

EZRA POUND AND THE INVENTION OF JAPAN, I*

DAVID EWICK

It is a good service . . .
that spreads in two worlds,
And binds up an ancient love between them.
I had watched for a thousand days.
I give you largess,
For this meeting is under a difficult law.

—*Nishikigi*

1. 'THE ORIENT FROM ALL QUARTERS'

As early as February 1909 Ezra Pound was visiting Laurence Binyon at the British Museum Print Room and expressing interest in Binyon's work on Japanese art,¹ and by April of that year Pound had joined the 'Poet's Club' at weekly meetings in Soho, where Japanese poetry was much in the air and amongst the forms considered promising in the aim of revitalizing an English poetic that all present agreed had gone stale (Flint 70–71). During this period Pound hardly could have been unaware of the discussions of Japanese art and aesthetics which appeared frequently in the *Times* (Ellis 97–112), and he would have known of Gordon Craig's journal *The Mask*, which from its inception in March 1908 regularly featured discussion of Japanese theatre and principles of art.² Pound read Binyon's *Flight of the Dragon* soon after it appeared in 1911 ('Chronicles' 85–86), and by that summer he was in correspondence with Yonejirō Noguchi.³ Shortly thereafter he would have read Basil Hall Chamberlain on Japanese poetry, and Sadakichi Hartmann's early experiments with English tanka and *hokku*, along with the idiosyncratic studies of Japanese poetry and

drama that Hartmann had published in *Reader Magazine* and the *Forum*.⁴ In April 1913 Pound published 'In a Station of the Metro', and in 'How I Began' in June his first discussion of how he had arrived at that work in a turn to Japanese poetry. He met Mary Fenollosa in September 1913—probably this was arranged by mutual acquaintance Binyon—and was in possession of a first batch of Ernest Fenollosa's manuscripts by November.⁵ That winter, Pound's first with Yeats at Stone Cottage, his work was with Fenollosa's Noh, and his reading was W. G. Aston's *History of Japanese Literature*, Frank Brinkley's *Japan: Its History, Arts, and Literature*, F. V. Dickins's *Primitive and Mediaeval Japanese Texts*, and Marie Stopes and Jōji Sakurai's *Plays of Old Japan* (EP/DS 270, 297; EP & EF, 'Classical Drama' 450).⁶ Pound was 'getting the orient from all quarters', he wrote to Dorothy Shakespear in October (EP/DS 264), and in following months this would continue in fortuitous ways. Noguchi, whose 'What is a Hokku Poem?' had appeared in *Rhythm* in January 1913, and who was preparing the Oxford lectures which John Murray would publish as *The Spirit of Japanese Poetry*, visited Pound and Yeats at Stone Cottage that winter, and through the following year, 1914, Pound worked with the Japanese materials he had found amongst 'old Fenollosa's treasures' (LEP 27). The Pound-Fenollosa *Nishikigi* appeared, without Pound's name appended to it, in *Poetry* in May, 'The Classical Drama of Japan', 'Edited from Ernest Fenollosa's manuscripts by Ezra Pound', in the October *Quarterly Review*.⁷ In 'Vortex' in June and 'Edward Wadsworth, Vorticist' in August Pound allied his own aesthetic with James McNeill Whistler's conceptions of Japanese art,⁸ and in 'Vorticism' in September he outlined the 'Japanese "sort of knowing"'—'super-position' he called it—that had led him to 'In a Station of the Metro', and for the first time, but not the last, suggested that the structure of the Noh provided a way to imagine that a 'long imagiste or vorticist poem' would be possible (471). By early 1915 Pound frequently was meeting at the Café Royale on Regent Street, and elsewhere—Yeats's rooms on Woburn Walk and Edmund Dulac's studio on Ladbroke Road, amongst them—with three young Japanese artists, the dancer Itō Michio, the painter Kume Tamijūrō, and the Shirakaba-ha novelist and playwright Kōri Torahiko (Ewick, 'Notes'). Itō, Kume, and Kōri helped in what ways

they could with Pound's work on the Noh, by singing and dancing, mainly, and in Kōri's case, in addition to singing Noh with an expert knowledge, trained professional voice, and perfect pitch, by arguing in perfect English that Pound entirely had misunderstood the tradition of Noh verse (Kōri 284–85, Sugiyama 160).⁹ Kōri's objections aside, however, by May to December 1915, as Pound was beginning his 'long poem' or 'poem which will resemble the Divina Commedia in length but in no other matter' or 'cryselephantine poem of unmeasurable length' or 'big long endless poem', the terms in which he described *The Cantos* in his earliest unmistakable references to the work (*EP/P* 347, 353, 360; *EP/ACH* 120; qtd. in Stock 184), his most important sources of information of Japan were in place. He had turned to them at the beginning of his 'endless poem' and would continue to do so in important ways and at critical moments for the remainder of his life.

2. BLACK BOUGH RED HERRING

Some of the effects of this in Pound's poetry have been well-documented. By his own accounts of 1913 and 1914 Japanese poetry and art were important models in the development of his Imagist and Vorticist aesthetic, and the *hokku*-derived technique of super-position may be traced not only through his poems of this period, particularly those collected in *Lustra* in September 1916, but also, adapted in increasingly complex ways, through the body of his work. Despite dozens of later studies the best accounts of this remain Earl Miner's in *The Japanese Tradition in British and American Literature* and 'Pound, Haiku, and the Image', both published sixty years ago. That Imagism in general and Pound's work of this period in particular owe to his understanding of *hokku*, or haiku as it more commonly is called now—they are not at all the same but the distinction has been lost in Pound scholarship—is discussed and re-discussed, nearly always with 'the Metro story' rolled out, in dozens of critical studies of Pound,¹⁰ all English-language book-length studies of Imagism,¹¹ and has spiraled through to supersets of people who write about other writers associated with Imagism, other writers associated with

Pound, Pound and *China*, the relation of 'the Orient' or 'Orientalism' to Modernism or to American poetry, and several general accounts of Modernism itself. In other words it has been overcooked, not infrequently by chefs who lack basic ingredients for the recipe.

The short version of how his came about is that Hugh Kenner announced in 1951 that 'the *Pisan Cantos* are full of *hokku*' (*Poetry* 63). Two earlier critics, Torao Taketomo in 1920 and William Leonard Schwartz in 1928, had called attention to a relation of *hokku* to Pound's Imagist verse, but no one paid much attention. Kenner, however, mostly for excellent reasons, has held tremendous sway in Pound studies. His 1951 *Poetry of Ezra Pound*, the book which 'got Pound listed on the academic stock exchange' as James Laughlin later put it ('Some Irreverent Literary History' xii), was but the third monograph on Pound,¹² but it opened the floodgates, and by the time Kenner's inescapable *Pound Era* appeared two decades later at least fifty other monographs on Pound had been published, roughly half of which had rediscovered *hokku* or haiku in Pound's poetics. Kenner revisited the point in *Pound Era* (84), but by then what should have been an interesting footnote had in the current parlance become a meme: Pound and Japan = haiku. This is incorrect in too many ways to enumerate. Those with an interest may see Kanaseki's eloquent deconstruction of the point as early as 1967 and my own recent disgruntled account in 'Imagism Status Rerum' (48–55). The latter explains why, unless we admit that we are relying on stipulative local definitions which have nothing to do with Japanese tradition, what Pound called *logopoeia*—'it does not translate' ('How to Read' 26)—renders 'haiku in English' an oxymoron, not essentially unlike 'limerick in Chinese'.

The central point is that an account of Pound's debts to Japan is done a disservice by repetitions that 'haiku' is its central feature. Pound himself never wrote the word 'haiku'. His more correct '*hokku*' appears in an important way in one essay, 'Vorticism', of September 1914, three references spanning nine sentences on one page and a passing reference in a closing footnote about Noh (467, 471n). That and four further fleeting references, none having to do with his own poetics ('Remy de Gourmont' 419; 'D'Artagnan Twenty Years After' 452; *EP&J* 113; *EP/P* 353) are the

beginning and end of Pound on *hokku*. His work with Noh occupied three years concurrent with the birth of *The Cantos*, many pages in his correspondence, two books, *Certain Noble Plays of Japan* and 'Noh' or *Accomplishment*, and recurred in the most lyrical passages from beginning to end, over fifty years, in *The Cantos*.

The most recent publication which brings important primary Pound documents newly to print is his warm 683 pages of *Letters to His Parents*. Neither 'hokku' nor 'Noh' appear in the index, but in those letters Pound mentions 'hokku' in a single clause in a single letter, only that Michio Itō had translated his *hokku*, i.e., the Metro poem, into Japanese (*EP/P* 353). He discusses Noh with Homer or Isabel in thirty letters, December 1913 to July 1919 (315, 321, 324, 326, 328, 333–34, 339–40, 345, 347, 349, 353–55, 362, 364, 366–67, 369, 373–76, 383–84, 386, 407, 411, 443). This is the equation which should pertain in the scholarship of Pound and Japan, but instead it has been inverted threefold. Even before *EP/P* the evidence from Pound himself has been there all along for anyone to see, but many scholars of the subject have found it easier to parrot earlier scholars on Pound and Japan than to read Pound himself.

3. 'NOH' RECEPTION AND A VOLTE-FACE, OR TWO

From the beginning critical response to Pound's adaptation of Fenollosa's Noh manuscripts has ranged from the derisive to the eulogistic,¹³ but generally, when it has been regarded at all, it has been regarded an interesting failure. This is an assessment sound enough if the primary standard by which it is judged is the accuracy of the translation. Where it is right it is beautifully right, but often it is not right at all, and occasionally it is wrong in grandiose ways. This is a sin usually forgiven Pound's Li Bái, but not often his Zeami, and the critical tendency has been to relegate the latter to a secondary status. In 1917 T. S. Eliot in the little-remembered and less-often-quoted 'Noh and the Image' found Pound's Noh of considerable value to English literature, and Eliot was smitten enough with Pound's discovery of a 'unity of image' in Noh that soon he was at work on a verse drama of his own which explored its possibilities,¹⁴

but by 1918, and more famously, Eliot declared the Noh work ‘not so important’ as *Cathay*, to be ‘rank[ed] among [Pound’s] translations’ and not, like *Cathay*, amongst the ‘original work’ (*EP: His Metric* 23–24). Others concurred, more or less, and then in 1953 the most influential voice in Pound criticism confirmed the discourse, in language strikingly like Eliot’s. The Noh plays are ‘somehow less successful’ than *Cathay* because ‘there is less of Pound in them’, Kenner wrote in introduction to his edition of Pound’s translations. If we put a passage from Pound’s Noh ‘beside...*Cathay*’ we ‘sense a remoteness’, Kenner wrote, ‘a sense on Pound’s part that he is doing something exotic, thin, appreciated rather than lived, that just prevents the *Noh* sequence from standing, as *Cathay* does, with his finest original work’ (13–14).

Pound himself is responsible for some of this. *Cathay* appeared in April 1915, but that the Noh was his greatest enthusiasm from the autumn of 1913 through 1916 is undeniable, and during this time Pound himself did not ‘put the [Noh] work under the category of translation’ but believed rather that he was engaged in a ‘re-creation’ (*LEP* 31). In ‘The Classical Drama of Japan’ in 1914 he wrote that the Noh is ‘as intense...as the ancient Greek drama of Athens’ (*EP & EF*, 451; *CNTJ* 59), and in ‘The Classical Stage of Japan’ in 1915 he placed it ‘unquestionably’ amongst ‘the great arts of the world’ (*EP & EF*, 201; *CNTJ* 3). Thrice between September 1914 and May 1915 he wrote that the construction of the Noh opened the way to a ‘long imagiste or vorticist poem’ (‘Vorticism’ 471; ‘Affirmations VI’ 17; *EP & EF*, ‘Classical Stage’ 224, *CNTJ* 27),¹⁵ and by early 1916 he was writing enthusiastically to his parents that he was ‘doing some “Noh” of his own’ (*EP/P* 367, first qtd. in Slatin 186), a comment Toshikazu Niikura in 1976, not unreasonably, took to be a reference to the early cantos, but in fact Pound, following Yeats, was indeed doing some Noh of his own, two comic fragments based on an understanding of the *kyōgen* and an adaptation of the legend of Tristan and Yseult closely modelled on the *mugen* Noh (collected in *Plays*). Pound’s work with Fenollosa’s Noh continued to appear through 1916, *Awoi no Uye* (*Aoi no Ue*) in the *Quarterly Notebook* of June, *Kakitsu-hata* (*Kakitsu-bata*) in the August *Drama*, and finally in book form, first in September, at Yeats’s request,

published with an Introduction by Yeats at Yeats's sister's press, in *Certain Noble Plays*, and then in January 1917 in *'Noh' or Accomplishment*, which collected the earlier-published 're-creations' and added fragmentary versions and synopses of several other plays.¹⁶ In 1916, a year after *Cathay* and some months after he had begun work on *The Cantos*, Pound turned his thoughts to the Noh in a preface he had prepared for a reading of Alfred de Musset's *Supper at the House of Mademoiselle Rachel*. The plays provided a method for 'reconstructing...the past' which gave him 'the closest parallel to [his] thought', he wrote (*Plays* 23).

By early 1917, however, something had changed. Pound had devoted the better part of three years to the work that appeared in *Certain Noble Plays* and *'Noh'*, but reviews were mixed. The London *Nation* wondered if 'our own past [is] so empty a granary, that we must transplant an exclusive, hieratic, allegorical, and chaste Oriental drama of the fourteenth century to generate a new literature' ('Japanese Masque' 87), and the anonymous reviewer in *Asiatic Review* berated Pound for being 'unacquainted with Japanese affairs', denounced his 'poetical licenses', and enumerated examples of his 'ignorance' of the form (Rev. 77–79). Pound would have been stung by this. *Cathay* had generated controversy, but a prolonged chorus of praise in the avant-garde journals and letters from acquaintances had allowed Pound to dismiss as reactionary the odd fault-finding elsewhere. But beyond Yeats's unrestrained enthusiasm¹⁷ and Eliot's initial reaction, the acquaintances Pound most would have liked to have approved were silent about his work with the Noh, and as the reviews came in even much of the praise would have put him off. O. W. Firkins in the New York *Nation* could not conceal his enthusiasm for the 'spell' of the 'lyric modulations' of Pound's 'plaintive rendering[s]'. They were 'like the rosy wreath which Celia returned to Ben Johnson', and led Firkins to wonder 'how much of [the] fragrance is assignable to the rose, and how much to the lips that have breathed upon it in its passage' (506). This alone would have set Pound wondering about the wisdom of what he had done.

By January 1917 Pound had begun to distance himself from his 'Japanese things', and to extol the virtues of a new method more closely allied with China. He called it 'ideogramic'. Reacting not to the poems of

Cathay but rather to the Fenollosa essay which later would see print as ‘The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry’ Pound wrote to John Quinn two days before ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*’ was published that he found ‘China...fundamental, Japan...not’. Japan was ‘a special interest, like Provence, or 12–13th century Italy (apart from Dante)’, but China was ‘solid’ (*LEP* 102). Pound returned both to the point and to the metaphor in August, in his own review of *Certain Noble Plays* and ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*. The ‘Japanese stuff has not the solidity...of Rihaku’ (Li Bái), he wrote in his ‘Comment’ for the *Little Review*, and ‘is not so important as the Chinese’ (8–9), an assessment which no doubt contributed to Eliot’s abrupt *volte-face* about the work in the following months. To Iris Barry Pound wrote that he no longer ‘believed in’ Noh. It was ‘too fuzzy and celtic, even too “90s”’ (qtd. in Tytell 136). And to Quinn again in June 1918 he wrote that ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*’ was ‘unsatisfactory’. Pound did not believe that ‘anyone else [would] come along to do a better book on Noh’, and he continued to find ‘beautiful bits in it’, but in the end it was ‘too damn soft’ (*LEP* 137).

The lines to Quinn contain a foreboding. Regarding the ‘better book on Noh’ Pound was aware by this date that Binyon’s young assistant at the British Museum, Arthur Waley, had turned attention from Chinese to the Japanese classical literature, and was preparing his own book on Noh.¹⁸ Waley’s first Noh translations appeared in *Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society* in 1920, then in March 1921 in *Nō Plays of Japan*, the most knowledgeable translation of the form to have appeared in a European language. In a bibliography Waley reviewed earlier translations and noted that ‘wherever Mr. Pound had adequate material to work upon he...used it admirably’, but beyond this Waley was, correctly and characteristically, guarded. ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*, despite Pound’s admirable use of Fenollosa’s material, was ‘fragmentary and inaccurate’ (260). Pound would have been stung again. He did not respond to Waley in print, and but for three allusions over the years—in canto 7, which first appeared in 1921 (7/26), canto 21, which first appeared in 1928 (21/99), and a brief passage in *The ABC of Reading* (92), first published in 1934 (see Ewick *JOM* BK34, 38a, 42)—Pound did not mention Noh again in print

until 1938. In a rare turn to the plays in his correspondence of the period Pound wrote to Glenn Hughes in 1927 to inquire about whether a Japanese acquaintance of Hughes might be able to revise his Noh work so that it would be ‘copper-bottomed and...correct in every way’. Pound himself ‘had not the philological competence necessary for an ultimate version’, he wrote, and so without a knowledgeable revision the work would remain but ‘scattered fragments left by a dead man, edited by a man ignorant of Japanese’ (*LEP* 214).

Important Pound scholars, Donald Davie, Herbert Schneidau, and John Tytell, amongst others, turning to these comments, have written dismissively of Pound’s Noh, and most others simply have ignored it. The genetic case, the combined nine hundred pages of Kenner’s *Poetry of EP* and *Pound Era*, finds room for four pages on the subject (222–23, 282–83). And so the tradition of relegating Noh to a secondary status in the Pound canon has continued. Pound scholars know that ‘China is fundamental’, the Noh ‘too damn soft’, and Pound’s work with it the ‘fragments [of] a dead man, edited by a man ignorant of Japanese’. To dismiss the work on the basis of Pound’s assessment of 1917, however, or to elide it in a study of the important sources of Pound’s poetics and methods of representation, represents a serious misunderstanding.

*

The first point to be made in this regard is that to read much into Pound’s distinctions between China and Japan during this period mistakes the degree of his understanding of either. Many sources were available, and Pound’s intuition about them was in particular matters remarkable. But particularly regarding Japan even the best of European and American scholarship was in its infancy, and Pound did not have information enough to draw extensive conclusions. Between 1914 and 1917 he understood bits and pieces, regarding particular conceptual principles in Noh more by 1917 than any writer in English, but he was no expert nor claimed to be, the occasional overflowing of bravado aside. Pound knew more than most in the Anglophone world, and more of Japan than China, but rightly we do

not read *Cathay* for its exacting scholarship, nor should we ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*, nor should we dismiss the importance of *Noh* in Pound’s work because for a time he believed it less ‘solid’ than *Lǐ Bái*. In the article ‘Chinese Poetry’ published in April 1918, three years after *Cathay*, Pound mistakenly draws every example from the Japanese, and even twenty years later, in a chapter on Chinese history in *Guide to Kulchur*, he admits that ‘to separate what is Chinese and what Japanese needs more knowledge’ than he has or is ‘ever likely to come by’, and adds not unreasonably that he is not alone, that virtually the whole of the West exists ‘in a thick fog of ignorance’ about both civilizations (276).

A second point is closely related, and anticipated in Eliot’s 1918 turnabout regarding Pound’s work with the *Noh*. The only evidence Eliot provides that ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment* is less ‘solid’ than *Cathay*—note Pound’s metaphor in Eliot’s evaluation—is not about Pound’s *Noh* but rather his audience. The ‘attitude’ of the *Noh* plays ‘is less usual to us’ than that of the Chinese poems, Eliot wrote (*EP: His Metric* 23–24), and he was right. Pound in *Cathay* may have been ‘the inventor of Chinese poetry for our time’, as Eliot so famously put it a few years later (Introduction xvi), but the point addresses a stylistic and conceptual rather than a historical matter. *Lǐ Bái* and *Wáng Wéi* had been around in translation in English for more than a century. What is remarkable about *Cathay* is not that it brought Chinese classical verse to English—many other popular monographs published in London and New York had done that—but that Pound was able to make the voices and stances and even the occasions of the poems resonate with contemporary European and American preoccupations, and in a contemporary idiom. But the *Noh* was different. Pound himself had written in 1914 that it was amongst the ‘least known arts of the world’ (*EP & EF*, ‘Classical Drama’ 450), and if the ‘world’ is accounted Europe and North America this is correct. The first mention of the plays in a European publication, by Algernon Mitford, interpreter at the British Legation at Edo, appeared but forty-two years before Pound received Fenollosa’s manuscripts. Fenollosa was the first American to discuss *Noh* in print, Pound the second, and it was largely Pound’s work which brought the plays to the attention of readers of English.

But not only was the Noh unfamiliar to British and American audiences. It also was, as Pound put it in 1915, amongst the 'most recondite' of the world's arts (EP & EF, 'Classical Stage' 201; *CNTJ* 3). He could bring voice to the Bowmen of Shu and England heard its sons at war in a far country and longing for home ('Will we be let to go back in October?'), but how to bridge the conceptual gap that divides English from Noh? Mitford was fluent in Japanese and aided by a helper trained in the tradition but had found the plays 'utterly unintelligible' (138); Chamberlain, first professor of Japanese philology at the Imperial University at Tokyo, believed the 'manner of representing' in the Noh so 'peculiar' that an accurate English version would be 'impossible' (27); Aston, author of the first history of Japanese literature in a European language, was as puzzled by the plays as Mitford, and as sure of the impossibility of their translation as Chamberlain (205–06); and Stopes, collaborator on the first monograph on Noh in English, found it necessary to forewarn her readers of 'the extreme remoteness' of the form 'from everything to which we are accustomed' (2).

In the beginning Pound himself would not have been aware of what he was getting into, but then, extraordinarily, he was. Not many of his readers followed the intuition, however. The Noh is a 'form of perception', Pound wrote in 1915, as 'precise' as any 'scientist's statement', but Europeans were 'still so bound by Aristotle and Aquinas' that they could not accept the very different nature of the categories of perception implicit in the Noh plays ('Affirmations VI' 19). Pound himself had found *Takasago* 'incomprehensible' until he began to understand its 'perfect...construction', which relied on a 'sense of past time in the present' unlike anything in European dramatic convention (*L/ACH* 110–11). But how to bridge the gap? Yeats found the plays congenial because he perceived in them a parallel to the legends of the Irish countryside and his own preoccupations with the spirits of the dead 'dreaming back' their passions in the world of the living (*Per Amica* 359–60), but few readers were so intimately acquainted with Swedenborg and Soho mediums, and in any case Yeats was no bellwether of popular taste. Most didn't get it, or like Firkins got the wrong thing. The fact in the end is that most who read

Pound's Noh simply did not understand it. 'We in the West are not in a position...to arrive at a full appreciation' the *Saturday Review* put it in 1917 (Rev. 527), the London *Nation* that the work is 'alien to our habitual atmosphere of art' ('Japanese Masque' 87). This has not changed in significant ways through the years, even for many who in influential ways have shaped reception of Pound's work. In this regard it is true that Pound's Noh was unsuccessful. Whether the error lies in the work or the reader remains an open question, though, and in any case to say that Pound's Noh has not been widely understood is not to say that it did not figure in important ways in things to come.

The idea that the Noh was of minor importance to Pound has grown in part from lack of understanding of the Noh itself, but it also misreads or fails to read at all much of Pound. Between 1913 and 1916 he made large claims for the plays, and even as he expressed the doubts of 1917 he reserved praise for particular 'bits' of the work. Had he found nothing in Fenollosa's notes but the 'truly Homeric laughter' at the end of *Kagekiyo*, he wrote in his review of 'Noh', he 'should have been well paid for the three years' he devoted to the plays ('Comment' 9). Pound's silence about them in following years reflects disappointment in their reception, his inability to make them 'copper-bottomed', and many other preoccupations, but then his enthusiasm for the Noh returned, one might say with a vengeance, sometime before *Guide to Kulchur* appeared in 1938.

4. TEXTS MISLAID

To be fair to Pound scholars who have been dismissive of or altogether elided Pound's Noh, the slow and nearly-random process of archival material finding its way to print has played a role in the misunderstanding, as has Pound's history of having his work with Fenollosa's manuscripts having been mislaid by editors or going missing in the mail, and a history of not retaining a copy of the manuscripts he had edited and sent to editors to be mislaid or to go missing in the mail. Two of Pound's most important accounts of his understanding of the significance of Fenollosa's Noh, for example, in 1915 already were lost and would

remain so for most of the twentieth century. ‘Affirmations VI: The “Image” and the Japanese Classical Stage’, which Pound intended as part of his extended ‘Affirmations’ series in A. R. Orage’s London-based *New Age*, somehow became switched with another ‘Affirmations VI’ and went missing. The essay is central to Pound’s understanding of the ways the ‘form of perception’ and ‘succession of images’ in *Noh* opened the way for ‘a long imagiste poem’, but today we would not know it had existed had it not been amongst Pound-Fenollosa papers donated anonymously to the Princeton University Library in 1991, seventy-six years after Pound sent it to Orage, presumably, and it went wherever it went other than into the pages of the February 15 *New Age*.

Likewise later in 1915. A seven-page typescript of Pound’s version of *Takasago* was amongst the papers donated to Princeton. But also in July 1915, after Pound had begun work on *The Cantos*, he sent an introduction and his edited version of the *Noh Takasago* to Alice Corbin Henderson for consideration at *Poetry*. The ‘flawless structure’, ‘perfect construction’, and ‘sense of past time in the present’ of *Takasago* made it ‘the very core of the “Noh”’, Pound wrote (*EP/ACH* 110). He subsequently wrote to Harriet Monroe that *Takasago* would provide ‘roughly the theme’ of his long poem by then underway (qtd. in Slatin 186). But neither Pound’s introduction nor the Pound-Fenollosa *Takasago* itself appeared in print anywhere during Pound’s lifetime. These too are central to his understanding of Fenollosa’s *Noh*, and to the birth of *The Cantos*. But Monroe apparently rejected the work, Henderson apparently mislaid it, Pound himself apparently had not retained a copy, and the introduction and play were unknown to scholarship for seventy-eight years, until Ira Nadel, looking for something else, discovered them amongst the Pound-Henderson papers at the Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas and published them with important commentary in his 1993 edition of the Pound-Henderson letters (xxii–xxiii, 110–17).

Likewise Pound’s own *Plays Modelled on the Noh* of 1916. Pound intended one of them to be performed along with Yeats’s *At the Hawk’s Well* in its famous first productions of April 1916 (*EP/P* 362, 364). In a related talk on ‘[Alfred] De Musset’s “A Supper at the House of

Mademoiselle Rachel” Pound wrote that the reconstruction of the past in Fenollosa’s *Nishikigi* ‘gives me the closest parallel to my thought’ (*Plays* 23). This is concurrent with the earliest composition of the earliest Cantos. But the plays themselves and Pound’s discussion of the ‘Japanese emotion’ which had allowed him to proceed with them, and with the earliest Cantos, were unknown to scholarship until Donald Gallup found them in the Pound archive at Yale and published them in 1987. Other Pound manuscripts from Fenollosa’s notebooks are missing still, all of those published as ‘The Classical Stage of Japan’ in the May 1915 *Drama*, for example, which constitute about half of ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*, and but for several unlikely turns a similar fate would have befallen, nearly did befall, *The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry* (Ewick, ‘Instigations of EP by EF, I’).

5. KULCHUR

Nonetheless, missing manuscripts aside, the 1938 *Guide to Kulchur* marks the re-emergence of Pound’s interest in Noh, in the chapters ‘Tradition, II’ and ‘Savoir Faire’, but in dozens of other instances between 1938 and 1942 Pound turned to Noh and his sense of its importance for the European tradition. During most of this time he was in Rapallo and cut off from sources of information of Britain and the United States, and from outlets for publication in English. Shortly before the war he had begun correspondence with a young Japanese poet, Kitasono Katue, whose magazine *VOU* Pound greatly admired (*EP&J* 25–128; Solt 111–35; Ewick *JOM* D29), and it was largely in correspondence with Kitasono and as the unlikely ‘Italian Correspondent’ for the *Japan Times* of Tokyo, a position arranged by Kitasono, that Pound set forth his views on the Noh and much else during this period. As much of this writing as has been found has been collected by Sanehide Kodama in *Ezra Pound and Japan*, and other texts in which Pound turned to the Noh during these years, transcripts of his broadcasts for Rome Radio, have been made available by Leonard W. Doob in ‘*Ezra Pound Speaking*’.

What one comes away with in reading Pound on the Noh in these

volumes is unmistakably that he had come once again to believe that the plays represented something profoundly missing in English letters, but also, as in other matters, that his increasing isolation led finally to ideas obsessive and little short of delusional. Recurring themes are that the West needs a set of bilingual or trilingual editions of the Noh and a set of films of the entire Noh canon, that *Aoi no Ue*, *Kagekiyo*, *Kumasaka*, and *Nishikigi* are of particular beauty, that Kume, who had helped with the Noh work of 1915, was well-remembered, well-loved, and badly missed, but also that the fourteenth-century Japanese drama demonstrated that twentieth-century Japan was a high civilization wrongly bated and forced into war, and that the war itself might be brought to an end if only the United States and Japan might be persuaded to make a simple trade: Guam for 'one set of color and sound films of the 300 best Noh dramas' (RSWWII 384). Pound raised the issue quite seriously both on Rome Radio and in a letter to the Japanese Ambassador to Italy (*EP&J* 112, 249). No new insight into the Noh is to be found in Pound's writing of these years, only the renewed enthusiasm, and ultimately this would be of small significance but for one thing: Pound's love of the Noh and belief in its regenerative possibilities is still there, mitigated by loss and mediated in much more remarkable ways, at Pisa. Donald Davie wrote in 1964 that Pound's Noh was a 'blind alley' (47), but what Davie could not see from where he stood was that twice thirty years apart that alley opened out into *The Cantos*.

In an interview in 1960 Pound told Donald Hall that he began *The Cantos* 'about 1904' (38), but his earliest unmistakable references to the poem date, as noted above, from letters of 1915. The 'problem' at the beginning, Pound told Hall, had been 'to get a form—something elastic enough to take the necessary material' (36). There are indications that he worked to find this form for some time, and references that indicate abortive starts on the poem—Dorothy Shakespear refers to his 'long poem' in a letter of December 1911, for example (*EP/DS* 82)—but the clear evidence is that Pound's work on the poem we now call *The Cantos* began in 1915, at the height of his early infatuation with Noh, and that for a time he believed he had found in the plays the form for which he had been searching. The second part of this essay will address that part of the story.

NOTES

* This is the first part of a longer essay. The second will appear in this journal in 2018. An earlier version lacking reference to significant materials which have come to light recently appeared in 2003 in *Japonisme, Orientalism, Modernism: A Bibliography of Japan in English-Language Verse of the Early 20th Century*. Page references to Pound's *Cantos* are to the 13th printing of the New Directions *Cantos of Ezra Pound* and follow standard practice in noting canto and page number in that work. Page references to Pound's work with Noh ordinarily are double: for the sake of chronology they note the earliest publication, for the sake of accessibility the most readily available, the New Directions *Classic Noh Theatre of Japan*. Where the texts vary I have preferred the former. I have preferred 'Noh' to the more strictly correct 'no' not only because it is the Romanization Fenollosa and Pound (and Yeats) used but also because it has become conventional in Pound scholarship. Standard abbreviations of titles are employed in parenthetical references:

CNTJ: *Classic Noh Theatre of Japan*

EP/ACH: *The Letters of Ezra Pound to Alice Corbin Henderson*

EP/DS: *Ezra Pound and Dorothy Shakespear: Their Letters, 1909–1914*

EP&J: *Ezra Pound and Japan*

EP/JQ: *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn, 1915–1924*

EP/P: *Ezra Pound to His Parents: Letters 1885–1929*

EP/WCW: *Pound/Williams: Selected Letters of Ezra Pound and William Carlos Williams*

LEP: *The Letters of Ezra Pound*

RSWWII: "Ezra Pound Speaking": *Radio Speeches of World War II*

I am grateful to Rupert Arrowsmith, Eiichi Hara, Lucas Klein, Dorsey Kleitz, Andrew Houwen, Tateo Imamura, Ira Nadel, Mary de Rachewiltz, and Haun Saussy for conversations and correspondence which have helped with the essay. Errors and indiscretions, of course, are mine alone.

1. Laurence Binyon (1869–1943) was the foremost European authority on Japanese art in the early decades of the twentieth century. Pound first met him in January 1909 (Wilhelm 19) and first visited him in the Print Room on 9 February (Hatcher 157). Pound was present for at least one of Binyon's lectures on 'Art & Thought in East & West' at the Small Theatre of the Albert Hall in March 1909 (Ewick JOM BC34a), and continued visiting Binyon at the Print Room at least into 1913. In a 1915 review of Binyon's *Flight of the Dragon* Pound criticized Binyon for having 'not sufficiently rebelled', but reserved high praise for his intellect and work on East Asian art ('Chronicles' 85–86). Twice in *The Cantos* Pound fondly recalls 'Bin-Bin' at the Museum (80/526–27; 87/592). The earliest studies of the degree to which Binyon was an instrumentally formative influence on Pound's understanding of Japan were by Terrell ('Na-Khi') and Holaday, but the relation recently has been explored sharply and anew by Arrowsmith (154–63) and Houwen (235–29). For the fullest accounts of Binyon's understanding of Japan itself see Hatcher (63–89, 243–69) and Ewick (JOM BC).

2. Edward Gordon Craig (1872–1966) was for many years the most influential theorist of the theatre in Europe, and particularly in his journal *The Mask* turned often to principles derived from an understanding of Noh (Ewick JOM D17). The connection between Pound

and Craig comes primarily by way of Yeats, whose theories of an 'anti-theatre' deeply were indebted to Craig. Pound himself, writing of Noh in 1915, noted that it represented a 'theatre of which both Mr. Yeats and Mr. Craig may approve' (EP & EF, 'Classical Stage' 202; *CNTJ* 4).

3. Some of Pound's correspondence with Noguchi (1875–1947) may be found in *EP&J* (4–5, 13). After initially finding Noguchi's poems 'rather beautiful' (*EP/DS* 44) Pound grew skeptical of his talent (*EP&J* 216; *EP/ACH* 66), but there can be no doubt that between 1911 and 1913 Noguchi was an important source for Pound's knowledge both of Japan and of Japanese poetics (Iwahara; Hakutani 27–46; Ewick *JOM* D15a).

4. Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850–1935) was the most widely-regarded European translator of Japanese poetry before Arthur Waley, and has been suggested to have been amongst Pound's chief sources of information about 'hokku' (Harmer 133). Pound himself does not mention Chamberlain in print, but he would have been aware of Chamberlain's *Classical Poetry of the Japanese*, since that work is cited by Stopes, who is amongst the writers on the Noh acknowledged both by Pound and Yeats in their earliest work drawing upon Noh. Sadakichi Hartmann (ca. 1867–1944) has been oddly overlooked in earlier studies of the shaping of European and American literary conceptions of Japan, but surely he was amongst the most important intermediaries in the early years of the twentieth century (Ewick *JOM* D12). In 1904 he outlined the history and methods of haiku and tanka, and associated these, eleven years before F. S. Flint, with *vers libre*. By June 1912, sixteen months before Pound met Mary Fenollosa, Hartmann had published an account of Noh which anticipates in striking ways the idiom both Pound and Yeats would use in their own later discussions of the form. The question of when Pound met Hartmann, then, is of more than passing interest, but the information probably is lost. Kenneth Rexroth states flatly that Pound 'derived much of his taste and many of his ideas' from Hartmann (Foreword ix), and surely by 1938 Pound's affection for Hartmann was considerable: 'if one hadn't been oneself, he writes in *Guide to Kulchur*, 'it wd. have been worth while to have been Sadakichi' (310). The earliest record of the friendship traceable in the published record, however, points to an acquaintance already established in 1924, in a letter mentioned in passing by Wilhelm (342). The Lilly Library copy of a 1926 reprint of Hartmann's hand-bound 1916 *Tanka and Haiku*, probably the first collection of 'haiku in English', issued in an edition of 200, bears the inscription, in Hartmann's hand, 'To Ezra Pound. Greetings!'

5. Mary McNeill Fenollosa (1865–1954) was the second wife of Ernest Fenollosa, about whose importance see Brooks; Chisolm; Yamaguchi; Ewick, 'Instigations I', 'Instigations II', and *JOM* D10; and, especially, for seminal updates of Fenollosa scholarship, Saussy; Saussy, Stalling, and Klein; and Stalling. Fenollosa's manuscripts in Pound's hands became *Cathay*, *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*, "Noh" or *Accomplishment*, and *The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry*. Nadel provides dates and data for three meetings between Pound and Mary Fenollosa (*Cathay* 23–29). She and Pound remembered differently the details of these meetings and Pound's acquisition of the manuscripts (Pound, "An Interview" 177; Pound, "EP: An Interview" 49; Mary Fenollosa qtd. in Chisolm 222, n. 3), but however it happened the results changed the course of Anglophone verse.

6. Pound twice in print acknowledges a debt to Marie Stopes (1880–1958) (EP & EF, 'Classical Drama' 450; 'Classical Stage' 207; both omitted in *CNTJ*), whose *Plays of Old Japan* was an important source not only for Pound but also for Yeats (Ewick *JOM* D23). By January 1914 in private correspondence Pound was dismissive of 'earlier attempts to do Japanese in

English: 'The poor scholars have done their bungling best', he wrote to Harriet Monroe, but the results were 'dull and ludicrous' (*LEP* 31). This is not a fair assessment, and perhaps has something to do with a rejection. Stopes recalled years later that in 1913 Pound solicited her help with the Fenollosa Noh manuscripts, but she had turned him down because 'he knew nothing whatever about the subject' (qtd. in Ishibashi 180). For notes about the importance of Aston, Brinkley, Dickins, and Stopes to early understanding of Japan and Japanese subjects see Ewick *JOM* D13, D14, D3, and D23. Pound rightly had a particular regard for Brinkley, author of the 'the best books on Japan that have been done' as Pound put it to his father in a 1918 letter (*EP/P* 411).

7. 'We will not mention who did the extracting', Pound wrote to Harriet Monroe with his submission of *Nishikigi* (*LEP* 31), and so the work first appeared 'translated... by Ernest Fenollosa', Pound nowhere in sight, beginning a dizzying series of permutations about how Pound, and Pound scholars, have treated the authorial provenance of Pound's work with Fenollosa's manuscripts. The four books which resulted each have a different permutation, three have further variations in reprint editions, and the periodical publications offer more than a dozen variations in stated authorial or editorial provenance. See Saussy (178–79n 16) and Ewick ('Instigations of EP by EF, I' 54–57) for further on this. I take Pound at his word that the Noh plays he published from 1914 to 1917 are 're-creations' (*LEP* 31) of Fenollosa's manuscripts, and so I consider them and write of them as Pound's work in collaboration with Fenollosa, despite the two having never met. Fenollosa died in London in September 1908, thirty-eight days after Pound, 'knowing no one', arrived in the city with £3 in his pocket ('How I Began' 707). The body of scholarship which traces Pound's omissions, additions, and emendations to the manuscripts generally supports this reading (Johnson; Tsukui; Murakata; Miyake, Kodama, and Teele; Saussy; Saussy, Stalling, and Klein; Stalling), with some evidence also of Yeats's hand in the earliest published versions (Katō; Chiba). Beyond this, for those to whom origins are of interest, the clear evidence is that it was not Fenollosa but rather his student Hirata Kiichi (1873–1943) who most fully was responsible for the translations which found their way to Pound (Johnson 51–52; Murakata 234–45; Furukawa 87–94; Yamaguchi 2: 251–87).

8. By Pound's Vorticist period Whistler (1834–1903) had become in Anglophone and Francophone avant-garde circles essentially a metaphor for Japanese aesthetics (Ellis 90–91; Miner, *Japanese Tradition* 76–87). The best account of the reasons for this remains Berger, 33–47.

9. In English-language scholarship the story of the importance of Pound's acquaintance with Itō (1894–1961), Kume (1893–1923), and Kōri (1890–1924) mainly has been told incorrectly (Itō), sketchily (Kume), or not at all (Kōri). In 1948 the usually-careful Richard Ellmann was the first to write that Itō had been a Noh dancer in Japan (214), an erroneous assertion which for years was orthodoxy in Pound and Yeats studies. Itō himself clarifies the matter unambiguously in both of his works which address his acquaintance with and love for Pound and Yeats during their time together in London, as do several other writers in Japanese, including Fujita in the only full-length biography of Itō. The fullest work on Itō in English remains Caldwell, recently and usefully supplemented by Kleitz. Anyone with an interest in Itō or his relation with Pound or Yeats will be rewarded by waiting for work to appear from Tara Rodman, who knows more of Itō than anyone living. Pound recalled his affection for Kume, whose name Pound usually had Koumé, throughout his life (*EP/P* 366–67,

370, 374, 386–87, 411, 489, 501, 535; *EP&J* 72; *RSWWII* 386, for example) and acknowledged Kume’s instrumental help with his Noh work (*LEP* 282), but beyond passing remarks for many years the only account of the warm friendship was Tsunoda, in Japanese, followed more recently, and thankfully, in English, by Imamura. Seventeen of Kume’s letters to Pound are collected in *EP&J*. Pound’s responses probably were lost in the 1923 Kanto earthquake, in which Kume himself died. In recent years Kume’s importance as a modernist artist has been recognized most notably by Omuka. Kōri, with whom Pound met frequently in 1914 and 1915 and became a ‘friend’ (Nishiwaki 50), was a Japanese novelist and playwright whose work for the London stage, two plays performed at the Criterion, was directed by Edith Craig—Ellen Terry’s daughter, Gordon Craig’s sister. Kōri lectured at SOAS on Japanese literature, including at least once on Noh. His *Collected Works* run to fifteen-hundred pages in three volumes and he is the subject of a full-length biography in Japanese, by Sugiyama, and a significant presence in any study of the *Shirakaba-ha* or “White Birch” writers, a major literary movement of Taishō Japan. Romanized variations of his name or pen-name, Kayano Hatakazu, in Anglophone Pound scholarship appear in no fewer than fifteen variations, most of them unrecognizable, all of them wrong, until the matter was clarified in 2012 (Ewick, “Notes”). Both Itō and Kume are remembered warmly in *The Pisan Cantos* (76/482; 77/489). Kōri does not recognizably appear in the poem, although Pound begins the tradition of getting his name wrong to the point of near incomprehensibility in a letter of September 1915 to John Quinn (*EP/JQ* 49). Itō, Kume, and Kōri would have been the “‘very much over-civilized’ young men to whom the Noh was familiar’ and from whom Pound had learnt what he knew of the form in practice, as he recalled in the *Japan Times* in 1940 (*EP&J* 185), and also the ‘Japanese players’ Yeats recalls in his introduction to *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*, with whom he had ‘lately studied certain...[Noh] dances’, which in turn led him to understand the ‘triumph of their art’ and opened the way for *At the Hawk’s Well* and his later ‘Noh’ plays (153, 158).

10. For example Kenner, *Poetry* (62–63) and *Pound Era* (84); Albright (136); Beech (40); Brooke-Rose (98–101, 159); Dasenbrock (108, 112, 200–04, 224); three contributors to Dennis (2, 108–09, 160); Kuberski (80); Laughlin (*Pound as Wuz* 132); Moody (209); four contributors to Nadel’s *Cambridge Companion* (2, 31, 49, 60); four others to Nadel’s *EP in Context* (69, 224, 318, 336); Norman (99); Perloff (220); Reck (25); Schneidau (31, 188); Stock (63–64), Terrell (*Companion* II 551, 566); Tiffany—who at least adds an interesting twist — (49–50, 157); two contributors to Tryphonopoulos and Adams (124, 163); Tytell (73); Wilhelm (334–34); Witemeyer (34, 126, 142); Yip (23–24); and countless periodical versions of same.

11. Carr (188–94 and frequent other references throughout); Coffman (159); Gage (17, 89); six of thirteen contributors to Gery, Kempton, and Stoneback (twenty-one references to ‘haiku’, for which see index entries for ‘Imagism(e) - Asian poetics’ and ‘Pound - Asian poetics’); Harmer (132–34); Hughes (54–55); Huang (122); and Thacker (58–63).

12. The first monograph on Pound was the originally anonymous *Ezra Pound: His Metric and Poetry* of 1918, published by Knopf in an effort to reinvigorate interest in Pound’s work after the relative lack of success of the American edition of ‘Noh’, or *Accomplishment*. *EP: His Metric* of course turned out to have been written under Pound’s supervision by a grateful T. S. Eliot. Pound had ushered ‘Prufrock’ into print in 1915 and possibly already was lending a hand with the earliest manifestations of what would become *The Wasteland*. Despite

the occasional piqued exchange in *The Athenaeum* or *Criterion* and the occasional swipe to be found in the letters of both Eliot and Pound, the loyalty would remain mutual for as long as either lived. The second monograph on Pound, Alice Steiner Amdur's *The Poetry of Ezra Pound*, 1936, originally a Radcliffe undergraduate thesis which somehow found its way to Harvard University Press publication, found *The Cantos* 'largely obscure or obscene, and sometimes both', and also the work of a 'roaring madman' (57). For incomprehensible reasons Amdur sent one of the three-hundred copies to William Carlos Williams, who sent it to Pound, and both Pound's response to Williams, wondering whether he should '[use]...steam roller on a monkey nut' and then the steam roller on monkey nut itself, his letter to Amdur—'IDIOT IDIOT...can you read?'—published in *Paideuma* fifty-five years after it was written, are worth looking up (*EP/WCW* 187–88; Knowles). The third monograph on Pound, fifteen years after Amdur, was Kenner's *Poetry of EP*.

13. For the derisive, see, for example, the anonymous review of '*Noh*' or *Accomplishment* which appeared in the 1917 *Asiatic Review*, which found the work simply 'ignorant', and Murakata, who in 1987 outlined Pound's 'lack [of] concern for a socio-historical perspective', 'misleading' footnotes, 'disorganized...paraphrase[s]' of 'technical details beyond his comprehension', and other editorial 'confusion' and 'dereliction' (272–73). For the eulogistic, see, for example, 'Japanese Mysteries', the anonymous 1917 *TLS* review of '*Noh*' or *Accomplishment*, which found that 'Mr Pound's mastery of beautiful diction' enabled the 'uninitiated foreigner' to 'appreciate the alternately wistful and proud appeal of these ghostly masterpieces', and Rexroth, who was no slavish admirer of Pound but who in 1945 found the Pound-Fenollosa *Nishikigi* 'the greatest poem of "our time"' and in 1947 'the most beautiful verse ever produced by an American' (Rexroth and Laughlin 60, 87).

14. Eliot's *Sweeney Agonistes* is comedic, and therefore unlike *Noh*. That he had Pound's *Noh* in mind, however, is clear from a letter he wrote in 1933 to the director of the first production: 'The action should be stylized as in the *Noh* drama—see Ezra Pound's book and Yeats's preface and notes to *The Hawk's Well*' (qtd. in Smith; see Ewick *JOM* CA10).

15. Some confusion about the number of times Pound makes explicit his understanding that *Noh* opens the way for a 'long imagist poem' arises in Bush's excellent *Genesis* (104) and is repeated in several studies, but recently has been clarified (Ewick, 'Imagism' 55n 8).

16. In addition to original periodical publication, Pound's *Noh* appears in four collections authorized by Pound. *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*, introduced by Yeats ('the men who created these conventions were more like ourselves than were the Greeks and Romans, more like us even than Shakespeare or Corneille'), appeared at Yeats's request in 1916 from his sister's press in Churchtown, Dundrum, Ireland, in an edition of 350. '*Noh*' or *Accomplishment*, a larger selection printed without the Yeats introduction, appeared from Macmillan in London in January 1917 (not, as the title page has it, 1916). The '*Noh Plays*' section of the 1953 *Translations of Ezra Pound* are with minor exceptions a reprint of the '*Noh*' or *Accomplishment* texts. The 1959 *New Directions Classic Noh Theatre of Japan (CNTJ)* is a second reprint of the '*Noh*' or *Accomplishment* texts under a third title, with Yeats's *Certain Noble Plays* introduction restored.

17. Yeats's enthusiasm for what he understood of *Noh* is apparent much of his writing after 1914. His introduction to *Certain Noble Plays* is the most sustained example. Studies of Yeats's adoption of the *Noh*, largely as filtered through Pound, were in the latter half of the

twentieth century a scholarly cottage industry, the subject of more English-language postgraduate theses than any other subject until Edward Said's *Orientalism* came along in 1978. An overview of studies of Yeats's 'Noh' through 2003 may be found in Ewick, *JOM* BL.

18. The Pound-Waley relation has been done a disservice in Pound scholarship. For the most part when Waley has not been slandered he has been erased, and the slanders and erasures intertextually in turn have led to the more common 'ignored'. During the years in London under discussion Pound and Waley were close friends, met often, and Waley helped Pound with his work on Fenollosa's Japanese and Chinese manuscripts. See Pound's gracious 1916 'Note', set off on a page by itself just following the title page in the first and in all subsequent editions of *'Noh' or Accomplishment*. It has been there for anyone to see since January 1917. The first paragraph, 'The vision and the plan are Fenollosa's', has been quoted dozens of times, but the second, in what is now more than forty-thousand pages of secondary Pound scholarship published in the last forty years, has been noticed, in passing, twice (Tsukui 10, Carpenter 269): 'I wish to express my very deep thanks to Mr. Arthur Waley, who has corrected a number of mistakes in the orthography of proper names from such Japanese terms as were available, and who has assisted me out of various impasses where my own ignorance would have left me'. My essay 'Intertextuality, the Invention of China, and the Scholarship of Elision: Ezra Pound and a Chap Named Waley', presented at a recent conference in Sydney, addresses this issue in detail and will be in print somewhere soon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Works edited by Pound from Fenollosa's manuscripts are listed under 'Pound, Ezra, and Ernest Fenollosa'.
- Albright, Daniel. *Quantum Poetics: Yeats, Pound, and the Science of Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Amdur, Alice Steiner. *The Poetry of Ezra Pound*. 1936. New York: Russell, 1966.
- Arrowsmith, Rupert Richard. *Modernism and the Museum: Asian, African, and Pacific Art and the London Avant-garde*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Aston, W. G. *History of Japanese Literature*. London: Heinemann, 1899.
- Beech, Christopher. 'The Pound Tradition'. *ABC of Influence: Ezra Pound and the Remaking of the American Poetic Tradition*. Ed. Beech. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California U, 1992.
- Berger, Klaus. *Japonisme in Western Painting from Whistler to Matisse*. Trans. David Britt. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Binyon, Laurence. *The Flight of the Dragon: An Essay on the Theory and Practice of Art in China and Japan, Based on Original Sources*. London: Murray, 1911.
- Brinkley, Frank. *Japan: Its History, Arts, and Literature*. 8 vols. Boston: Millet, 1901–02.
- Brooke-Rose, Christine. *A ZBC of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber, 1971.
- Brooks, Van Wyck. *Fenollosa and His Circle*. New York: Dutton, 1962.
- Bush, Ronald. *The Genesis of Ezra Pound's Cantos*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976.
- Carpenter, Humphrey. *A Serious Character: The Life of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber, 1988.
- Caldwell, Helen. *Michio Ito: The Dancer and his Dances*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1977.

- Carr, Helen. *The Verse Revolutionaries: Ezra Pound, H. D. and the Imagists*. London: Cape, 2009.
- Chamberlain, Basil Hall. *The Classical Poetry of the Japanese*. London: Trübner, 1880.
- Chiba, Yoko. 'Ezra Pound's Versions of Fenollosa's Noh Manuscripts and Yeats's Unpublished "Suggestions & Corrections"'. *Yeats Annual* 4 (1986): 121–144.
- Chisolm, Lawrence. *Fenollosa: The Far East and American Culture*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1963.
- Coffman, Stanley K., Jr. *Imagism: A Chapter for the History of Modern Poetry*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1951.
- Dasenbrock, Reed Way. *The Literary Vorticism of Ezra Pound & Wyndham Lewis: Towards the Condition of Painting*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1985.
- Davie, Donald. *Ezra Pound: Poet as Sculptor*. New York: Oxford UP, 1964.
- Dennis, Helen M., ed. *Ezra Pound and Poetic Influence*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- Dickins, F. V. *Primitive and Mediaeval Japanese Texts*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- Eliot, T. S. *Ezra Pound: His Metric and Poetry*. New York: Knopf, 1917 [i.e., 1918].
- . Introduction. *Selected Poems*. By Ezra Pound. London: Faber and Gwyer, 1928. vii–xxv.
- . 'The Noh and the Image'. Rev. of *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*. *Egoist* 4 (1917): 102–03.
- . *Sweeney Agonistes: Fragments of an Aristophanic Melodrama*. 1926–27. London: Faber, 1932.
- Ellis, Sylvia C. *The Plays of W. B. Yeats: Yeats and the Dancer*. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Ellmann, Richard. *Yeats, the Man and the Masks*. New York: Macmillan, 1948.
- Ewick, David. 'Imagism Status Rerum and a Note on Haiku'. *Make It New: The Ezra Pound Society Little Mag* 2.1 (2015): 42–57.
- . 'The Instigations of Ezra Pound by Ernest Fenollosa, I: The Chinese Written Character, Atlantic Crossings, Texts Mislaidd, and the Machinations of a Divinely-Inspired Char-Woman'. *Essays and Studies* (Tokyo Woman's Christian University) 66.1 (2015): 53–72.
- . 'The Instigations of Ezra Pound by Ernest Fenollosa, II: Pound, The Telluric Mass of Miss Lowell, and the Pilfering of "The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry"'. *Essays and Studies in British and American Literature* (Tokyo Woman's Christian University) 61 (2015): 15–32.
- . *Japonisme, Orientalism, Modernism: A Bibliography of Japan in English-Language Verse of the Early 20th Century [JOM]*. 2003. Web.
- . 'Notes Toward a Cultural History of Japanese Modernism in Modernist Europe, 1910–1920, with Special Reference to Kōri Torahiko'. *The Hemingway Review of Japan* 13 (2012): 19–36.
- Firkins, O. W. 'Traditions and Modernites'. Rev. of 'Noh' or *Accomplishment*. *Nation* (New York) 106 (1918): 506–7.
- Flint, F. S. [and Ezra Pound]. 'History of Imagism'. *Egoist* 2 (1915): 70–71.
- Fujita, Fujio. *Itō Michio sekai wo mau: Taiyō no gekijō wo mezashite*. [Michio Itō's dancing in the world: Toward a theatre of the sun]. [Tokyo]: Shinpūsha, 2007.
- Furukawa, Hisashi. *Ōbeijin no nōgaku kenkyū* [European and American studies of the nō]. Tokyo: Tokyo joshidaigaku gakkai, 1962.
- Gage, John T. *In The Arresting Eye: The Rhetoric of Imagism*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP,

- 1981.
- Gery, John, Daniel Kempton, and H. R. Stoneback, eds. *Imagism: Essays on its Initiation, Impact, and Influence*. New Orleans: U of New Orleans P, 2013.
- Hakutani, Yoshinobu. Introduction. *Selected English Writings of Yone Noguchi: An East-West Literary Assimilation*, vol. 2. London: Associated University Presses, 1992. 13–51.
- Harmer, J. B. *Victory in Limbo: A History of Imagism, 1908–1917*. New York: St. Martin's, 1975.
- Hartmann, Sadakichi. 'The Japanese Conception of Poetry'. *Reader Magazine* 3 (1904): 185–91.
- . 'Japanese Drama'. *Forum* 47 (June 1912): 724–34.
- Hatcher, John. *Laurence Binyon: Poet, Scholar of East and West*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Holiday, Woon-Ping Chin. 'Pound and Binyon: China via the British Museum'. *Paideuma* 6 (1977): 27–36.
- Houwen, Andrew. 'Ezra Pound's Early Cantos and his Translation of *Takasago*'. *Review of English Studies* 65 (2014): 321–41.
- Huang, Guiyou. *Whitmanism, Imagism, and Modernism in China and America*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated UP, 1997.
- Hughes, Glenn. *Imagism and the Imagists: A Study in Modern Poetry*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1931.
- Imamura, Tateo. 'Hemingway, Pound, and the Japanese Artist, Tamijuro Kume'. *The Hemingway Review of Japan* 13 (2012): 37–47.
- Ishibashi, Hiro. 'Marie C. Stopes to nō' [Stopes and nō]. *Eigo seinen* 124 (1978): 180–81, 214–16.
- Itō, Michio. 'Omoide o kataru' [Reminiscences]. *Hikaku bunka* [Tokyo Woman's Christian University] 2 (1956): 57–76.
- . *Utsukushiku naru kyōshitsu* [A classroom for the beautiful]. [Tokyo]: Hōbunkan, 1956.
- Iwahara, Yasuo. 'Ezra Pound to Noguchi Yonejirō: Pound no Nippon tonō kaikō' [Pound and Noguchi: The beginning of Pound's involvement with Japan]. *Kōgakuin daigaku kenkyū ronsō* 28 (1990): 33–43.
- 'The Japanese Masque'. Rev. of *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*. *Nation* (London) 20 (1916): 87.
- 'Japanese Mysteries'. Rev. of 'Noh' or *Accomplishment*. *Times Literary Supplement*, 25 Jan. 1917: 41.
- Johnson, Scott. 'The Fenollosa-Hirata Manuscripts on Noh and How Ezra Pound Edited Them'. *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan* 23 (1978): 49–59.
- Kanaseki, Hisao. 'Haiku and Modern American Poetry'. *East-West Review* 3 (1967–68): 223–41.
- Katō, Eileen. 'On the Pound-Fenollosa Versions of the Noh and Possible Traces of Yeats'. *Hikakubungaku kenkyū* 33 (1978): 1–19.
- Kenner, Hugh. Introduction. *The Translations of Ezra Pound*. London: Faber, 1953. 9–14.
- . *The Poetry of Ezra Pound*. Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions, 1951.
- . *The Pound Era*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1971.
- Kleitz, Dorsey. 'Michio Ito and the Modernist Vortex'. *The Hemingway Review of Japan* 13 (2012): 49–60.

- Knowles, Sebastian D. G. 'Ezra Pound to Alice Steiner Amdur, 23 Jan. 1937'. *Paideuma* 21.1–2 (1992): 235–49.
- Kōri, Torahiko. *Kōri Torahiko zenshū 2: Hōben hen* [The complete works of Kōri, vol. 2: Works in Japanese]. Tokyo: Iizuka shobō, 1981.
- Kuberski, Philip. *A Calculus of Ezra Pound: Vocations of the American Sign*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1992.
- Laughlin, James. *Pound as Wuz: Recollections and Interpretations*. London: Owen, 1989.
- . 'Some Irreverent Literary History'. *The Poetry of Ezra Pound*, 2nd. ed. By Hugh Kenner. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1985. ix–xiii.
- Miner, Earl. *The Japanese Tradition in British and American Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1958.
- . 'Pound, Haiku, and the Image'. *Hudson Review* 9 (1956–57): 570–84.
- Mitford, A. B. *Tales of Old Japan*. 1871. Rutland, Vt.: Tuttle, 1966.
- Miyake, Akiko, Sanehide Kodama, and Nicholas Teele, eds. *A Guide to Ezra Pound and Ernest Fenollosa's Classic Noh Theatre of Japan*. Orono, Maine: National Poetry Foundation, 1994.
- Moody, A. David. *Ezra Pound: A Portrait of the Man and His Work, Volume 1: The Young Genius*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Murakata, Akiko. *The Ernest F. Fenollosa Papers, The Houghton Library, Harvard University/ Harvard daigaku Houghton Library, Ernest Fenollosa shiryō*, vol. 3. Tokyo: Museum, 1987.
- Nadel, Ira. *Cathay: Ezra Pound's Orient*. London: Penguin, 2015.
- , ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ezra Pound*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- , ed. *Ezra Pound in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010.
- Niikura, Toshikazu. 'The Pisan Cantos and Noh Drama'. *American Literature in the 1940's* 1 (1976): 132–40.
- Nishiwaki, Junzaburō. 'Kōri-san no koto' [About Kōri]. *Kōri Torahiko zenshū 3* [The complete works of Kōri, vol. 3]. By Kōri Torahiko. Tokyo: Iizuka shobō, 1981. 49–51.
- Noguchi, Yone. *The Spirit of Japanese Poetry*. Wisdom of the East Series. London: Murray, 1914.
- . 'What is a Hokku Poem?' *Rhythm* 11 (Jan. 1913): 354–59.
- Norman, Charles. *Ezra Pound*. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
- Omuka, Toshiharu. 'Avant-garde to sesshokusuru: Kume Tamijūrō wo chūshin ni' [Touching the avant-garde: The work of Kume]. *SAP* 6 (2001): 67–86.
- . 'Mō hitori no "Pound no sakka": Kume Tamijūrō ni kansuru shin shiryō ni tsuite' [One more of 'Pound's Writers': New materials on Kume]. *Tsukuba daigaku geijutsu nenpō* (1994): 6–9.
- . *Nippon no avant-garde geijutsu: 'Mavo' to sono jidai* [Japanese avant-garde art: 'Mavo' and its era]. [Tokyo]: Seidonsha, 2001.
- Perloff, Marjorie, 'The Contemporary of Our Grandchildren: Pound's Influence'. *Ezra Pound Among the Poets*. Ed. George Bornstein. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985. 195–229.
- Pound, Ezra. *The ABC of Reading*. 1934. London: Faber, 1961.
- . 'Affirmations VI: The "Image" and the Japanese Classical Stage (1915)'. *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 53/1 (1991): 17–22.
- . *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*. 3rd collected ed., 13th printing. New York: New Directions, 1995.

- . 'Chinese Poetry'. *To-day* 3.14 (Apr. 1918): 54–57; 3.15 (May 1918): 93–95.
- . 'Chronicles'. *Blast*, 2 July 1915: 85–86.
- . 'Comment by Ezra Pound'. Rev. of *Certain Noble Plays of Japan* and 'Noh' or *Accomplishment*. *Little Review*, Aug. 1917: 8–10.
- . 'D'Artagnan Twenty Years After'. 1937. *Selected Prose*, 452–60.
- . 'Edward Wadsworth, Vorticist'. *Egoist* 1 (Aug. 1914): 306–07.
- . *Ezra Pound and Dorothy Shakespear: Their Letters, 1909–1914 [EP/DS]*. Ed. Omar Pound and A. Walton Litz. New York: New Directions, 1984.
- . *Ezra Pound and Japan: Letters and Essays [EP&J]*. Ed. Sanehide Kodama. Reading Ridge, Conn.: Black Swan, 1987.
- . 'Ezra Pound: An Interview'. With Donald Hall. *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*, 2nd ser. Ed. George Plimpton. New York: Viking, 1963. 35–59.
- . 'Ezra Pound Speaking': *Radio Speeches of World War II [RSWWII]*. Ed. Leonard W. Doob. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1978.
- . *Ezra Pound to His Parents: Letters 1885–1929 [EP/P]*. Ed. Mary de Rachewiltz, A. David Moody, and Joanna Moody. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010.
- . *Guide to Kulchur*. London: Faber, 1938.
- . 'How I Began'. *T.P.'s Weekly*, 6 June, 1913: 707.
- . 'How to Read'. 1929. *How to Read*. London: Harmsworth, 1931.
- . 'In a Station of the Metro'. *Poetry* 2 (Apr. 1913): 12.
- . 'An Interview with Ezra Pound'. With D. G. Bridson. *New Directions* 17 (1961): 159–84.
- . *The Letters of Ezra Pound, 1907–1941 [LEP]*. Ed. D. D. Paige. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950.
- . *The Letters of Ezra Pound to Alice Corbin Henderson [EP/ACH]*. Ed. Ira B. Nadel. Austin: U of Texas P, 1993.
- . *Lustra*. London: Mathews, 1916.
- . *Plays Modelled on the Noh (1916)*. Ed. Donald Gallup. Toledo: Friends of the U of Toledo Libraries, 1987.
- . *Pound/Williams: Selected Letters of Ezra Pound and William Carlos Williams [EP/WCW]*. Ed. Hugh Witemeyer. New York: New Directions, 1996.
- . 'Remy de Gourmont'. 1915. *Selected Prose*. 413–23.
- . *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn, 1915–1924 [EP/JQ]*. Ed. Timothy Materer. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.
- . *Selected Prose, 1909–1965*. Ed. William Cookson. [New York]: New Directions, 1973.
- . 'Vortex'. *Blast* 1 (June 1914): 153–54.
- . 'Vorticism'. *Fortnightly Review* NS 96 (Sept. 1914): 461–71.
- Pound, Ezra, and Ernest Fenollosa. 'Awoi no Uye [Aoi no Ue]: A Play by Ujinobu'. *Quarterly Notebook* 1 (June 1916): 9–16.
- . *Cathay*. London: Mathews, 1915.
- . *Certain Noble Plays of Japan: From the Manuscripts of Ernest Fenollosa, Chosen and Finished by Ezra Pound, With an Introduction by William Butler Yeats*. Churchtown, Dundrum: Cuala, 1916.
- . 'The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry'. *Little Review* 6.5 (Sept.

- 1919): 62–64; 6.6 (Oct. 1919): 57–64; 6.7 (Nov. 1919): 55–60; 6.8 (Dec. 1919): 68–72. Also published in Pound, *Instigations*, 357–88; and as a book: London: Nott, 1936; New York: Arrow, 1936; Washington: Square \$ [1951]; San Francisco: City Lights, 1964; and in Saussy, Stalling, and Klein, 41–74.
- . ‘The Classical Drama of Japan, Edited from Ernest Fenollosa’s manuscripts by Ezra Pound’. *Quarterly Review* 221 (Oct. 1914): 450–77.
- . ‘The Classical Stage of Japan: Ernest Fenollosa’s Work on the Japanese “Noh”’. *Drama* 5 (May 1915): 199–247.
- . *The Classic Noh Theatre of Japan [CNTJ]*. New York: New Directions, 1959.
- . ‘*Kakitsuhata [Kakitsubata]*, by Motokiyo [Zeami]: From the Notes of Ernest Fenollosa, Finished by Ezra Pound’. *Drama* 6 (Aug. 1916): 428–35.
- . *Nishikigi*. ‘Translated from the Japanese of Motokiyo [Zeami] by Ernest Fenollosa’. *Poetry* 4 (May 1914): 35–48.
- . ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment: A Study of the Classical Stage of Japan*. London: Macmillan, 1916 [i.e., 1917].
- Reck, Michael: *Ezra Pound: A Close Up*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Rev. of ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*. *Asiatic Review* 12, ser. 4 (1917): 71–80.
- Rev. of ‘*Noh*’ or *Accomplishment*. *Saturday Review* (London) 123 (1917): 527.
- Rexroth, Kenneth. Foreword. *White Chrysanthemums: Literary Fragments and Pronouncements*. By Sadakichi Hartmann. Ed. George Knox and Harry W. Lawton. New York: Herder & Herder, 1971. vii–xi.
- Rexroth, Kenneth, and James Laughlin. *Kenneth Rexroth and James Laughlin: Selected Letters*. Ed. Lee Bartlett. New York: Norton, 1991.
- Saussy, Haun. ‘Fenollosa Compounded: A Discrimination’. Saussy, Stalling, and Klein. 1–40.
- Saussy, Haun, Jonathan Stalling, and Lucas Klein, eds. *The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry: A Critical Edition*. New York: Fordham UP, 2008.
- Schneidau, Herbert. *Ezra Pound: The Image and the Real*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1969.
- Schwartz, William Leonard. ‘L’Appel de l’extrême-Orient dans la poésie des États-Unis’. *Revue de littérature comparée*, Jan. 1928. 113–26.
- Slatin, Myles. ‘A History of Pound’s *Cantos* I–XVI, 1915–1925’. *American Literature* 35 (1963): 183–95.
- Smith, Carol H. *T. S. Eliot’s Dramatic Theory and Practice*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.
- Solt, John. *Shredding the Tapestry of Meaning: The Poetry and Poetics of Kitasono Katue*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 1999.
- Stalling, Jonathan. *Poetics of Emptiness: Transformations of Asian Thought in American Poetry*. New York: Fordham UP, 2010.
- Stock, Noel. *The Life of Ezra Pound*. London: Routledge and Paul, 1970.
- Stopes, Marie, and Jōji Sakurai, trans. *Plays of Old Japan: The ‘Nō’*. London: Heinemann, 1913.
- Sugiyama, Masaki. *Kōri Torahiko: Sono yume to shōgai* [Kōri Torahiko: His dream and life]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1987.
- Taketomo, Torao. ‘American Imitations of Japanese Poetry’. *Nation* (New York) 110: (1920): 70–72.
- Terrell, Carroll F. *A Companion to the Cantos of Ezra Pound*. 2 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P., 1980, 1984.

- . 'The Na-Khi Documents I'. *Paideuma* 3 (1974): 91–122.
- Thacker, Andrew. *The Imagist Poets*. Horndon, Tavistock, Devon: Northgate, 2011.
- Tiffany, Daniel. *Radio Corpse: Imagism and the Cryptaesthetic of Ezra Pound*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Tryphonopoulos. Demetres S., and Stephen J. Adams, eds. *The Ezra Pound Encyclopedia*. London: Greenwood, 2005.
- Tsukui, Nobuko. *Ezra Pound and Japanese Noh Plays*. Washington, D.C.: UP of America, 1983.
- Tsunoda, Shirō. 'Pound to Kume Tamijūrō no koyū' [The friendship of Pound and Kume]. *Ezra Pound kenkyū*. Ed. Fukuda Rikutarō and Yasukawa Akira. Kyoto: Yamaguchi, 1986. 11–15.
- Tytell, John. *Ezra Pound: The Solitary Volcano*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Waley, Arthur, trans. *Nō Plays of Japan*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1921.
- Wilhelm, J. J. *Ezra Pound in London and Paris: 1908–1925*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1990.
- Witemeyer, Hugh. *The Poetry of Ezra Pound: Forms and Renewal, 1908–1920*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1969.
- Yamaguchi Seiichi, *Fenollosa: Nippon bunka no senyō ni sasageta isshō* [Fenollosa: A life devoted to the advocacy of Japanese culture]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1982.
- Yeats, W. B. Introduction to *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*. 1916. In Pound and Fenollosa, *CNTJ*. 151–63.
- . *Per Amica Silentia Lunae*. London: Macmillan, 1918.
- Yip, Wai-lim. *Ezra Pound's Cathay*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.