

her overall account of Eliot's poetry as a 'coherent form of spiritual autobiography'.[16]

Refreshingly, the 'new turn' provides biographers and critics with an abundance of detail on Eliot's engagement with the visual arts, not least at pivotal stages of his early development, which might bring further nuance to narratives concerning his artistic sensibility. A wide range of correspondences between the life and work are highlighted, which somewhat offset the ascendancy of philosophy when he left Paris, such as his studies as a Harvard student of Italian Renaissance artists and his visits to museums in Paris, Italy and London. Drawing attention to Eliot's commencement of writing 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock' (1917) in 1910/11, with its lines 'In the room the women come and go/Talking of Michelangelo',[17] Schuchard speculates that Eliot may have had in mind Fenway Court 'just as memories of Okakura and the Titian Room may have inspired the presence of 'Hakagawa among the Titians' in 'Gerontion' [1920]'.[18] Significantly, the *Companion* conveys that from 'his first publications, Eliot's poetry invited comparison with modern art movements that he first encountered in Paris and subsequently in London, including Fauvism, German Expressionism, Futurism, Vorticism, and most prominently Cubism'.[19] The accumulation of these sorts of connections, both the definitive and speculative, increasingly illustrates how important Eliot's lived experience as a knowledgeable seeker and admirer of, and creative borrower from, the visual arts is to appreciation of his oeuvre.

The 'new turn' Eliot who emerges in the *Companion*, then, along the trajectory set by Chinitz, is more biographically grounded in his work in relation to the visual arts and, through the later chapters, wider arts. His 'inter[-]art dimension' shows 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,

[16] Ibid., 11.
[17] T.S. Eliot, *The Complete Poems & Plays* (1969; London: Faber and Faber, 2004), 13.
[18] Schuchard, 'Preface', xii.
[19] Dickey and Morgenstern, eds., 'Introduction', *The Edinburgh Companion*, 4.

and vigorously defending the arts from censorship',[20] as in the case of D.H. Lawrence. Rather than high-mindedly aloof, the 'new turn' Eliot is keenly interested and involved in the arts scene. The quite forensic tracking throughout the *Companion* of his visual arts-related studies and activities makes for interesting comparison with Altieri's general sense that Eliot's 'own actual relation to the visual arts seems to be an outgrowth of his wariness before all visual experience, because that experience seemed so insistently bound to objective surfaces that it could not display the density of relations that, for Eliot, constituted a livable [sic] reality'.[21] As Altieri also observes, it is 'clear from Eliot's letters that what most interested him in the visual arts were images of St Sebastian'[22]; and in the *Companion*, Anne Stillman finds in her examination of Eliot's engagement with Italian painting in 'The Love Song of St. Sebastian' and *Poems* (1920) an ekphrastic imagination: his myriad 'allusions to Italian Renaissance artists and works throughout the mid to late 1910s register an awareness of his own mimesis in 'reproducing' these paintings in poetry'.[23]

However, while the *Companion* can be understood as an elaboration of Chinitz's 'culturally elastic' and more relatable Eliot who 'is needed today… if Eliot is to matter at all', a fuller picture of Eliot's legacy into the 21st century can be gained by widening the critical lens from what Eliot made of the visual arts to what the visual arts have made of Eliot. Schuchard duly reports that Eliot's first poems to be published abroad, 'Preludes' and 'Rhapsody on a Windy Night', appeared in the avant-garde arts periodical *Blast: Review of the Great English Vortex* (July 1915) among 'numerous Vorticist and Cubist prints and a photograph of Gaudier-Brzeska's sculpted 'Head of Ezra Pound''; and he notes that Eliot 'would remain a lifelong friend of [Wyndham] Lewis and [Jacob] Epstein, both of whom made him the subject of their separate arts'.[24] That Eliot does indeed continue to attract attention and be recognised as a cultural phenomenon is, of course,

[20] Schuchard, 'Preface', xi.
[21] Charles Altieri, 'Visual Art', in *T.S. Eliot in Context,* ed. Jason Harding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 105.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Dickey and Morgenstern, eds., 'Introduction', *The Edinburgh Companion*, 5.
[24] Schuchard, 'Preface', xiii.

not just owing to his literary achievements but also his associations with other well-known writers and artists, not least those who left records or representations of him which we can read or view to this day. As a central figure of works by outstanding visual artists like Lewis and Epstein, Eliot was clearly not the sole contributor to his legacy, which must be considered, too, through the prism of memorable artistic interpretations and portrayals of him. Eliot's collaboration with Lewis, in particular, constitutes *the* prime example of his 'translation' into visual arts form for posterity. As we will see, Lewis's brilliant yet controversial 1938 portrait of Eliot – which met with Eliot's approval as a potential influence on how he might be remembered – has become a positive and powerful embodiment, so to speak, of not only his connectedness to the visual arts but also its capacity, through transmedia adaptation, to revitalise public consciousness of his cultural stature in the digital age.

Lewis's portrait can be compared with the vastly different approach to the depiction of Eliot by Kitaj in his striking and controversial 'Killer-Critic' in 1997, at the dawn of use of the Internet becoming widespread internationally. This painting, too, along with references to Eliot in his free-verse *Second Diasporist Manifesto* (2007), constitutes a key example of the importance of the visual arts to sustaining Eliot's cultural profile and relevance, and to impacting how he is perceived by audiences not only via canvas and print but also online. In combination, Kitaj's painting and writing amount to extremely hard-hitting criticism of Eliot. They might easily upset admirers of Eliot, unlike Lewis's portrait which encapsulates and perpetuates Eliot's modernist and poetical mystique. As an American-born Jewish artist who lived for many years in the UK, Kitaj emphatically rejects Eliot's theory of impersonality and the anti-Semitism evident in some of Eliot's verse – though he accepts indebtedness to Eliot's early influence as a foremost exemplar of modernism. His spurning of Eliot's cultural authority, however, is fuel for his own art. For Kitaj, Eliot is a species of malevolent Muse. His animus towards Eliot is that of a fiercely individual artist seeking to claim and proclaim for himself a new 'Jewish

Diaspora Art'[25] tradition. This is in stark contrast to Lewis's overall approbation of Eliot, and the fittingly Cubist inspiration Lewis drew from their friendship (and rivalry) for the creation of his portrait. Taken together, these contrary representations of Eliot by Lewis and Kitaj illustrate in part his complex assimilation into the visual arts and indeed his permanent inseparability from the visual arts as a famous literary subject – significant factors, then, for his legacy into the 21st century. Extending across media in the digital age, these versions of Eliot are more widely accessible than ever before.

Wyndham Lewis

Lewis submitted the portrait, rather mischievously, for a decision by the Selection Committee on whether to include it in the Royal Academy's Summer Exhibition in 1938. As Paul Edwards describes it: 'In his smart suit, Eliot sits slightly hunched, avoiding our gaze… His haunted expression seems to chime with Eliot's own later belief that he had paid too high a price in personal happiness for being a poet.'[26] The hullabaloo that followed its rejection, including Augustus John's protest resignation and front-page newspaper headlines, has been repeatedly recounted in Lewis scholarship. Although the Academy 'claimed to object to the elaborate 'scrolls' in the background'[27] which contained phallic symbolism, Lewis had 'always disdained the Academy', so his submission 'seemed a move calculated to fail and affirm the 56-year-old artist's continued status as a rebel'. [28] These dramatic events, the portrait's new lease of life post-rejection in Durban, South Africa, and Eliot's remarkable encounter with it there in 1954 have all been covered previously in *The Journal of the T.S. Eliot Society*. Readers who are not familiar with Lewis's unique portrait, which proved to be a lasting boon to Eliot's celebrity, are encouraged to

[25] R.B. Kitaj, *Second Diasporist Manifesto (A New Kind of Long Poem in 615 Free Verses)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007). There are no page numbers in Kitaj's book. Hereafter, verse numbers are provided in-text.
[26] Paul Edwards (with Richard Humphreys), *Wyndham Lewis Portraits* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2008), 68.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Richard Slocombe, *Wyndham Lewis: Life, Art, War* (London: IWM, 2017), 74.

learn more about its fascinating backstory by consulting the article entitled ‘‘Mr. Eliot has Re-Discovered a Portrait of Himself’: Reframing Lewis’s Rejected Masterpiece in the 21st Century’, which was published in the 2018 edition of the Journal (see pp69-94). While that backstory remains pertinent, attention to Lewis’s portrait in this section serves expressly to form a basis for comparative reflection on the transmedia influences of Lewis and Kitaj on Eliot’s legacy. Here, and in the next section which concludes this article, special attention will be paid to the proliferation online of their respective representations of Eliot as further evidence of their key roles in raising his cultural visibility and impacting his reputation in the digital age.

The prominent treatment in print of Lewis’s masterpiece, which is ‘now considered one of the finest British portraits of the twentieth century’,[29] can be ascertained in part from its reproduction in the catalogue for the ‘Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957)’ exhibition at the Fundación Juan March in Madrid in 2010, as well as its appearance on the cover of, and within, the catalogue for the ‘Wyndham Lewis Portraits’ exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery in London in 2008. The latter confirms this as Lewis’s ‘most famous portrait’,[30] which is highly impressive given the array of acclaimed literary subjects such as Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, Rebecca West, Edith Sitwell and Ezra Pound. It was inevitable, however, in our increasingly digital age that the standard encounter with Eliot, as it were, at art exhibitions through the original oil-on-canvas portrait, augmented by reproductions and textual information in print, would be elevated to a multimedia experience. A good example of this was the ‘packaged’ display of the portrait at the major retrospective ‘Wyndham Lewis: Life, Art, War’ at the Imperial War Museums North in Manchester in 2017. In conventional fashion, the print catalogue features a reproduction of the portrait on the opposite page to several contextual paragraphs on Lewis’s ‘most controversial painting’.[31] To encourage public engagement, the exhibition experience was enhanced by supplementary material on the

[29] Fundación Juan March (with Paul Edwards and Richard Humphreys et al.), *Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957)* (Madrid: Fundación Juan March, 2010), 238.
[30] Paul Edwards (with Richard Humphreys), *Portraits*, 68.
[31] Richard Slocombe (Preface by Paul Edwards), *Life, Art, War*, 74.

IWM website. This included audio commentary on the portrait, available at that time to anyone with online access but which ceased to be available post-exhibition.

Notably, too, the portrait appeared online multiple times in relation to this exhibition – a glimpse into how the advent of the Internet has further spread, across media, what is arguably *the* iconic image of Eliot internationally, and therefore added a new dimension to reflection on his legacy. A still-accessible article on *The Guardian* newspaper website, for instance, singles out the portrait from the overall exhibition collection. Vignettes on its significance follow a cropped reproduction foregrounding Eliot's head and upper body as well as the 'scrolls'.[32] The article includes observations that Eliot 'looks serious and far from comfortable', with his face 'a jigsaw puzzle of shadowy half-moons and sharp planes' while his hands 'droop from the oversized suit, suggesting the subtle creepiness of a limp handshake'.[33] A link to this article is provided alongside an image of the portrait within a news item, about its presence at the exhibition, dated July 2017 on the T.S. Eliot Society (UK) website. The item has since been archived and is therefore still accessible.[34] There is also the bonus of a link to the newsreel clip, on *YouTube*, of Lewis responding to a journalist's questions following the rejection of the portrait, next to which he is standing. Links to both the newsreel clip and *Guardian* article have since become more readily accessible within the 'Portraits' section of the 'Images of TS Eliot' page which can be visited via the 'Resources' tab.[35] As this links-laden page indicates, images of Eliot – such as photographs, portraits, illustrations, caricatures, film footage and even a US postage stamp – can be found all over the Internet. However, the dissemination online of news and/or images of Lewis's portrait not only confirms its

[32] See https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2017/jul/07/wyndham-lewis-ts-eliot-jigsaw-puzzle-rebellion-radicalism. [Accessed 5 August 2024.]
[33] See https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2017/jul/07/wyndham-lewis-ts-eliot-jigsaw-puzzle-rebellion-radicalism. [Accessed 5 August 2024.]
[34] See http://s699163057.websitehome.co.uk/news-archive-2017. [Accessed 5 August 2024.]
[35] See http://s699163057.websitehome.co.uk/tseliot-images. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]

special importance in heightening Eliot's cultural profile but also illustrates its transmedia adaptability in the digital age.

As the newsreel clip shows, Lewis revelled in the media frenzy after the portrait's rejection; and as the *Guardian* article also indicates, journalism has been a significant conduit for generating public awareness of the portrait via prominent treatment in print and online news coverage of art exhibitions where the portrait has been on display. Other examples of articles featuring the portrait include coverage of the 2008 'Wyndham Lewis Portraits' exhibition by *The Independent* ('Banned TS Eliot portrait goes on show'[36]) and *The Spectator* ('Shifting truths'[37]); coverage of the 2017 'Wyndham Lewis: Life, Art, War' exhibition by *The Art Newspaper* ('Manchester gets first comprehensive retrospective of Wyndham Lewis in 40 years'[38]); and coverage of the 2018 'The Great Spectacle: 250 Years of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition' by *The Sunday Times* ('Royal Academy shows portrait of TS Eliot after 80 years in wasteland'[39]). The considerable reach of such journalism encompasses online and corresponding print publication (the latter article, for instance, also appears on p16 of the print edition of *The Sunday Times* on the same date, 10 June 2018) as well as online sharing functionality via email and social media such as Twitter (now X) and Meta-owned Facebook and WhatsApp.[40] The appearance of the portrait within journalism is not limited to coverage of art exhibitions. For instance, a photo of Lewis with the portrait, drawn from *Getty Images*, accompanies a 2019 review by *The Telegraph* of Volume 8

[36] See https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/news/banned-ts-eliot-portrait-goes-on-show-859095.html. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[37] See https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/shifting-truths/. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[38] See https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2017/06/19/manchester-gets-first-comprehensive-retrospective-of-wyndham-lewis-in-40-years. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[39] See https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/royal-academy-shows-portrait-of-ts-eliot-after-80-years-in-wasteland-c6xvrn7m6. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[40] Of course, such journalism is not always 'open access'. It can be subject to online paywalls and print copy prices.

of *The Letters of T.S. Eliot* which asks in the headline, 'is all this really necessary?'.[41]

Beyond journalism, the portrait's transmedia intertwinement with Eliot's legacy can also be seen in resources associated with places immortalised in 'Four Quartets'. On the *Friends of Little Gidding* website, for instance, the 'TS Eliot' tab leads to the cropped portrait alongside an explanation of Eliot's visit in May 1936 and the birth in 2006 of the annual Eliot Festival as well as the T.S. Eliot Society (UK).[42] Albeit at a small size, the portrait also adorns the entry on Eliot on the *Poets' Graves* website, which provides information on his final resting place at St Michael's parish church, East Coker.[43] Print books featuring the portrait on their covers, such as Lewis's volume of essays *Wyndham Lewis the Artist: From 'Blast' to Burlington House* (1939) and Peter Ackroyd's biography *T.S. Eliot* (1984), can be located on Google Books.[44] There is also a Wikipedia entry on the portrait, where it appears in the customary top-right image slot.[45] The portrait has also been incorporated into snippets and blogs, such as a 2009 *flickr.com* entry on Lewis on *Pinterest*;[46] a 2010 'scrapbook' entry on 'The Hollow Men' on *Tribal Interloper* (where the portrait is situated downpage and, at the top, Eliot's cropped head briefly appears in an embedded *YouTube* video with an audio reading of the poem);[47] a 2018 entry on 'Wyndham

[41] See https://www.telegraph.co.uk/books/what-to-read/letters-ts-eliot-vol-8-review-really-necessary/. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[42] See https://littlegidding.org.uk/t-s-eliot-and-little-gidding/. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[43] See https://www.poetsgraves.co.uk/eliot.htm. [Accessed 6 August 2024.]
[44] To view these book covers, Google the titles and click Images. Ackroyd's book cover can also be seen within this blog review: https://scottjpearson.com/t-s-eliot-a-life-by-peter-ackroyd/. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]
[45] See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portrait_of_T._S._Eliot. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]
[46] See https://www.pinterest.co.uk/pin/lewis-wyndham-1882-1957-portrait-of-ts-eliot--230316968416845051/. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]
[47] See https://rudhro.wordpress.com/2010/10/16/audio-this-is-the-way-the-world-ends-this-is-the-way-the-world-ends-this-is-the-way-the-world-ends-not-with-a-bang-but-a-whimper-the-hollow-men-by-t-s-eliot-poetry-reading/. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]

Lewis and the Royal Academy' on the *London Historians' Blog*;[48] and a 2023 entry on 'Ted Hughes' Memorializing Tribute to his Mentor T.S. Eliot' on *The Examined Life.*[49] The *Getty* photo of Lewis with the portrait also arises within a 2016 article on *Blast 1* (1914) on *Flashbak.*[50] A sense of the magnitude of social media posts of images of the portrait can be gained by searching for Eliot, for instance, via Media on Twitter (now X) and scrolling down the results timeline. This is all merely a snapshot of what is out there online.

Suffice to say that the portrait and the photo of Lewis with the portrait have become widely noticeable on websites and social media, in a digital age that has transformed how we can encounter Eliot into expanded transmedia possibilities. Even further expansion can be expected as Artificial Intelligence becomes more widely utilised, following the launch of ChatGPT in 2022. While other portraits and photos of Eliot are also available online, it is Lewis's portrait that continues to stand out for its frequent and prominent use as the representation *par excellence* of Eliot for posterity.[51] This does not mean, however, that the portrait's positive and important contribution to perpetuating Eliot's legacy as a celebrated literary figure, manifestly connected to the visual arts, is not beset with thorny issues. As the survey above of art exhibitions and reproductions in print and online shows, there has tended to be brief, repetitive and ultimately reductive treatment of the portrait as an object of controversy sparked by Lewis. Use of the portrait on websites and social media often comes across as decorative rather than substantive.

---

[48] See https://londonhistorians.wordpress.com/2018/06/21/wyndham-lewis-and-the-royal-academy/. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]
[49] See https://theexaminedlife.org/library/ted-hughes-memorializing-tributes-to-his-mentor-t-s-eliot. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]
[50] See https://flashbak.com/wyndham-lewis-blast-1-the-daddy-of-the-modern-aesthetic-manifesto-51448/. [Accessed 7 August 2024.]
[51] Lewis's conventional 1949 portrait of Eliot, which appears on the cover of *T.S. Eliot: The Man and His Work* ([1966] 1971), edited by Allen Tate, is not nearly so prolific online.

Eliot's legacy would benefit, therefore, from improved contextualisation across media of his strategic and active, rather than passive and minor, involvement in the creation of the portrait and controversy. That Eliot, by then a famous writer who had been overseeing a golden period for poetry at Faber and Faber, lent himself as a long-time friend and ally to Lewis's agitation against the perceived orthodoxy of the Royal Academy is testament to their mutually beneficial collaboration. Eliot's cultural elasticity here, in solidarity with Lewis as an exponent of innovative modernist painting, helps to explain in part why he continues to be so culturally visible and appealing. Amid widespread circulation of images of the portrait online, Eliot as the sitter deserves more credit for both supporting Lewis and appreciating the likely relevance of the portrait's fortunes to his own cultural profile in the long term. In a letter to Lewis dated 21 April 1938, Eliot expresses his approval of the portrait and recognises its potential role in shaping his legacy. He judges it 'a very good portrait, and one by which I am quite willing that posterity should know me, if it takes any interest in me at all.' [52]

Moreover, improved contextualisation in direct relation to Eliot is sorely needed concerning the portrait's new lease of life post-rejection in South Africa, where it has stayed ever since, except for loans to exhibitions internationally. While displays, and reproductions in print and online, have generally tended to credit the Durban Art Gallery as the portrait's custodian, there has also tended to be a lack of explanation of why and how the portrait came to be rehomed in Durban in late 1939, and a lack of acknowledgement of Eliot's remarkable encounter with the portrait in Durban while on holiday en route to Cape Town in 1954, amid the bigger political picture of apartheid being forcibly entrenched. A photo of Eliot admiring and pointing to the portrait in Durban appeared in local newspaper *The Natal Mercury* and was later published in W.K. Rose's edited *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis* (1963). Problematically, the portrait has continued to be 'dehistoricised' in these respects even as it has been multiplied extensively online.

[52] W.K. Rose, ed., *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis* (London: Methuen, 1963), 251.

R.B. Kitaj

Another powerful representation of Eliot – which could not be more different from Lewis's portrait – forms part of a centrepiece painting within a mixed-media installation by Kitaj that 'electrified'[53] the Royal Academy's Summer Exhibition in 1997. Entitled 'The Killer-Critic Assassinated by his Widower, Even', this painting also proved to be highly controversial and merits attention for its repudiation of Eliot's theory of impersonality. Combined with Kitaj's hostility to Eliot in his writing, as a Jewish artist who viewed Eliot as anti-Semitic, this painting poses a significant challenge to Eliot's cultural stature in the multimedia environment of the 21st century, while Kitaj's own reputation – as a contemporary of illustrious figures like David Hockney and Lucian Freud – continues to develop posthumously. Both Kitaj's painting and Lewis's portrait were on display, in different rooms, among the artworks included in the commemorative event entitled 'The Great Spectacle: 250 Years of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition' in London in 2018. Eliot's encounter with the portrait in Durban in 1954 was not registered in the hefty print catalogue nor in the glass display case (which contained Augustus John's resignation letter) a few steps from where the portrait was positioned; and curiously, too, although Eliot's name is impossible to miss on close inspection of Kitaj's painting, this detail was not highlighted in the catalogue nor addressed in a display area. Nevertheless, as with Lewis's portrait, Kitaj's painting was reproduced in the catalogue with an explanation of its turbulent past.

Again, journalism is an important part of the story. After receiving 'unusually vicious press reviews' for his major retrospective at the Tate Gallery in 1994, and blaming these reviews in part for his wife and fellow painter Sandra Fisher's death from a brain aneurysm soon afterwards, Kitaj produced a series of artworks dealing with these traumatic events: 'Sandra One' (1996), 'Sandra Two' (1996) and 'Sandra Three' (1997), which 'served as an unfolding pictorial memorial to his dead wife and as an extended instrument of artistic revenge'. As the catalogue elucidates, the centrepiece painting within 'Sandra Three' 'alludes in its title to Marcel

[53] Mark Hallett and Sarah Victoria Turner, *The Great Spectacle: 250 Years of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition* (London: RA, 2018), 147.

Duchamp's famous early twentieth-century art work *The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, Even*' and 'also revises the iconography and narratives of Edouard Manet's nineteenth-century painting *The Execution of Maximilian*, a photograph of which Kitaj included as part of his overall installation'. Kitaj's painting 'shouted out from the Academy's muted green walls with its lurid red palette and shocking imagery', with Kitaj placing himself among 'a group of figures firing at point-blank range into the monstrous, multi-eyed and blood-bespattered head of the eponymous 'Killer-Critic''.[54]

There is obviously far more going on in this complex painting than its explicit reference to Eliot. However, the significance of the incorporation of Eliot to 'correct' him cannot be underestimated, particularly when Kitaj's animosity towards Eliot in his writing is taken into account. Stretched horizontally to the right, near the top of the painting, is a thin band which is largely red and contains, in cursive, the words 'art is the escape from personality'. This is a paraphrase of Eliot's theory in his essay 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' (1919) of poetry being 'not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality'.[55] Kitaj subversively crosses out Eliot's name to which the words are ascribed, crosses out the 'from' and adds 'to' instead, and inserts his own name to which the revised statement is therefore attributed. Applied to art, Kitaj effectively reverses the meaning of the original statement. This might seem merely a rejection of Eliot's critical position in the essay, based on Kitaj's demonstration of artistic practice, but in the bottom-left corner of the painting there is also a row of books which includes a Penguin edition of *An Enemy of the People: Antisemitism* (1945) by James Parkes. An American-born artist of Jewish heritage, Kitaj had been a prominent figure in the British art world since the 1960s. He was elected as an Academician in 1991. Conducting in the painting a 'raging and embittered attack on the kinds of art critics who had long rounded on the Summer Exhibition itself',[56] Kitaj seems to be indicating that anti-Semitism and his Jewish

[54] Ibid., 148.
[55] T.S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (1920; London: Methuen, 1940), 58.
[56] Mark Hallett and Sarah Victoria Turner, *The Great Spectacle*, 147.

background are part of the potent mix which has triggered such a violent artistic response from him. Certainly, in his writing, he scorns Eliot for producing lines of anti-Semitic poetry.

In verse 52 of his *Second Diasporist Manifesto* (2007), Kitaj advocates painting that is contrary to anti-Semitism and quotes from Eliot's 'Burbank with a Baedecker: Bleistein with a Cigar' (1920): 'PAINT THE OPPOSITE OF ANTI-SEMITISM: 'The rats are underneath the piles, the jew is underneath the lot.' – T.S. Eliot'. Kitaj personally addresses Eliot, with enmity and an expletive: 'Hi, Tom. Fuck you in my art each day.' In the painting, as described, Kitaj turns Eliot's theory of impersonality into the opposite. While the reversal is enacted on canvas for posterity, it is evidently not a once-off disagreement with Eliot on a purely theoretical level. Kitaj's writing illuminates, retrospectively, his attitude and approach to Eliot who is clearly an abiding presence and motivation for Kitaj – as a Jewish artist – in undertaking his creative work with intellectual and emotional intensity. Notably, Kitaj's approval of personality – and thus his disapproval of Eliot's theory – appears to derive in part from his esteem for Franz Kafka to whom he dedicates the book as the 'Greatest Jewish Artist'. In verse 444, Kitaj quotes Kafka: 'Art is always a matter of the entire personality. For that reason it is fundamentally tragic.' Kitaj agrees that painting 'is a personality game' and imagines that Kafka taunts him from the Other Side 'to dare a tragic sense of Jewish Art' before he crosses over himself.

Notably, too, his approval of personality also appears to be derived in part from Susan Sontag. In verse 228, he writes that she 'used 'to assume fully the privilege of the personal'' when under attack. He adds: 'That's one of my favorite sayings when I'm attacked for my questionable personal-ity.' Moreover, the 'correction' of Eliot within the painting to assert the opposite, or personality, evidently stems from Kitaj's understanding and application of traditional Jewish practice. In verse 58, he extols the Talmud and recalls that '50 yrs ago I was the first to introduce my own written Commentary on to the surfaces of my paintings' and ever since he has 'done Commentaries about some of my pictures, an ancient Jewish visual form on each page of Talmud'. He reiterates the licence for this practice in

verse 313: ‘THE OPPOSITE OF ANTI-SEMITISM… Jews may write into their pictures as well, like a Talmud page.’ Similarly, in verse 604, he reflects: ‘Commentary about art. How Jewish can you get?’

Kitaj’s overall engagement with Eliot is more complicated, however, than might be gleaned from his negativity towards Eliot in his painting and writing. For instance, in one of the diary entries on the sitting sessions for Kitaj’s portrait *The Architects* (1979-1981), Colin St John Wilson recalls drawing a comparison between Kitaj’s reluctance to meet new people as it ‘gets more difficult as you grow older’ and an anecdote about Eliot saying ‘the older you get…. the more difficult it is to write’. He recalls: ‘RB picks down *Little Gidding* from the shelf and slowly spat out the passage ‘Let me disclose the gifts reserved for age… the cold friction of expiring sense… the conscious impotence of rage… the rending pain of re-enactment... the shame of motives late revealed…’ That made us feel better and so he painted away at my face.’[57] The word ‘spat’ is telling but so too is Kitaj’s knowledge of ‘Little Gidding’ and reading out loud from Eliot’s poetry to his friend.

A sense of esteem for, and indebtedness to, Eliot also arises in the *Second Diasporist Manifesto* when Kitaj returns to what he calls ‘My Commentaries’ in verse 83. He repeats that as a young artist he ‘sometimes put commentaries right on the pictures themselves, in writing. I believe I was the first painter to do that (see 58)’. He reflects that three ‘inspirations excited me in those days: Eliot’s notes to his Waste Land; the Warburg tradition of iconographic commentary to pictures; some Surrealistic practice… Never stop writing onto some few pictures’. In addition to the ‘correction’ of Eliot ‘on’ or ‘onto’ the painting being a sign of both Kitaj’s conception of Jewish practice and his study of ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’, the influence of *The Waste Land* (1922) on Kitaj’s work can also be traced in several directions. As *Dídac Llorens-Cubedo* writes: ‘Eliot's ‘Notes’ to the poem were a model for Kitaj's ‘prefaces,’ short texts supplementing many of his paintings’; the ‘external and imaginative structure [of *The Waste Land*] inspired the composition of Kitaj's *Tarot*

[57] Colin St John Wilson and M.J. Long, *Kitaj: The Architects* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2008), 36.

Variations (1958)'; and Kitaj's *If Not, Not* (1975-1976)[58] 'memorialises the Shoah, also drawing on *The Waste Land* – the definitive text as well as its drafts and critical reception'.[59]

Furthermore, verse 371 is reminiscent of the 'correction' of Eliot: 'You will have noticed by now my constant use of quotations… the real scholar (or Rebbe) speaks and I utter a kind of Responsum.' The importance to Kitaj of modernism can be discerned in verse 391: 'Jewish Art is a different sort of discourse altogether… its salient features are bound to and with what is called Modernism, and its aftermath.' Generally, too, Kitaj's highly intellectual and allusive work can be seen to be, in part, influenced by Eliot's poetry. In 2011, *The Paris Review* reprinted poet John Ashbery's appraisal of Kitaj in 1981. Ashbery argues that if Kitaj's 'pictures could, in some cases, be illustrations for Eliot's poetry, the poetry itself often sounds like an approximation of Kitaj's brushwork'.[60] During what Kitaj called his 'Tate War' (in verses 166 and 176), he was even disparagingly likened to Eliot. *The Independent*'s Andrew Graham-Dixon described him as an 'inveterate name-dropper… The Wandering Jew, the TS Eliot of painting?', concluding mockingly that Kitaj was 'the Wizard of Oz: a small man with a megaphone held to his lips'.[61]

Continuing the 'ballistic' attitude laid bare in the *Killer-Critic*, Kitaj's *Second Diasporist Manifesto* is a lengthy riposte to these kinds of

[58] Kitaj's painting *If Not, Not* is discussed later in this article. It formed part of the *Journeys With The Waste Land* exhibition at Turner Contemporary, Margate, as well as Herbert Art Gallery and Museum, Coventry, in 2018. Lewis's portrait of Ezra Pound was also included.

[59] Dídac Llorens-Cubedo, 'T.S. Eliot in the Art of R.B. Kitaj: Anatomy of an Influence', *The Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies,* 41, no. 2 (December 2019), 123-142.

[60] See John Ashbery, 'R.B. Kitaj', *The Paris Review* (7 March 2011): https://www.theparisreview.org/blog/2011/03/07/r-b-kitaj/. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]

[61] See https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/art-the-kitaj-myth-the-man-who-would-leapfrog-his-way-into-history-on-the-backs-of-giants-stands-exposed-andrew-grahamdixon-on-kitaj-at-the-tate-1425629.html. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]

statements from his critics. In verse 473, he highlights that 'Jewish Commentary by me, about my own pictures, is unacceptable to half the art people'. In verse 56, he encourages himself to 'PAINT THE OPPOSITE OF ANTI-SEMITISM – as James Joyce did… Joyce's Bloom is always alive in me and my art'. In verse 168, he rails against how 'Nazi enemies accused the Jews of 'overestimation of the intellect,' which is a favorite accusation thrown at me and my bookish Jewish pictures. So be it'. His painting and writing are rooted in his powerful sense of Jewish identity, as an American-born artist who had long been prominent – yet an 'outsider' – on the arts scene in the UK. He expresses his sense of identity in verse 492: 'So may my easel-painting waver between image and commentary, both Jewish.' In verse 523, he affirms: 'I belong to 3 tribes: Jewish, American, painter, and this unrhymed poem is a tribal Manifesto like Ginsberg's HOWL or Whitman's Leaves of Grass, but less accomplished.'

Significantly, on the page opposite verse 337, there is a reproduction showing the book title *The Jews (Are They Human?)* which formed part of Kitaj's 'How to Reach 67 in Jewish Art: 100 Pictures' exhibition in Manhattan in 2000. A *New York Times* reviewer of this exhibition notes Kitaj's 'very allusive mind', which might also help to explain his affinity with – rather than merely enmity towards – the allusive Eliot. The reviewer also observes that Kitaj 'simply exhibits an opened book, maybe from the 1920's, laid face down to display that title on its spine'.[62] However, while the reviewer does not venture to name or speculate about the author, this sounds more like Lewis's book of that title published in 1939. Lewis's reputation, as David Bradshaw reports, 'has been irrevocably damaged both by his treatment of Jews in *The Apes* [*of God*, 1930]… and the openly laudatory *Hitler* (1931)' despite 'the publication of both *The Hitler Cult* and *The Jews, Are they Human?* in 1939, in which he renounces his previous enthusiasm for the German leader and his politics'.[63]

[62] See https://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/24/arts/art-in-review-r-b-kitaj.html. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]
[63] David Bradshaw, 'The Apes of God', in *Wyndham Lewis: A Critical Guide*, ed. Andrzej Gasiorek and Nathan Waddell (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), 104.

Lewis's rejected portrait of Eliot was acquired by the Durban Art Gallery in December 1939, escaping the threat of bombs in London following the declaration of war on Germany in September. Eliot's creation of some anti-Semitic poetry is not part of the picture, as it were, in the portrait (and scholarly commentaries) even as its enduring power into the 21st century to draw admirers internationally via exhibitions, print publications and online platforms rests in crucial part on Eliot's literary fame. In this light, Kitaj's targeting of Eliot in his painting and writing exerts a formidable bearing on Eliot's legacy in several ways.

Firstly, Kitaj's negative representations of, but nuanced overall relation to, Eliot rival Lewis's positive but not altogether flattering portrayal of Eliot in the portrait (with their friendship further expressed through their letters). Both Lewis and Kitaj are well-known names in the visual arts internationally so their contrasting versions of Eliot will continue to attract audiences in the multimedia environment of the 21st century. As we have seen, beyond canvas and print, Lewis's portrait has readily adapted to circulation online – not least via journalism. So too has Kitaj's 'Killer-Critic', with journalism again providing impetus. The painting appears, for instance, at the top of a 2013 article on *The Guardian*'s website, with the headline 'RB Kitaj: an obsession with revenge'[64], which is shareable via Facebook, Twitter (now X) and email. The article is about the first UK retrospective of Kitaj's work since his suicide in 2007, jointly hosted by The Jewish Museum in London and Pallant House Gallery in Chichester. The painting also appears at the top of a piece containing extracts from memoirs and diaries on the *Prospect* magazine website ('The way we were: bitterness');[65] and at the top of a 2011 round-up piece on the independent arts journalism site *Hyperallergic*[66] which also refers to Ashbery's appraisal. Beyond journalism, the painting can be found on museum and

[64] See https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2013/feb/10/rb-kitaj-obsessions-tate-war. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]
[65] See https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/culture/46854/the-way-we-were-bitterness. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]
[66] See https://hyperallergic.com/20710/required-reading-7/. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]

arts sites, including the *R.B. Kitaj Studio Project*[67] where its place in the Astrup Fearnley Collection in Oslo is acknowledged. The *Second Diasporist Manifesto* can also be accessed at multiple locations online, including *Google Books*[68] and the *Internet Archive*.[69]

Secondly, by strongly associating Eliot with anti-Semitism, Kitaj invites a level of attention in the art world akin to the critical storm in the literary world caused by Anthony Julius's exploration of the issue in *TS Eliot, Anti-Semitism and Literary Form* (1995), which had been prompted in part by Julius noting there was only brief reference to Eliot in the chapter 'Anti-Semites' in Bernard Lewis's *Semites and Anti-Semites* (1986). Connecting art and literature, Kitaj's powerful expressions of opposition to Eliot's theory (evidently seen as antithetical to the importance of personality in Jewish art) and anti-Semitic lines in 'Burbank' (which had also been quoted in *Semites and Anti-Semites*) are potentially further damaging to Eliot's legacy, especially in having come from a passionately Jewish artist of international standing. In 2003, when a new edition of Julius's book was released, he argued in a piece in *The Guardian* (which is still accessible online[70]) that the issue was 'now even more relevant'. Defending his book, Julius discloses that it 'did not occur to me that there might still be serious disagreement about the anti-semitic nature of parts' of Eliot's work and it was 'not my intention to damage his reputation'. In Julius's estimation, 'by as early as 1922, anti-semitism had ceased to be a resource for Eliot's poetic imagination' although Eliot 'continued to draw on anti-semitic themes in his critical prose'. Having identified five poems as anti-Semitic – namely 'Burbank', 'Gerontion', 'Sweeney Among the Nightingales', 'A Cooking Egg' and the posthumously published 'Dirge' – Julius ultimately proposes

[67] See http://rbkitaj.org/the-killer-critic-assassinated-by-his-widower-even. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]
[68] See Second Diasporist Manifesto: (a New Kind of Long Poem in 615 Free Verses) - R. B. Kitaj - Google Books. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]
[69] See Second diasporist manifesto : (a new kind of long poem in 615 free verses) : Kitaj, R. B : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive. [Accessed 8 August 2024.]
[70]See https://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/jun/07/poetry.thomasstearnseliot. [Accessed 9 August 2024.]

that readers adopt an 'adversarial stance' whereby 'we must contest that poetry, with strategies that acknowledge both its value and its menace' rather than ban, ignore or submit to the poetry. Having also posed the rhetorical question that 'if one is addressed as a Jew, isn't it reasonable to respond as one?', Julius concludes: 'Refusing either to acquiesce in, or to rail at, Eliot's contempt for Jews, one strives to do justice to the many injustices Eliot does to Jews. This is what adversarial reading allows.'[71]

The extent to which Kitaj's intense and combative rather than measured and dispassionate responses to Eliot are compatible with Julius's conception of an 'adversarial stance' is debatable. However, Kitaj's readings of Eliot's theory and lines from 'Burbank' are fundamentally adversarial. Moreover, and thirdly, his expressions of opposition are striking not only for targeting Eliot so specifically and vehemently but also in the context of the persistence of widespread anti-Semitism into the 21st century. As Julius observes, anti-Semitism has not in fact 'dwindled to a marginal, limited phenomenon' since the Second World War and Holocaust. On the contrary, 'anti-semitic propaganda is in global circulation, both on the internet and in printed form'. This profusion of anti-Semitic content, especially online, suggests that the relevance of Kitaj's painting and writing – which invite, in their transmedia forms, renewed attention in the digital age to Eliot's anti-Semitism – will not be diminishing any time soon. Kitaj's own developing posthumous reputation rests to a degree on whether, and to what extent, his works will, in time, destabilize and discredit Eliot's cultural authority as he intended.

Fourthly, in comparison with Julius, Kitaj is extremely provocative by associating Eliot, visually, with the Holocaust. Julius defends himself against claims that 'by describing Eliot as an anti-semite I was implicating him in projects of terror and murder'. He clarifies that to 'describe a person as anti-semitic is not to imply that he endorses the crimes of the Nazis, still less is it to imply that he would be capable of committing them himself. It is to imply, however, that he is careless about the consequences of anti-semitic positions held by others, and that he lacks the imagination to grasp

[71] Ibid.

where Jew hatred may lead'. Significantly, Kitaj's negative representations of Eliot are not so clear-cut. They could potentially compel audiences to see Eliot in not only an ugly but also a culpable anti-Semitic light – perhaps even when viewing Lewis's portrait, which was completed shortly before the Second World War and Holocaust.

Indeed, in 'If Not, Not' (1975-1976), Kitaj had already gone so far as to place Eliot, hard of hearing and in the arms of a naked woman, within a surreal and dismal scene featuring the gatehouse to Auschwitz. As the National Galleries of Scotland website describes 'probably Kitaj's best-known and most complex work':

> the poet is depicted at the bottom left, wearing a hearing aid. The building in the top left corner is the gatehouse to Auschwitz. Below it lies a scene of cultural disintegration and moral collapse. The stagnant water, the dead and blackened trees, and the books scattered about the landscape, speak of death and destruction... The small figure of the man in bed, holding a baby, is a self-portrait.[72]

The exceeding complexity of Kitaj's indebtedness to, yet denouncement of, Eliot which boils over in later works like the 'Killer-Critic' and *Second Diasporist Manifesto* appears to have long since manifested in 'If Not, Not'. Reflective of Kitaj's fascination with *The Waste Land* and linkage of Eliot with anti-Semitism, here encapsulated at its most horrific extreme by the dreadful gatehouse to Auschwitz, 'If Not, Not' confronts us with a hellish vision of a cultural wasteland to which Eliot, deaf and distracted, with his eyes fixed on the naked woman and his back turned, is apparently connected and for which he seems to bear some responsibility.

Repeatedly singling out Eliot in his work, however, is more revealing of Kitaj's obsession with his modernist exemplar than it is about the extent of anti-Semitism among leading literary figures historically. Although Julius describes Eliot as being 'not a typical' but 'instead an extraordinary anti-semite', and argues that Eliot 'did not reflect the anti-semitism of his times, he contributed to it, even enlarged it', Eliot is not an isolated case. As

[72] See https://www.nationalgalleries.org/art-and-artists/644/if-not-not. [Accessed 9 August 2024.]

George Orwell observed in 1944, anti-Semitism 'flourishes especially among literary men… I can think of passages in Villon, Shakespeare, Smollett, Thackeray, H.G. Wells, Aldous Huxley, T.S. Eliot and many another which would be called anti-Semitic if they had been written since Hitler came to power'. He concluded it was 'partly the fear of finding out how widespread anti-Semitism is' that prevented it 'from being seriously investigated'.[73] Such a roll call continues to deeply trouble posterity. With Eliot's enduring cultural cachet and relevance confirmed in different ways by the artistic representations of him by Lewis and Kitaj which have achieved widespread transmedia circulation in the digital age, reflection on his legacy will have to reckon, ultimately, with this perplexing wider context.

[73] George Orwell, 'As I Please 11', in *Orwell in Tribune: 'As I Please' and Other Writings 1943-47,* ed. Paul Anderson (2006; London: Methuen, 2008), 97.

Bibliography

Altieri, Charles. 'Visual Art'. In *T.S. Eliot in Context*, edited by Jason Harding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 105-113.

Chinitz, David E. *T.S. Eliot and the Cultural Divide.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005 [2003].

Crawford, Robert. *Young Eliot: From St Louis to The Waste Land*. London: Vintage, 2016 [2015].

Dickey, Frances and Morgenstern, John D., eds. *The Edinburgh Companion to T.S. Eliot and the Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

Edwards, Paul and Humphreys, Richard. *Wyndham Lewis Portraits*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2008.

Eliot, T.S. *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen, 1940 [1920].

Eliot, T.S. *The Complete Poems & Plays*. London: Faber and Faber, 2004 [1969].

Fundación Juan March; Edwards, Paul and Humphreys, Richard, et al. *Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957)*. Madrid: Fundación Juan March, 2010.

Gardner, Helen. *The Art of T.S. Eliot*. London: Faber and Faber, 1985 [1949].

Gordon, Lyndall. *The Imperfect Life of T.S. Eliot*. London: Virago, 2012 [1998].

Hallett, Mark and Turner, Sarah Victoria. *The Great Spectacle: 250 Years of the Royal Academy Summer Exhibition*. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2018.

Harding, Jason, ed. *T.S. Eliot in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Kitaj, R.B. *Second Diasporist Manifesto (A New Kind of Long Poem in 615 Free Verses).* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007. *Llorens-Cubedo, Dídac. 'T.S. Eliot in the Art of R.B. Kitaj: Anatomy of an Influence'. The Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies, 41.2 (December 2019), 123-142.*

Murphy, Jaron. ''Mr. Eliot has Re-Discovered a Portrait of Himself': Reframing Lewis's Rejected Masterpiece in the 21st Century'. *The Journal of the T.S. Eliot Society* (2018), 69-94.

Orwell, George. 'As I Please 11'. In *Orwell in Tribune: 'As I Please' and Other Writings 1943-47*, edited by Anderson, Paul (2006; London: Methuen, 2008), 95-99.

Rose, W.K., ed. *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis*. London: Methuen, 1963.

Schuchard, Ronald. 'Preface'. In *The Edinburgh Companion to T.S. Eliot and the Arts*, edited by Dickey, Frances and Morgenstern, John D. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), xi-xviii.

Slocombe, Richard and Edwards, Paul (Preface). *Wyndham Lewis: Life, Art, War*. London: Imperial War Museums, 2017.

St John, Colin and Long, M.J. *Kitaj: The Architects*. London: Black Dog Publishing, 2008.