

Translation and Poetics: Reciprocal Technologies in the History of Chinese-to-English Transfer

James H. Dunn

Arthur Waley tells a story about the circumstances of his discoveries of Chinese poetry. Around 1913, when he began working in the Oriental Sub-Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, the young Waley went looking for information about the texts he was printing:

I soon began to feel the needed guidance. I went to the recently-founded School of Oriental Studies, then in Finsbury Circus, and consulted an old missionary, who was in charge of Chinese studies. He was not at all encouraging. 'You'll find that the Chinese are very weak in that line,' he said, referring to poetry, 'They have their ancient *Book of Odes* by Confucius, but that is all.' However, seeing that I did not look convinced, he kindly said I might go up to the Library and see if I could find anything. There was, of course, in those days no catalogue and the books were arranged in a rather haphazard way, but I soon discovered hundreds of volumes of poetry.¹

The old missionary's ignorance is not surprising, insofar as it indicates the level of interest in Chinese poetry throughout the English-speaking world during the first decade of the century. After having found his text and translated it, Waley found no one was interested. Infact, he says his translations actually irritated some of his most "cultivated and benevolent" readers. This is all to say that there was little appreciation for Chinese poetry among English readers before 1915.²

Fenollosa's famous essay on the Chinese character, not published until 1919, is predicated upon a widespread ignorance of Chinese poetry. In his preface, written between 1904 and 1908, he says that he responds to a

generally held notion of Chinese poetry as not worth the effort needed to study it. He says there is a widespread belief that:

Save for the purposes of professional linguistic scholarship, these branches of poetry are fields too barren to repay the toil necessary for their cultivation.³

He correctly assumes that the problem has been:

Some lack of aesthetic sympathy and of poetic feeling in the accepted methods of presenting poetry of China.⁴

Even among poets in English before 1909, there is a signal ignorance of Chinese poetry, in spite of the fact that Herbert Giles' *Chinese Poetry in English Verse* had been available since 1898, along with earlier translations by James Legge. Before Giles and Legge, John Francis Davis stands almost alone to represent English translations of Chinese poetry during the nineteenth century.⁵ For their first encounter with the Chinese material, however, English-speaking poets went through the French versions of the Marquis d'Hervey de Saint-Denys' *Poesies de l'epoque des Thang* (1862)⁶ and of the symbolist renditions in Judith Gauthier's *Livre de jade* (1867).⁷ Kenneth Rexroth asserts that poets in English were unable to use Giles' 1898 collection, because his translations were doggerel verse. Presumably, by doggerel Rexroth means the effect on the modern reader of Giles' use of rhyme and regular prosody in eleven to twelve-syllable lines.⁸

When the Imagist poets in London began looking to other literary systems in search of a new poetics, there were few resources in English by which to gain access to the Chinese. Poet John Gould Fletcher, a member of the Hulme group, recalls that he had not been acquainted with Chinese literature until 1910, when he acquired a copy of Giles' *History of Chinese Literature*:

Just what book first introduced me to them, I do not know; but I suspect it was Herbert A. Giles' *A History of Chinese Literature*, published in 1901 — a book which I still possess and still find worth reading. This led me to Giles' predecessor, James Legge, and to Confucius; but Legge's more than Scotch matter-of-factness, as well as his utter inability to appreciate any poetic qualities in the Chinese written character, repelled

me. I received, at the same time, far more enlightenment from the pages of Judith Gautier's *Le Livre de Jade*, first published in 1867, and revised early in the twentieth century. This I found totally delightful; though Chinese scholars have told me it is quite inexact. Cranmer-Byng's *A Lute of Jade*, published in 1909, and consisting largely of rather romantically colored adaptations of Giles and some French or Latin translators, also charmed me when it first appeared; but with the real pioneer effort in French, the Marquis d'Hervey-Saint-Denys' *Poesies de l'Epoque des Thang*, a magnificent piece of scholarship published in 1862, I was quite unfamiliar at the time, and did not see a copy in fact until shown one by Ezra Pound about a year after I came to know him, early in the spring of 1914.⁹

What limited Waley's missionary informant also limited the general poetry-reading audience in English. David Lattimore suggests that the dearth of poetic translation before the second decade of the century is related to contemporary poetics:

A rather astonishing thing about the history of translating Chinese poetry into English is that it was really done so successfully down to about the second decade of the 20th century. There were marvelous translations, for example, from Persian poetry in the 18th and 19th centuries. Chinese poetry could not be translated into English until the writers of English were willing to give some ground in changing their own idiom into something that could catch the Chinese as it came.¹⁰

As Lattimore implies, Chinese poetry did not transfer well into the pre-modernist poetic idiom in English. Indeed, the acceptance of Chinese poetry-in-translation as poetry in English is linked to a change in sensibilities that took place in English poetics during the first two decades of the century. We find poets at that time putting effort into educating the English audience to the beauties of Chinese verse. It is in this vein that Lytton Strachey, in 1908, reviews Herbert Giles' anthology, published in 1898. He emphasizes the obscurity out of which he brings the book to the reader's attention by beginning his essay with a puzzle:

The book, if you can get it, is worth reading, not only for its curiosity, but for its beauty and charm. It was published

ten years since, and one would be tempted to say that the poetry in it is the best that this generation has known, save that the greater part of it has been written for the last ten centuries. Yet, though it contains so much that is excellent and old, one might travel far without meeting a single reader who had ever heard of the poets of this anthology. Have they then been lately rediscovered, dug up, perhaps, from a buried city, and so, after the lapse of ages, restored to the admiration that is their due? By no means! These poems have been printed in innumerable editions, and the names of their writers are familiar words in the mouths of millions. Here are contradictions enough to perplex the most expert of Hegelians, but they are contradictions which, like those of Hegel, may be synthesized quite comfortably, if only you know the trick. The book is a collection of verse translations by Professor Giles, of Cambridge; and the translations are from the Chinese.¹¹

Here is an attempt to educate the reader in a poetic taste, and in the process, he musters evidence to convince the audience. Although the spirit of Chinese poetry is classical, Strachey tells us, it is in curious contrast to the epigrams of the Greek Anthology:

Different, indeed, is the effect of the Chinese lyric. It is the very converse of the epigram; it aims at producing an impression which, so far from being final, must be merely the prelude to a long series of visions and of feelings. It hints at wonders; and the revelation which at last it gives us is never a complete one — it is clothed in the indefinability of our subtlest thoughts.¹²

He amplifies his point by bringing Verlaine into the discussion:

Its poets are the poets of reflection, preoccupied with patient beauties and the subtle relationships of simple things. Thus, from one point of view, they are singularly modern, and perhaps the Western writer whose manner they suggest most constantly is Verlaine. Like him, they know the art of being quiet in verse.¹³

The modernist argument is here asserting itself, and in fact, the

acceptance of Chinese poetry in English translation was linked to the rise of modernist poetics, specifically imagism. Appreciation was to come slowly. Pound publishes *Cathay*, from the Fenollosa manuscripts, in 1915. Although Waley could initially find no publisher for his first poetic translations, he finds a receptive audience in 1917.¹⁴

Putting this axiomatically, we might say that which hindered the translation of Chinese poetry into English was, according to imagist poets, what hindered pre-modernist poetics. That is, the dominant mode in English poetry at the time that Fenollosa was writing did not readily accommodate Chinese verse, because it valued discursive statement, philosophical insight, and fixed formal architecture. It was a poetics that leant itself to the long line and syllogistic statement in a way that hinders the transfer of the Chinese original.

Before Imagism, English poetics concerns itself with form, elevated diction, extended meaning, and philosophical statement. Said in another way, this poetic idea represents an inventory available to the poet in English, which is expected by the reader of poetic discourse. It can be said that not until the advent of modern imagist poetics can English poetic technology accommodate the characteristics of Chinese verse. This is a case of target system poetics restricting translation by limiting the inventory of poetic procedures.

These generalizations, of course, do not apply to all translators and translations. But to appreciate the poetic-technological problem is, for instance, to gain an insight into the singular accomplishment of Giles working in premodernist fetters. We should also recognize the limits of chronological clichés such as describing a neat change in English poetics occurring in the second decade of the century. As late as the early twenties a strong conservative impulse remained in English poetics in the form of Georgianism, bucolic romantic realism, presenting delicate emotion in traditional prosodic form. This finds a transmutation in the verse of Robert Frost, but its swan song was the last anthology edited by Edward Howard Marsh, *Georgian Poetry 1920-1922*.¹⁵ Although the romantic realist mode of poetry remains in English at least through the twenties, and certainly later in British poetry, there is a paucity of translations from the Chinese into English using the romantic repertory.¹⁶

The point here is simply that pre-modernist and modernist poetics each bring different tools to the task of translating Chinese poetry. The exigencies of pre-modernist poetics govern the repertoire of the translator with demands

of line, rhyme, diction, and decorum. Modern poetics, on the other hand, offers a more favorable medium, mainly due to the modern rejection of formal concerns and extended meaning. The imagist poem must present the object world directly. Its rhythmic freedom and tolerance of syntactic ambiguity make modern poetry an accommodating vehicle for the translation of Chinese poetry.

We can see the interference created by poetic assumptions, specifically those of romantic realism and Georgian verse, in the work of W.J. Bainbrigge-Fletcher, *Gems of Chinese Verse* (Shanghai, 1919). Fletcher's rendering of Wang Wei's *Zhongnan Retreat*:

A Mountain Retreat

Over against the Chung-nan Hill
 See shyly peer my roof of thatch;
 The whole year round so lone and still
 No stranger's hand will lift the latch
 Time is my own to idle here;
 In pebbled rills the fish to catch;
 Or quaff a flask of vintage clear.
 Come thou and share my simple cheer;
 An hour's pleasure snatch.¹⁷

For the sake of understanding the limitations imposed by poetics, we might look at Pauline Yu's line-by-line translation from her critical collection of the work of Wang Wei:

Zhongnan Retreat

In middle years I am rather fond of the Tao;
 My late home is at the foot of Southern Mountain.
 When the feeling comes, each time I go there alone.
 That splendid things are empty, of course, I know.
 I walk to the place where the water ends
 And sit and watch the time when the clouds rise.
 Meeting by chance an old man of the forest,
 I chat and laugh without a date to return.¹⁸

By comparison with Yu's more literal, and more modern, version, it can be seen how the poetics of the earlier version forces the translator away from

the original. Bainbridge-Fletcher's translation is governed by regular pentameter, a unifying rhyme scheme, and the need to provide extended meaning in a discursive statement. The translator is forced not only to skew syntax but to throw out the sense of the source text in order to accommodate his own poetic idea, in this case a Georgian idyll. Bainbridge-Fletcher's poetics is untouched by the First World War, intolerant of ambiguity, and severely limited in dealing with reality. The range of procedures available to him are limited by poetics.

Perhaps the most acute problem in rendering Chinese poetry into English verse is the inability of the target language to support as much ambiguity and consequently as much compression of meaning as the source text. To say the least, much is lost, and the rich ambiguity of the original poses particular problems for pre-modernist intolerance of ambiguity, often forcing the English translator to abandon the sense of the original entirely. Target language poetics limits transfer of the original's surface density and resonance of allusion. A good example of the problem of transferring ambiguity can be found in another poem by Wang Wei (Yu's translation):

In Response to Vice-Magistrate Zhang

In late years I care for tranquility alone —
 A myriad of affairs do not concern my heart.
 A glance at myself; there are no long-range plans.
 I only know to return to the old forest.
 Pine winds blow, loosening my belt;
 The mountain moon shines as I pluck my zither.
 You ask about reasons for success or failure;
 A fisherman's song enters the shore's deeps.¹⁹

We might use Wai-lim Yip's word-for-word version as a literal touchstone for discussion:

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------|
| late | year/s | only | love | quietude; peace |
| ten-thousand | affair/s; matter/s | not | involve (concern) | mind |
| self | look into | no | long-term | plan |
| empty | knowledge | return | old | woods |
| pine | wind | blow | loosen | girdle |
| mountain | moon | shine | strum | lute |
| you | ask | exhaust | to-be-expert | pattern (i.e., cosmic) |
| fisherman's | song | enter | estuary | deep ²⁰ |

Yu's editorial notes articulate the choices forced upon the translator in bringing the poem to English. The syntax becomes problematic in the third couplet, where significantly, the language turns imagistic in describing the pleasures of a hermit. Yu offers the three following translations as alternative to her own choice:

Pine winds blow; I loosen my belt.
The mountain moon shines; I pluck my zither

The pine winds blow and loosen my belt.
The mountain moon shines and plucks my zither

Pine winds blow on my loosened belt
The mountain moon shines on my plucked zither²¹

Although the second version stretches credibility in making the moon pluck a zither, all three preserve a sense of the original's parallelism. They each represent syntactical choices that change the sense of the translation: two independent clauses; a causal relationship between the clauses; a relationship without an agent. Yu chooses to add an agent to the first line and coordination to the second, thus scrambling the parallelism of the Chinese poem. The syntactical questions of the third couplet, however, just begin the problems of compression in the poem.

The final couplet addresses the poet's friend, who seems to have asked a question about success and failure or about the principle of universal change. According to Yu, the final image suggests at least three interpretations. It may be a non-answer and so would have no syllogistic relationship with the question. This makes the final line an attempt to bring the questioner to a sudden intuitive understanding. Second, by interpreting the fisherman as a symbol of simple life in harmony with nature, the final line can be read as straitforward advice to Zhang to leave worldly affairs for a life in the country. A third interpretation reads the line as an allusion to a fisherman's song in the third-century B.C. *Songs of Chu*.²²

The ancient poem tells the story of a fisherman's meeting with the poet Qu Yuan (fourth century B.C.), just banished from court because of slander. Qu self-righteously explains to the fisherman that he was in exile because he was "clear/lucid" and "sober," while others were "muddy/obscure" and "drunk." The fisherman replies that perhaps the poet should adapt to the facts as they are and asks why he should exile himself for the sake

of his own deep thoughts and aspirations. Qu Yuan says he would rather drown in the river. Faintly smiling, the fisherman paddles off singing:

When the Ts'ang-lang's waters are clear, I can wash my hat
strings in them;
When the Ts'ang-lang's waters are muddy, I can wash my feet
in them.²³

This allusion gives Wang Wei's answer a mystical sense of transcending the distinctions of failure and success in the same way the fisherman's song of going with the immediate condition of the water transcends the distinctions to which Qu Yuan clings.

No English poem will accommodate the ambiguity compressed into the third and fourth couplets of Wang Wei's poem, and it is clear from Yu's translation what choices she made in the third couplet. She can, however, preserve some of the ambiguity of the last couplet, because imagist poetics have accustomed us as readers to accept the unexplained presentation of the object world as charged with multiple meanings.

Working with a model of romantic realism, on the other hand, Bainbridge-Fletcher obviates the problem of the third couplet by excising it altogether. And because he is committed to extended meaning, he interprets the last line by inserting the voice of the poet:

In the evening of life, tranquility is my only joy.
Ten thousand affairs cease to trouble the heart.
I reflect there is no more excellent scheme than
To give learning a miss and to return to the forests of my old
home
If you ask me why I don't care for the proprieties
(I invite you to listen while) over the estuary is wafted to me the
fisherman's song.²⁴

Fletcher resolves the ambiguities of the last couplet by putting the poet in parentheses. The modern reader is distracted by parentheses, while the sense of the original has been abandoned in the third couplet anyway. Fletcher again sacrifices all for the sake of his poetic idea. To resolve imagistic compression and syntactical ambiguity, Fletcher abandons the original poem, as his poetic technology cannot accommodate the transfer.

What must be plain by now is that Chinese poetry had little or no

audience in English before 1915-1920, and that pre-modernist poetic technology is related to this phenomenon. Chinese poetry did not conform to the rules current in English, making the transfer difficult. What brought about an increase in the number of translations was the popularization of a new poetic idea, which itself used translation of Chinese poetry as an argument for change in the English poetic system.

The repertory of poetic procedures available to the translator of poetry is the same inventory available to the poet writing in that target language. What can or will be transferred depends on the target system's poetics. Corollary to this is the fact that an audience's poetic assumptions limit the field of receptivity within which the translator is confined.

It is at this intersection of poetics and translation where Chinese poetry had a use in proposing innovation in the English target system. In this case, a reciprocal relationship developed between poetics and translation, such that translation functioned as an alibi, as André Lefevere calls it,²⁵ for the innovations which, in turn, allowed easier transfer. The translations served poetic innovation as innovations served the poetics of translation.

Ezra Pound, of course, is central to these innovations. In his essay "Chinese Poetry," published in 1918, Pound speaks clearly about his purposes in translating:

It is because Chinese poetry has certain qualities of vivid presentation; and because certain Chinese poets have been content to set forth their matters without moralizing and without comment that one labours to make a translation, and that I personally am most thankful to the late Ernest Fenollosa for his work in sorting out and gathering many Chinese poems into a form and bulk wherein I can deal with them.²⁶

He gives examples of the qualities of Chinese poetry in which he is interested:

The first great distinction between Chinese taste and our own is that the Chinese *like* poetry that they have to puzzle over. This latter taste has occasionally broken out in Europe, notably in twelfth-century Provence and thirteenth-century Tuscany, but it has never held its own for very long.²⁷

What Pound finds pleasing in his notion of Chinese poetry is the "short,

obscure" poem and the absence of "mellifluous circumlocution" and "sentimentalizing."²⁸ He is here arguing for a poetic platform, rather than elucidating the intricacies of Chinese verse. The qualities he perceived in Chinese poetry were evidence for his argument. Pound's translations are motivated by the need to persuade.

Wai-lim Yip's exhaustive study of *Cathay* (1915) demonstrates the interrelationship between Pound's poetic platform and his early translations of Chinese poetry. Yip points out that Chinese verse acted as a catalyst in Pound's own campaign against rhetoric and discursiveness:

As Pound moved toward 1914 (at about which time he actually started translating Chinese poems from the Fenollosa notebooks), he was obsessed with the effort to use no involved syntax, no archaic diction, and no inversions.²⁹

Pound had found a coincidence of architecture that could serve the imagist argument with evidence from another literary system. In a sense he stumbled upon the matter. Mary Fenollosa had decided, on the basis of reading Pound's poetry, that he was the one to rescue her late husband's manuscripts from academic translators.³⁰ Given the first portion of the material in late 1913, Pound knew the value of what he had. In January 1914, he wrote Harriet Munroe about the Japanese play, *Nishikigi*. He begins the letter by suggesting that his name not be associated with the translation when published in *Poetry*, in order to make it seem like objective evidence. He wants the work to stand by itself:

I think you will agree with me that this Japanese find is about the best bit of luck we've had since the starting of the magazine. I don't put the work under the general category of translation either. It could scarcely have come before now. The earlier attempts to do Japanese in English are dull and ludicrous.³¹

His translations in *Cathay* (1915) were the concrete evidence that was to persuade many. It was a force for change, as John Gould Fletcher indicates:

It was only after I had read the *Cathay* translations — taken as Pound said, "from the notes of the late Ernest Fenollosa, and

the decipherings of the Professors Mori and Ariga" — that I threw overboard my own scruples, which had forbidden me up to then to take part in the Imagist movement, and proclaimed myself truly an Imagist. The Chinese influence and example seemed to me to fortify the whole case for Imagism, which in H. D.'s early poetry, as in that of Aldington, had depended too closely and exclusively on Greek or Latin models.³²

This is translation as a smoke screen for innovation. Pound could not mount a successful frontal attack on the dominant mode, which in London was the Georgian revival of romantic nature-lyricism. Fenollosa's essay on the written character was the apologia Pound wanted in print, but it was to find no receptivity until 1919, and only then in the United States.³³ In 1915 Pound complained to Felix Schelling:

Fenollosa has left a most enlightening essay on the written character (a whole basis of aesthetic, in reality), but the adamant stupidity of all magazine editors delays its appearance.³⁴

Pound did not let the stupidity of magazine editors stop him from trying to place the essay. He clearly saw its propoganda value, as he implies to John Quinn in January 1917:

I have just sealed up Fenollosa's "Essay on the Chinese Written Character," to send to them [*Seven Arts*]. It is one of the most important essays of our time. But they will probably reject it on the ground of its being exotic. Fenollosa saw and anticipated a good deal of what has happened in art (painting and poetry) during the last ten years, and his essay is basic for all aesthetics, but I doubt it will cut much ice.³⁵

Here Pound attaches the weight of prophecy to what Fenollosa himself had said was an attempt to educate the reader to the beauties of Chinese poetry. Pound is not interested in Fenollosa's project, but in his own program. For Pound, Fenollosa's China was a classical authority, providing evidence to suggest that innovations in the system were not revolutionary, but radically conservative. For the purpose of proving that Chinese verse was great poetry, Fenollosa had argued from what he understood to be the

poetic qualities of the written system. For Pound, translations from Chinese were proof of the validity and applicability of imagist innovation. They were ammunition for a change in poetics.

This change in poetic idea that Pound labored to bring about, with the help of Chinese verse, itself amounts to a change in the technology of translation. Modern poetics offers a wider range of inventory to the translator of poetry. It thus allows more flexibility for the translator, a technical breakthrough that helps account for the blossoming of poetic translation since 1915.³⁶ In this case the function of translation within the target system was to help foster a new poetics, which in turn helped foster translation.

Notes

1. Ivan Morris, ed. *Madly Singing in the Mountains: An Appreciation and Anthology of Arthur Waley* (London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, 1970), p. 133.
2. Morris, ed. pp. 134-5.
3. Ernest Fenollosa, *The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry*, ed. Ezra Pound (San Francisco: City Lights, 1936, 5th prt. 1969), p. 5.
4. Fenollosa, p. 5.
5. Henri Cordier, ed. *Bibliotheca Sinica: Dictionnaire Bibliographique des Ouvrages Relatifs a L'Empire Chinois* (NY: Burt Franklin, 1922; rpt. 1968), 3942-8.
6. Marie Jean Leon Marquis d'Hervey de Saint-Denys, *Poesies de l'epoque des Thang (VII., VIII. et IX siecles de notre ere: traduits du chinois pour la premiere fois, avec une etude sur l'art poetique en Chine et des notes explicatives* (Paris: Amyot, 1862).
7. Judith Gauthier comp. and trans., *Livre de jade* (Paris: A. Lemerre, 1867).
8. Kenneth Rexroth in panel discussion on the "History of Translation of Chinese Poetry into English," in *Ironwood* 17, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 11.
9. John Gould Fletcher, "The Orient and Contemporary Poetry" in *The Asian Legacy and American Life*, ed. Arthur E. Christy (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), pp. 149-50.
10. David Lattimore in a panel discussion on "Aspects of Translation" in *Ironwood* 17, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 38.
11. Lytton Strachey, "An Anthology" in *Characters and Commentaries* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1933), pp. 138.
12. Strachey, p. 139.
13. Strachey, p. 140.
14. Morris, ed. p. 135.
15. Sir Edward Howard Marsh, ed. *Georgian Poetry 1920-1922* (London: The Poetry Bookshop, 1922).
16. For examples see: Launcelot Cranmer-Byng, *A Lute of Jade* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1913); Mabel Lorenz Ives, *Chinese Love Songs* (New Jersey: B. L. Hutchinson, 1949).
17. W. J. Bainbrige-Fletcher, *Gems of Chinese Verse* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1918; rept. 1932), p. 133.

18. Pauline Yu, *The Poetry of Wang Wei* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), #79.
19. Yu, #118.
20. Wai-lim Yip, ed. and trans. *Chinese Poetry: Major Modes and Genres* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), pp. 250-1.
21. Yu, p. 163.
22. Hong Xingzu, ed. *Chu ci Buzh* (Taipei, 1973), 7/295-8.
23. Yu, pp. 163-4.
24. W. J. Bainbridge-Fletcher, *More Gems of Chinese Verse* (Shanghai, 1919), p. 107.
25. André Lefevere, "Slauerhoff and 'Po Tsju I': Three Paradigms for the Study of Influence" *Tamkang Review* vol. X, no. 1+2 (Autumn & Winter), p. 73.
26. Ezra Pound, "Chinese Poetry" in *To-day*, 3 (April 1918), p. 54.
27. Pound, "Chinese Poetry," p. 55.
28. Pound, "Chinese Poetry," pp. 56-7.
29. Wai-Lim Yip, *Ezra Pound's Cathay* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1969), p. 56.
30. Noel Stock, *The Life of Ezra Pound* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 148-9.
31. D. D. Paige, ed. *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1950; reprt. New Directions, 1971), p. 31.
32. Arthur Christy, ed., p. 154.
33. *The Little Review* No. 4 (Sept. 1919).
34. D. D. Paige, ed. *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound: 1907-1941* (London: Faber and Faber, 1971), p. 61.
35. Paige, p. 101.
36. Yip, *Ezra Pound's Cathay*, pp. 244-9.