

## Abuse of Criticism: T.S. Eliot and Northrop Frye's Academic Ramp-up to "Fake News"

Percy Bysshe Shelley's "Defence of Poetry" originates T.S. Eliot's 1932 Harvard Norton Lecture on "taste" maligning "a marked swing in his feelings toward Shelley's verse from fervid imitation to contemptuous disdain." Lowe, P.J., 2002. Eliot's acolyte, Northrop Frye, in 1957 follows similar tautology to exclude Shelley's straw-man agonist, Thomas Love Peacock, from *Anatomy of Criticism* commentary over Sir Philip Sidney's "Apology for Poesy," Shelley's obvious rhetorical target. Here we treat Eliot and Frye's **methodologies as a Prigozhin troll factory authoritarian oligarchic academic coup that**, "like the Internet Research Agency, engage in ... 'coordinated inauthentic activity, ranging from the use of false names and the creation of false audiences to the publication of false stories and the creation of divisive narratives.'" Applebaum, A. 2018.

We are the hollow men/ ... the stuffed men/Leaning together/Headpiece filled with straw. Eliot, T.S., "The Hollow Men," 1925

### Introduction

Modern paradigms per "Forensics of a Straw Man *Pharmakos* in Northrop Frye's 'theory of modes.'" Goranowski, 'Int'l J. Knowledge, Culture and Change Management, Volume 10, Issue 32011, p.133. seek "forensics" as the operant word in portrayal of Northrop Frye because the forensic juxtaposes a Princeton University student's civil case, Napolitano v. Princeton University Trustees, 453 A.2d (1983) 263, in New Jersey's appellate court arguing collateral plagiaristic challenge to Northrop Frye paralleling Princeton Press' warhorse canon, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Frye, N.H. 1957), Napolitano failed to use quotation marks in her Gabriel Garcia Marquez essay; Northrop Frye knowledgeably failed to mention the name of the originator lifting "theory of modes" from Thomas Love Peacock's "Four Ages of Poetry" (*Literary Miscellany* 1820) As far as Frye on Peacock:

This is not a new question: it was raised a hundred and fifty years ago by Thomas Love Peacock, who was a poet and novelist himself, and a very brilliant one. He wrote an essay called *Four Ages of Poetry*, ... 'A poet in our times,' said Peacock, 'is a semi-barbarian in a civilized community. ... The march of his intellect is like that of a crab, backwards.' Peacock's essay annoyed his friend Shelley, who wrote another essay called *A Defence of Poetry* to refute it. Shelley's essay is ... not likely to convince anyone who needs convincing." [Frye, N., *The Educated Imagination* 1964 p.27]."

### The Barbaric Bard

Scholarly objection to Frye's plagiaristic palimpsest observes that Percy Bysshe Shelley is indeed convincingly responsive to Peacock. Sidney usefully

alludes proto-linguistic “semi-barbaric” (*see also* Shelley, “Defence”) deep structure to rhyme<sup>1</sup> that codes the recall of the pre-literate bard chanting oratory around tribal camp fires evoking lost legends of Stonehenge to rapt audiences--- as a straw man---the Bard,<sup>2</sup> apparently obeys proto-Plato in moving like Bob Dylan down the road from performance to performance. Rhythmic hortatory is thus historic in English-speaking peoples peaking with the poetic command of Winston Churchill who, yet disdained after WWII, remains the modern “unacknowledged legislator of the world” [ibid.]

The modernity of Shelley’s *Defence* ascends to a quantum state: In it Shelley’s cat, whose “I dare not” of principled uncertainty rivals “I would,” (ibid) superpositions Ervin Schrodinger’s “cat in the adage” [ibid] simultaneously as living as dead. Nobility in the Shelley is ignored by the cookie-cutter “modes” (Goranowski, 2010, id.) of Frye’s unprincipled certainty cannibalizing Peacock’s essay. Frye *supra* tactically ignores Shelley’s sincere rebuke *infra* of his abiding contemporary colleague---Frye invokes only the mechanistic odometer-turning cultural repetition in Vico whereas Percy Shelley’s fugal subject discerns even in the famed digression wherein Shelley argues Peacock “omits the observation of conditions still more important, and more is lost than gained by the substitution of the rigidly defined and ever-repeated idealisms of a distorted superstition for the living impersonations of the truth of human passion” Shelley, *Defence of Poetry*.

At point, Frye acolyte Robert Dunham participates in more Frye borrowing: “*Platonic synthesis vs. Aristotelian analysis*, ... and hundreds of other oppositions. *In the first essay of Anatomy of Criticism alone*” (Dunham, R., Northrop Frye and Giordano Bruno para.3) Frye shoplifts Shelley’s *Defence* opening paragraph: “The one is *the το ποιειν, or the principle of synthesis, . . . ; the other is the το λογιζειν, or principle of analysis*,” [Shelley, 1821 para.1 *emphases intended*] Note how Shelley cites not directly to Plato/Aristotle (whom all of Cambridge have dutifully committed to memory!) but instead merely to the Greek; whereas neither Denham nor Frye deign cite to Shelley!

Shelley’s hortatory debunking of Peacock’s sly diction and casuist argument devises not as foisted Vico but discerns as Shelley’s own anthropomorphic rhetorical structure, difficult to follow but discernable. Nonetheless Peacock still provokes “theory of modes” (Nohnberg in Goranowski, 2011 p.133) in Frye’s

<sup>1</sup>Sidney superposes Shelley: “[F]ault-finders, who will correct the verb before they understand the noun, and confute others’ knowledge before they confirm their own, I would have them only remember that scoffing cometh not of wisdom; *An Apology for Poesy*, 1579 para.53 But that which giveth greatest scope to their scorning humor is riming and versing.... carrying even in themselves a harmony,—para.54 Now that verse far exceedeth prose in the knitting up of the memory, ... being so set, as one cannot be lost but the whole work fails; which, accusing itself, calleth the remembrance back to itself, and so most strongly confirmeth it.”, id.

<sup>2</sup>“The Provençal Trouveurs, or inventors, preceded Petrarch, whose verses are as spells, which unseal the inmost enchanted fountains of the delight [para..]” Shelley, P.B. 1821. Near contemporaneous in 1831, “Wherever poetry has arisen, whether in classic Greece, whether among the Skandanavian scalds, or the Welsh bards, whether in the Northern Trouveur or Southern Troubadour, it seems simultaneously ... to have expressed the impassioned feelings of the people in a lyric shape ... the popular traditions or narratives.” A.E. Miller, “French Novels,” *The Southern Review*, Vol.VII, No.xiv Charleston, SC p.322

pedantry: Peacock' ellipsis of Vico in "Four Ages" stands as guilty of pilferage as Napolitano's ellipsis of quotation marks. Yet the foregoing "Forensic Straw-man" (*id.*) makes clear that literary cannibalism has evolved to its present-day Maryanne Conway "alternative fact" status via a shell game Renaissance reversal touting not only Vico but Machiavelli. We herein discern the specter of plagiarism in 21st century academic publishing as a checkerboard precedent that fails as a chess defense in the Napolitano case. Nonetheless academic collegial cabalism yet evades the fact-check stakes for 21st Century pedagogic literacy that instructs electoral governance as platform politics. The earlier monograph by this author outlined the inveterate controversy of Eliot serving as the strategic font for Northrop Frye's tactical deployment of Thomas Love Peacock's "Four Ages of Poetry" thinly disguised as Vico in "theory of modes" as "coordinated inauthentic activity" (Prigozhin in Appelbaum, *id.*) providing Peacock's cavalier exclusion from the now-canonic *Anatomy of Criticism* Anglican Index. We reiterate James C. Nohrberg from the "Forensic Straw-man" Frye eponym:

The Vico-ized progressions of Frye's theory of fictional modes (from mythical to ironic) ... reworked Peacock's "Four Ages of Poetry" and the three elevations of style for modern criticism. "The Master of the Myth of Literature: An Interpenetrative Ogload for Northrop Frye," [Nohrberg, 2001]

### The Merely Barbaric

In 1911 T.S. Eliot celebrated his Harvard graduation with a tour of Paris memoriously interloping "Eliot later recalled, around the figures of Émile Durkheim, Paul Janet, Rémy de Gourmont, Pablo Picasso. (Bush, R., in Garrity and Carnes, ed., 1999 para.5). It adheres therefore that the classicist element in Eliot, *infra* quantified as anti-Semitic, racist and monarchist emerged as a synthesis of academic and life experience resolved in Eliot's artistic and critical faculty: T.S. Eliot's grasp of Plato's *Republic* Book X (380.B.C.) is implicit given his graduate pursuit of philosophy between 1911 and 1914 during its "golden age" at Harvard amidst Santayana, William James and visiting Bertrand Russell [Bush, *id.*] --- explicit in realization that his first wife, Vivienne, cuckolded him in torrid Roaring 20's fashion with said Bertie. Mendolsohn, T., *NY Review of Books* 2/11/16.

Rejection being bittersweet, Eliot the *philosophe* is discerned as effecting Plato's wining, dining then expelling poets from his *Republic*. [*id.*, Book X] We serve to penetrate the veil of camouflaged modernity, of *avant-garde* adulation cast upon Eliot by his many admirers, chief of whom, Christopher Ricks, a sucker for dubious Nobel recipients as indeed Eliot in 1948 and Bob Dylan in 2016. Ricks and James McCue throw a wide net in the roaring 2016 Volume 1 and 2 of Eliot (Ricks & McCue, *Elliot Annotations* 2016) *ad nauseam* yet fail to catch the fishy political ethos devised by Eliot capitalized by Canadian cohort, Northrop Frye (see generally, *T.S. Eliot, an Introduction*) [1996] plotting to send, rascally radical leftist artistes on down the road. "Bootheel" Bob Dylan himself barely acknowledging his Nobel never responded to Ricks' 2005 *Vision of Sin*, a

preposterously influential critical economia of Dylan, who allegedly plagiarized his Nobel acceptance letter. Sisario B., “Accusations about Bob Dylan's Nobel Prize Letter Kindle an old Debate.” NYTimes 2017, serves small beer: “I try to harmonize with songs the lonesome sparrow sings,” Dylan 1965 “Gates of Eden” downloads “A poet is a nightingale who sits in darkness and sings to cheer its own solitude with sweet sounds” Shelley, id., 1821.

Consider the contemporary Nobel canonization of Bob Dylan as barbaric bard: Shelley’s “the child is to the man what the savage is to the ages,” is candid in Friedrich Schiller’s 1795 presage “just as to human nature in its children, in the morals of country folk” in “Naïve and Sentimental Poetry.” Yet Dylan’s untoward reticence and unmannered indifference to the Swedish Academy argues bardic lucidity. Dylan eschewed ‘critics’ from the beginning excoriating a *Time* Magazine correspondent in Pennebaker’s 1965 *Don’t Look Back* film, “*I won’t be able to talk to you afterwards, I got nothing to say about these things I write. I just write them. I don’t have anything to say about them, I don’t write them for any reason. There’s no great message. If you want to tell other people that, go ahead and tell them. But I’m not gonna have to answer to it*” [ibid.]

Bob Dylan, a Big 10 university drop-out, stylized a critical controversy in the ‘70s abruptly transitioning from his collegiate Folk acoustic fan base to electric amplification expanding his repertoire into working-class Rock and Roll. Indifferent to potential catastrophe, Dylan, *nee* Zimmerman, had just enough exposure to Big 10 literati to change his stage name to echo that of Welsh poet Dylan Thomas; confidant in his own talent, invention and mood swings to pull off a major coup with Cinna’s Roman “mob.” Yet ultimately entered Oxonian Christopher Ricks who cleaned up the Dylan imago more than anyone else, especially where *Rolling Stone* and *New Yorker* critics extolled Minnesotan Dylan material as Shakespearean—sufficient to interest the Swedish Academy. Ricks, to his tasteful Shelley credit, seized Dylan’s barbaric similitude thus to engage the sophisticated sedentary Nobel Committee celebrating Bob Dylan’s itineracy.

So far as the Facebook knows, Bob Dylan has still to correspond or communicate his regret to Ricks, who could just yet slip in and be Nobel’d for just his Dylanic observations superseding all that boring Eliot. Ricks could elevate Bob Dylan over Shakespearean as a superior rhymester, who Bob Dylan clearly is (not to mention Dylan forgoing heavy-footed pentameter favoring foot-tapping ballade).

### Palimpsest

Eliot on how the poet makes something new from what he appropriates strikes me as apposite for understanding Frye’s conversion of indebtedness into new cohesions. I don’t know that what Frye does constitutes allusion, so much as amalgamation.” Nohrnberg, J.C. [email to [rhgorano@uncc.edu](mailto:rhgorano@uncc.edu) 2009.]

For consistency, whereof these times are a-reverting to futuristic fascism in the academic ramp-up to “fake news,” this writer’s earlier Frye eponym evolves

discussion of Dr. Nohnberg's kind communication patronizing Frye's palimpsestry by probing Pablo Picasso's attribution to "The great artist steals." Pablo copied stolen figurines from Iberian artifacts as provenance for *Les Femmes d'Alger* knowingly accepting the statuary as stolen property ironically from the Louvre. Picasso was implicated by Guillaume Apollinaire, whose secretary did the theft. It is indisputable Eliot was aware from the French press over the Mona Lisa heist qua Picasso arrest: Eliot as a post-grad at the Sorbonne in 1911 moreover memoriously interloping with Picasso as above; Oxford Press never implies Eliot knew Picasso; just "recalling." As Picasso said, "God is really another painter, like me," [39] really begging the question whether Jesus Christ was a proto-communist given that Picasso was a real communist, as were his contemporaries Marcel Duchamp and most of that Dada crowd. It is also well-represented that Picasso was nearly deported on the husting of the 1911 *Giaconda* Louvre robbery [Goranowski, 2010 p.143.]

By 1924 Eliot ensconced as the *nouveau Infanta* of 20th Century verse boasted as personal friends his editor, Ezra Pound, Gertrude Stein and Wyndham Lewis, [Jemeson, F., 1979 *Fables of Aggression, the Modernist as Fascist*] all undisputed political fascists; Stein was a Vichy collaborationist who lip-served Petain much as friend Ezra Pound did Mussolini; [Will, B., *Humanities*, March 2012] Later in the pre-war Depression Eliot espoused French fascist author Charles Maurras [ibid] lecturing at the University of Virginia imposing "After Strange Gods" [Eliot, T.S. 1934] glorifying the "unity of religious backgrounds." Eliot eloquently refused to publish his 1933 pronunciamento but earlier cemented his critical reputation as the new Mathew Arnold with *The Sacred Wood* in 1920. Also in 1933, the year of Hitler's "*grosse luge*" takeover:

"The ideas of Shelley seem to me always to be ideas of adolescence [...] for most of us, Shelley has marked an intense period before maturity, but for how many does Shelley remain the companion of age? [...] I find his ideas repellent [ . . . ] Shelley's abuse of poetry does me more violence." [*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* from Norton Harvard lecture 'Shelley and Keats' 17 February 1933]

Thus, episodic intellectual shoplifting, this time Eliot from Shelley's *Defence*, abjures taste itself: "The theory of taste outlined in the Norton lecture breaks down if we apply it to Eliot's response to Shelley. If the mature Eliot has attained 'Taste', why is there such a marked swing in his feelings toward Shelley's verse from fervid imitation to contemptuous disdain?" Lowe, P.J., "Christian Romanticism: T.S. Eliot's Response to Percy Bysshe Shelley" 2002 e-theses Online at 21. *Ergo*, "there is a certain order or rhythm belonging to each of these classes of mimetic representation, from which the hearer and the spectator receive an intenser and a purer pleasure ... an approximation to this order has been called taste," Shelley, "Defence," Thus Shelley originates Eliot's Norton Lecture topic of "taste: baldly restated "by modern writers," namely Eliot and Frye, whence mimetic representation recurs in Frye's highbrow-lowbrow treatment of Renaissance-to-Romantic mimesis of classic Greece-to-Rome

without a word of attribution. . **Eliot's methodology was a Prigozhin troll factory authoritarian oligarchic academic coup.**<sup>3</sup>

### Swerving or Trolling?

Eliot's 1924 "sure test" catalyzing what "Immature poets imitate; mature poets steal; bad poets deface what they take" streams within his essay in *Sacred Wood* on "Philip Massinger," [Eliot, 1920 Ch.15] an Elizabethan Shakespeare contemporary well-known to Wikipedia but less so to Eliot's "unprepared reader" [ibid]. Gallant enough, Eliot "swerves" (Bloom, *infra*) well past the Pygmalions and Earnests etherized among his own collegiality retreating instead from the 20<sup>th</sup> Century *avant-garde* to English Restoration distilled from the English Renaissance by the Puritans of the Glorious Revolution. Eliot's points however gratuitous of Milton therefore are political tweets. Eliot's *Sacred Wood* is literary furniture accessorizing coffee tables like art books.

Nonetheless, observable art follows scientific discovery is discernable via Newtonian optics leading to Renaissance perspective and the camera obscura presaging photographic realism inciting revolt by Cubist geometries derived arguably as Lobachewski's negation of Euclid's parallel postulate. Critically illustrious, "Tears" Eliot abjures abstract expressionism, Dada, not to mention pointilliste impressionism, arrogantly arguing within a preceding *Sacred Wood* chapter in "The Perfect Critic," commingling e.e. cummings with Jackson Pollock: "Mere strings of words flung like dabs of paint across a blank canvas, may awaken surprise ... but have no significance whatever in the history of literature." Eliot, 1920 Ch.1

Imitation has long had a bad rap, especially among spokesmen for modern art. "Immature poets imitate; mature poets steal": T. S. Eliot's often-cited dictum on the subject doesn't pretend that poets get nothing from their predecessors, but it certainly implies that owning up to the debt is a sign of inferiority. The aggression implicit in the theft is presumably justified by the results—the mature poet takes what he likes and makes it his, by which point its origins matter less than what he has done with it. ... Eliot stops short of saying, [w]hy risk being classified as a mere imitator? [Yeazell, R.B., "The Highest Form of Flattery" *NYBooks Daily* 8/7/17]

Yeazell's review of Elizabeth Prettejohn's *Modern Painters, Old Masters: The Art of Imitation from the Pre-Raphaelites to the First World War* virtuously ignores stealing "art" Picasso-style in "*Les Demoiselles d'Avignon*" versus "verse" via Harold Bloom's *Anxiety of Influence* (1973): "strong poets...wrestle with their strong precursors, even to the death," and one of their principal strategies is "misprision"—Bloom's term for the process by which the later poet

<sup>3</sup>Here's the real challenge faced by all the major platforms: ... organizations that, like the Internet Research Agency, engage in what one tech executive calls "coordinated inauthentic activity," ranging from the use of false names and the creation of false audiences to the publication of false stories and the creation of divisive narratives. Applebaum, A., "It's Not Just Russia,," *NYTimes* April 6, 2018.

misreads[. Id.]” Prettejohn, per Yeazell, “openly acknowledge[ing] Bloom’s influence, nonetheless *swerves*,” *id.* We emphasize “swerves” here as an unacknowledged Bloom cite extending from the same essay, “Clinamen or Poetic Misprision,” *id.*, 1973.

### Just Misreading?

Eliot’s bloodless coup in *Sacred Wood* pamphleteering superposes as Frye’s *Ogdoad* attempt ‘not judging but recognizing’ ellipsis of Thomas Love Peacock in *Anatomy of Criticism* as propaganda for the NATO post-Warsaw Pact ‘new world order’ euro by Frye’s demise in 1991. James Nohnberg argues “Frye’s answer [is] a prescient defense of the well-wrought urn of literature against appropriation by cultural-materialist ideologues of New Historicism. The urn may be a literary canon of great works, an aesthetic object with no practical purpose except as a tool for imaginative play or reflection, a museum or library free from censorship, or an educational system not devoted to serving up propaganda or flattering the customers. Yet if the urn declares the taste, breeding, purchasing power, proprietary rights, ancestors, or inheritance of its owner, it favors a political interest by renewing the display, hoard, or temple of which it is always part. *Should criticism detach an object of study from such contexts, or expose its pretensions to objectivity as fraudulent in the first place?*” [*Id.*, Nohnberg, 2001; *emphasis added.*]

The poet-expulsion mandate in Plato’s *Republic* Chapter X was for Eliot and Frye a peevish postgrad political necessity. Yet Platonic irony anomalously respected the itinerant nature of barbaric bardic tradition well enunciated by Homer led about in his blindness to iterate his historic oratory in Greek literacy’s emergence. Plato at least did not advocate imprisoning poets, himself schooled in Homeric tradition and culturally taught to please both his sedentary academic crowd basking in the adoration of each other versus common “mob” adulation of salaciously entertaining still-proliferating wandering bards. Yet by Plato’s time advancement of writing all but obviated the wandering Homeric bard whose musings became glyphic, concretized sufficient to said sedentary academics. Changes in theme, ideation, plot, setting, scansion, *et cetera* coalesced in manuscript covertly revised by the itinerant poet in his invention and mood swings (*see id.*, Dylan 1965: “*I don’t write them for any reason. There’s no great message.*”) produced chaos in the Republic--so disruptive that even the organized chaos of the dialectic corrupted formal logic resulting in (a) Socrates’ hemlock cocktail; (b) oligarchy; (c) Aristotle. The static postulates of Plato, however forgivably accurate, and his student Aristotle’s obvious yet untested inaccuracies, ruled for eons in European civilization, surviving Roman barbarism later enforced by Christian inquisition.

Frye’s further sin of omission ignoring both Peacock and Shelley’s furtherance of Sir Philip Sidney’s riposte of Plato in Frye’s above-indented prattle highlights the cavalier poet’s antithesis to Plato’s oligarchy banishing poets. Frye purposively ignores the import of Peacock’s essay in its crucially historic context

copping to Frye's commission of literary piracy. Otherwise Shelley's eponym on Philip Sidney's "Apology for Poesy" are "cooperating thoughts" pursuing Peacock as vigilantly as Sidney had Gosson. Shelley's defenses *vers* poetic expulsion in the Sidney-Platonic concatenation is difficult to dismiss.

### For Conclusion

"I say the philosopher teacheth, but he teacheth obscurely, so as the learned only can understand him; that is to say, he teacheth them that are already taught." [Sidney, id.]

The question 'whether Frye had Lauder in mind?' quantifies Frye "gaming" of his naïve readers. He slyly prescribed a "naïve" (again as in Schiller) student audience for his colleagues' sententious amusement while baiting considerable literary "sentiment" before attempting him, "teaching obscurely so that only the learned could understand him" – had Frye evoking Fielding's right to allusion to self-justify as Ricks' 'dependence on the reader's recognition' of Peacock? Or was Frye "guilty of the use of paraphrase and the re-employment of ideas or facts that cannot be considered generally known," [Goldgar 2001, id.] as had Princeton's under-specific Napolitano in the exemplary view of academic justice? How do we teach Schillerian sentiment to the naïve? How do we teach law and justice to women? The ultimate irony arises as Bench *dicta* in the Napolitano decision seems gender-berating, given the writing judge, per "recognition of a source," [Wallace, p.25] appears to have read Shelley's *Defence* for form if not content:

Perhaps plaintiff's self-concern blinds her to the fact that the penalty imposed on her, as a leader of the University community, has to have some educative effect on other student members of the community. In addition, *to paraphrase the poet, "the child is mother to the woman,"* we believe that the lesson to be learned here should be learned \*576 by Gabrielle Napolitano and borne by her for the rest of her life. [453 A.2d (1982 263; emphasis supplied.)]

The misguided application of Shelley by the judge ruling for Princeton is the ultimate offensive irony. The thrust of this paper risibly highlighted the double standard between what is acceptable on a canon facultative level and what can be tolerated as imitation in a suborned supervised pedagogic cannon fodder population. The faculty supervisor group supposedly living under a 'publish or perish' axiom, depends on peer review to decide what is tolerable as canon whereas the aspirants subsist on the individual shibboleth opinion of paternalistic parasitic overlords. What guards the Guardians? "Taste?"

The Chronicle of Higher Education published a special report that delved into this debate. [Quilantan, B, "Should Colleges Let Ailing Majors Die or Revamp Them?" 5/20/18] described what was happening at the flagship campus of the University of Illinois and at Assumption College in Worcester, Mass., casting these developments as different harbingers for higher education. Illinois is pairing certain majors in the liberal arts — for example, anthropology and linguistics — with



computer science. Assumption is doing away with a host of traditional majors in favor of new ones geared to practical skills. Goodbye, art history, geography and, yes, classics. Bruni, F., "Aristotle's Wrongful Death, NYTimes 5/25/18.

"The masters make the rules for the wise men and the fools." Dylan, 1965 Such is college; such is middle management, the dreary desideratum of graduation. Those "happy few" allowed to progress to advanced study, especially in today's 'failed' humanities, are absolutely expected to keep mouths shut, ears open and not touch certain areas of the syllabus, such as Shelley's and Peacock's criticism; and commit to memory the Christian orthodoxies of Northrop Frye and T.S. Eliot, however Confucian or Islamic the maternal upbringing. Graduate theses and dissertations gratuitously chock full of references as well as titular eponyms exalt these hierophants. Rousting the university research industry of Frye and Eliot is impossible where "alternative facts" survive as civil liberties. A bright light however must militate on humanist canonizations when such celebration is put in place for strict oligarchic political purposes left uninvestigated by those empowered to (who privately do) know better than proselytizing alternated, adulterated and propagandized Fake News.

## References

- Bruni, F. "Aristotle's Wrongful Death, NYTimes 5/25/18.
- Bush, R., in Garrity A.H. & Carnes, M.C., American Council of learned Societies, ed., *The American National Biography*, New York : Oxford University Press, 1999
- Dylan, Bob, "Mister Tambourine Man" *Columbia Records*, New York, 1963
- Dunham, R., "Northrop Frye and Giordano Bruno," *The Educated Imagination*, University of Toronto Press, 2016
- Domanska, E., "Historographical Criticisms, A Manifesto" in *Manifestos for History* ed. Morgan S., Jenkins K., Munslow, A., Routledge, Barnes & Noble,
- Eliot, T.S., *The Sacred Wood* 1921, "The Hollow Men,". 23 November 1925, in Eliot's *Poems: 1909–1925*, "After Strange Gods" Norton University of Virginia Lecture, 1933,"*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, Shelley and Keats," Norton Harvard Lecture 1933 *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy*, Faber & Faber, London 1934
- Fielding, H. *Tom Jones*, Book XII, 1749
- Frye, N.H. *Anatomy of Criticism* Princeton University Press 1957, *T.S. Eliot, an Introduction*, University of Chicago Press 1996, *The Educated Imagination*, University of Toronto Press, 1964
- Goldgar, Bertrand A., *Imitation and plagiarism: The Lauder affair [Studies in the Literary Imagination, Spring 2001/2006*
- Goranowski, R.H. "Forensics of a Straw Man *Pharmakos* in Northrop Frye's 'theory of modes'" *Int'l Journal of Knowledge, Culture & Change Management* vol.10, no.3 *Common Ground* 2010
- Jemeson, F., *Fables of Aggression, the Modernist as Fascist*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.
- Lauder "An Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Modems in his 'Paradise Lost,'" *The Gentlemen's Magazine* London 1747 No.5

- 1 Lowe, Peter James *Christian Romanticism: T. S. Eliot's response to Percy Bysshe Shelley*,  
2 Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online at 21.  
3 2002
- 4 Mendolsohn, T., "A Different T.S. Eliot, *NY Review* 2/11/16
- 5 Miller, A.E. "French Novels," *The Southern Review*, vol.VII, no.xiv Charleston, SC, 1831
- 6 *Napolitano v. Princeton University Trustees*, 263; 186 N.J. Super. 548 (1982); 453 A.2d  
7 26, 1983
- 8 Nohnberg, J.C.. "The Master of the Myth of Literature: An Interpenetrative Ogdoad for  
9 Northrop Frye," *Duke Journal of Comparative Literature* 2001. Email to  
10 [rhgorano@uncc.edu](mailto:rhgorano@uncc.edu), 4/9/2009
- 11 Peacock, Thomas Love "Four Ages of Poetry" *Literary Miscellany* London, 1820.
- 12 Peckinpugh, S., *Don't Look Back*, 1965
- 13 Picasso, P., Quotations 1925 On-line "*Les Demoiselles d'Avignon*" 1910
- 14 Plato *The Republic*, Athens, 590 b.c.
- 15 Prettejohn, I. *Modern Painters, Old Masters: The Art of Imitation from the Pre-Raphaelites*  
16 *to the First World War*
- 17 Quilantan, B., "Should Colleges Let Ailing Majors Die or Revamp Them?" *The Chronicle*  
18 *of Higher Education* 5/20/18
- 19 Ricks, Sir Christopher. and McCue, J., *Eliot Annotations* vols.1 and 2, Oxford 2016
- 20 Ricks, Sir Christopher, *Dylan's Vision of Sin*, Barnes & Noble, New York, 2005
- 21 Schiller, Friedrich, "On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry (*Über naive und sentimentalische*  
22 *Dichtung*) ca. 1795
- 23 Shelley P.B., A Defence of Poetry
- 24 Sidney, Sir Philip, *An Apology for Poesy*, London 1579
- 25 Sisario B., 'Accusations about Bob Dylan's Nobel Prize Letter Kindle an old Debate' [NY  
26 Times June 14 2017
- 27 Will, B., 'The Strange Politics of Gertrude Stein,' *Humanities* vol.33 no.2 March 2012  
28 *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Spring 2001]
- 29 Yeazell, R.B., "The Highest Form of Flattery" *NYBooks Daily* 8/7/2017