Conclusion

W.B. Yeats and T.S. Eliot have both propounded and practised poetic drama and their theory accords completely with their practice. It is futile to understand their poetic/dramatic art without cognising their world-vision and without grasping their Poetics because the problems which they resolve concretely in their poetic plays have undertones of their world-vision and over-tones of their Poetics. This does not mean that they subordinate their poetic/dramatic art either to their world-vision or to their Poetics because vis-à-vis both they are enthusiastic advocates of the autonomy of poetic drama. For example, Yeats holds that his world-vision, with all its cosmological, mythological and magical reverberations, only provides metaphors for his creative process. Similarly Eliot, with all his religious and philosophical preoccupations, insists upon the autotelic nature of creative writing. All the same, their world-vision and Poetics cannot be separated from their poetic plays as substance cannot be separated from function; perhaps their poetic plays consummate the function of which their world-vision and Poetics envision the substance.

Similar in upholding the nexus of theory and practice, Yeats and Eliot are otherwise antithetical to each other. As F.A.C. Wilson has averred, "Where Yeats and Eliot differ is, essentially, in the type of discipline which they felt the visionary world demanded of them. Eliot, from Yeats's point of view, would be a classic type of the objective (or primary personality): that is, he accepted the Christian procedure of purification through renunciation, and sensing human inadequacy and impurity tried to perfect his life by self-denial." As against Eliot, Yeats "thought of himself, however, as what he called a subjective (or antithetical
personality): that is to say, he preferred the road to visionary experience which leads through the sense of self-sufficiency and joy." So both Yeats and Eliot are men of strong personality, Yeats exults in affirming it and Eliot finds solace in suppressing it. Both are men of strong subjective self in conflict with the objective world: Yeats realises himself in subjectivising the objective and Eliot objectivising the subjective. By superseding the conflict between the subjective self and the objective world, neither Yeats nor Eliot strikes a balance between the subjective self and the objective world in such a way that both may seem to be identical. In this way they both hold the objective world as subject-matter, the truth-content of which lies essentially in the subjective self.

As a result, Yeats and Eliot fail to grasp history as the raison d'être of human life. Holding history as corruption of time rather than its humanisation, they envision the universe as meta-structure rather than as time-space continuum. For example Yeats regards it as an antinomial system opening only predetermined vistas of reality. In line with Heraclitus, Empedocles, Blake, Swedenborg, Vico, Nietzsche and Spengler, he holds the universe to be gyral in which the primary and the antithetical gyres denote the form and content of life with irrevocable predetermination. Eliot also regards the universe as antinomial but between the natural and the supernatural or the human and the divine. In line with St Augustine, St. John of the Cross, Pascal, Kierkegaard, Bradley and Whitehead, he regards the supernatural or the divine as extra-historical and extra-human objectivity that exists in separation of and in parallelism with the
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natural or the human reality. So long as the natural or human reality exists in deracination from the supernatural or divine reality, it is pervaded with history or the past-present-future flow of time. However when it is redeemed by the divine reality, it begins to exist as an eternal simultaneity of the present. All the same in Yeats's gyral system, the primary and the antithetical aspects or features are equivalent though subconsciously he is fascinated by its antithetical aspect. In Eliot's universe on the other hand, the supernatural reality is far more potent than the natural reality but almost obsessively, Eliot is concerned with the natural reality.

Correlative with their vision of the universe and their respective fascination and concern, are the human worlds with which they animate their poetic dramas. In the case of Yeats, this human world is that of the super-country which seeks to mythicise the real world of the countryside. The life of the countryside is pervaded with man's relationship with nature, his relationships with self and society only approximating to this fundamental relationship. Since man's relationship with nature is mediated with labour, it, in the process, creates "the first elements of an intuition of the world free from all magic and superstition." In his effort to mythicise it, Yeats delves deep into its nature and conceives it as an interplay of male and female principles, as "vivid and volatile as it seems in the polymorphous perversity of infancy."

Poised thus, Yeats regards history as anti-history by envisioning it as "myth against myth" or "myth of interconsumption, something living something else's death." He perceives it through magical perspective

because magic sets up immediate rather than mediated relationship between the subjective self and the objective reality. All the same, this magical perspective is magical not in the sense of making magician's magic as the mode of perception but in regarding the philosophical idea of magic as the matrix of his knowledge of philosophy, history and psychology.

In the process Yeats has written poetic plays in which characters and incidents respond to time and history only to the extent to which they are derivatives of space and myth. Even then there is the tendency to spatialize time and mythicize history. No wonder character-action plays of his tragic phase have an element of dispersion in them which seems to separate dramatic structure from lyrical articulation. A complete sense of unity prevails only in his dance-dramas based upon the pentatonic pattern in which the characters have archetypal aura and lyrical articulation the aroma of the lapidary style. Music and dance are suffused into lyrical articulation which then, working through an intertexture of mnemonic images, creates a moment of birth, copulation or death, seeming to be universal in space and eternal in time. In this moment music tends to identify itself with the sound-effect of the lapidary word, and dance with its momentum because dance is "an art of static time, a turning in a circle, a movement without progress" and music in its manifestations "transforms the heterogeneous course of time into the course of the musical process."

T.S. Eliot uses the life of the super-city to animate the world of his poetic plays. Eliot's use of it tends to impart absolute proportions to the life of the city because only by regarding it so can it be impart ever-

present awareness of the supernatural reality. Topographically, the super-city of his vision is the super form of a capitalist city with industrialisation and urbanisation as its essential aspects or features. Capitalist city, as Henri Lefebre has pointed out, "undergoes a remarkable expansion (economic, quantitative, measured in tons and kilometres) and a limited development." When this capitalist city acquires the absolute proportions of a super-city, it automatically becomes "an expression of the boundless maze of indirect relationships, complex mutual dependencies and compartmentations into which human beings are forced by modern forms of living."

People living in the super-city reproduce from within what it shows as landscape from without. So they imbibe built-in-instability within themselves and feel that the traditional ethos nurtured in them by culture, tradition and family is ending on a note of dasein. Reluctant to renounce this traditional ethos but at the same time unable to assert its raison d'etre, they experience life as a paradox which in Thomas Mann's words may be termed as "the poisonous flower of quietism, the iridescent surface of the rotting mind, the greatest depravity of all." From this greatest depravity, human beings can salvage themselves by developing ever-present awareness of life. The core of this ever-present awareness is religious which may come into grasp of man through a feeling of realisation, sense of vocation or benediction.

In all his plays, Eliot poses and resolves this problem of ever-present awareness. He posits his characters upon a singular moment in the life of the super-city, i.e., familial in *The Family Reunion*, social in *The Cocktail Party*, commercial in *The Confidential Clerk* and political in *The Elder Statesman*. Thus posited, they feel themselves lost in nothingness but some guardian so supervenes in their life that from then onwards life becomes meaningful for them. Before the supervention of the guardian, these characters feel the past to be dead and the future unable to take birth. So the present is almost like an ambit for them which they transcend by becoming representatives of characteriological types. In this transformation, articulation hinging upon confession and expiation plays a role of prominent proportions.

The world vision, Poetics and poetic/dramatic practice of Yeats and Eliot tends to make Yeats's play a play-in-miniature and Eliot's play a concrete allegory. Play-in-miniature and concrete allegory transform human life into a moment of eternity rather than moment of history. This is because they hold their world-vision primary and human life only as mode for articulating their philosophy of life. Thus they do not identify philosophy and history at the matrix of life as Lorca and Brecht seem to be doing. No wonder they can assert themselves as poets but not playwrights as Brecht does when he remarks,

"I am a playwright, I show
what I have seen. In mankind's markets
I have seen how mankind is traded. That
I show, I, the playwright."