November 2017

W.B. Yeats and the Sculpture of Brancusi

Jack Quin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/iys>

Recommended Citation

Quin, Jack (2017) "W.B. Yeats and the Sculpture of Brancusi," *International Yeats Studies*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 1 , Article 4.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34068/IYS.02.01.03>

Available at: <https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/iys/vol2/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Yeats Studies by an authorized editor of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.

W. B. YEATS AND THE SCULPTURE OF BRANCUSI

Jack Quin

D uring a stay with the art collector John Quinn in 1920, George Yeats recalled how W. B. Yeats went through the various rooms in his New York apartment “turning all the Brancusis over, or face down, on sofas and cushions [...] All those ovoids—those smooth, curved surfaces, and rounded figures, with their egg-shaped heads—seemed to put him off.”¹ By 1920 Quinn had acquired a sizeable collection of the Romanian sculptor’s work, including the smooth, curvilinear faces and bodies of *Prometheus* (1911), *The Newborn* (1915), and several versions of *Sleeping Muse* (1909–10) and *Mademoiselle Pogany* (1912–13) in marble and bronze. This vignette of W. B. Yeats rearranging the furniture, turning away the sculpted faces and hiding others from sight altogether, is more than simply anecdotal. Constantin Brancusi’s abstracted and geometrical “portraits” marked an unsettling watershed in the history of sculpture. When *Mlle. Pogany* was first exhibited in plaster at the 1913 Armory Show it was derided by one critic as “a hard-boiled egg balanced on a cube of sugar.”² Yet when Ezra Pound and his companions visited the Paris studio of Brancusi, they would exclaim “he is upsetting all the laws of the universe,” and “it isn’t like work of a human being at all,” or so Pound recounted in his “Paris Letters.”³ On first impression the abstracted, pared-down forms that barely resembled faces or bodies were to varying degrees ridiculed or admired. In terms of art criticism and sculptural aesthetics, Brancusi was variously written off, rewritten, and at times overwritten by his contemporaries. In George Yeats’s account, her husband’s later reference to the ovoids of Brancusi in *AVB* was “made with a certain amount of humour,” not to be taken too seriously, and informed by his early encounter with the ovoids in Quinn’s Central Park West apartment.⁴

W. B. Yeats was deeply engaged in a substantial body of art writing around the Romanian sculptor. Yeats referred to Brancusi’s work in *AVA*, *AVB*, and in a neglected verse-fragment from the Cuala Press edition of the introduction to *The Words upon the Window-Pane*.⁵ The aesthetic debates glossed in these references underscore his familiarity, and at times disagreements, with the authoritative writing of Ezra Pound on Brancusi and modernist sculpture. By revivifying the connections between Pound’s writing on Vorticist sculpture in the 1910s, on Brancusi in the 1920s, and Yeats’s own partial but astute engagements with these same figures, we might complicate a prevailing Vorticist historiography of modern sculpture. The “smooth, curved surfaces, and

rounded figures,” however unsettling or humorous, became particularly magnetic and paradigmatic in the later writing of Yeats.

I

Yeats’s most well known reference to Brancusi occurs in “A Packet for Ezra Pound,” which was placed at the beginning of *AVB*. Reflecting upon his system of gyres and recurring phases of history more than a decade after their first conception, he writes:

Some will ask whether I believe in the actual existence of my circuits of sun and moon [...] Now that the system stands out clearly in my imagination I regard them as stylistic arrangements of experience comparable to the cubes in the drawing of Wyndham Lewis and to the ovoids in the sculpture of Brancusi. They have helped me to hold in a single thought reality and justice (*AVB*, 19).

Yeats’s comparison of *A Vision*’s system to the ovoids of Brancusi is at once tantalizing and bewildering. If Yeats is thinking analogically about his writing process—whether through gyres, circuits, cubes or ovoids—do these geometric shapes provide little more than spatial metaphors for his art? Like the communicators in automatic writing sessions, which were also discussed in “A Packet,” have the ovoids of Brancusi come to give Yeats “metaphors *for* poetry?” (*AVB* 7, *italics mine*).

The theosophical suggestiveness of the passage, and the use of Brancusi’s ovoids as illustrative prop, are glossed by Giorgio Melchiori, Timothy Materer, and recently Miranda Hickman.⁶ However, Yeats’s analogy might flatten or ossify some of the more nuanced interpretations of modern sculpture that persist across his *oeuvre*. Elizabeth Bergmann Loizeaux notes that the reference to abstract art might be a belated intervention into Vorticist writing on art.⁷ Detailed accounts of the relationship between Yeats and Wyndham Lewis have shown the depth of Yeats’s familiarity with Lewis in an inter-arts context that goes beyond his curious cubes metaphor.⁸ In turn, Brancusi’s importance to Yeats in an inter-arts aesthetic and a specifically sculptural context deserve consideration.

The eponymous addressee of Yeats’s packet, Ezra Pound, might elucidate Yeats’s Brancusi metaphor.⁹ In the late 1920s through the early 1930s, the ovoids of Brancusi were a shorthand for the political and aesthetic considerations formulated at length by Pound in the previous decade. Listening to Mussolini in 1934, he was reminded of the Romanian sculptor’s carvings: “The more one examines the Milan Speech the more one is reminded of Brancusi, the stone blocks from which no error emerges, from whatever angle one look at them.”¹⁰ Rebecca Beasley notes that “[t]hree decades of the relationship

between politics and the visual arts are submerged in this close reading,” and yet it is also “an analogy whose very pervasiveness indicates the extent to which Pound’s engagement with the visual arts has become evacuated of its history, existing only as a repository of analogies to be manipulated at will.”¹¹ If abstract sculpture claimed to be apolitical, the discourse around abstract sculpture was malleable to the ideologies of its commentators. Brancusi was notoriously Janus-faced in his infrequent comments on his work, refusing to conform to any particular artistic movement. “Why write about my sculptures?” he once asked, “Why not simply show their photos?”¹² This claim would foreclose the efficacy of art writing but also the intrinsic three-dimensionality of sculpture, if Brancusi meant it in earnest. In the absence of authoritative delineations of his own work, Brancusi’s sculpture was appropriated and redescribed by writers throughout the century. He was variously framed as a Modernist, Minimalist, Dadaist, and Surrealist. That the same sculpture gave Yeats a metaphor for his elaborate mythography and Pound an analogue to the oratory of Mussolini underscores the malleability of abstract art in subsequent written accounts.

In *The Literate Eye* (2013) Rachel Teukolsky notes a common trait of art writing from the Victorians to the Modernists in their construction of a “verbal fantasy of visual exactitude.”¹³ The othering and apotheosis of the visual arts in art criticism can misrepresent the artwork in the service of a convenient analogy. Drawing on W. J. T. Mitchell’s *Picture Theory* (1994), Teukolsky contends: “Abstract art is perhaps the most obvious, most extreme case of a visual art whose value is constructed by the words or master-narratives of critics.”¹⁴ Of particular interest for this article is the sculptural vernacular of Pound and his fellow Vorticists, including the sculptor Henri Gaudier-Brzeska, in the modernist little magazines of the 1910s and early 1920s, and the extent to which their art writing dictated the terms of appreciating Brancusi’s ovoids. Sarah Victoria Turner describes the art criticism of the Vorticists as an attempted erasure of Victorian aesthetics, “to create a smooth, plain and neat-edged tabula rasa on which to build the foundations of a ‘new’ kind of art practice in the twentieth century.”¹⁵ The smooth, plain, and almost featureless surfaces of Brancusi’s work were the ideal blank slate for a radical rewriting of art. Yet as Teukolsky and Turner note, there is an arbitrariness to what is considered Victorian and what is elevated as Modernist in the written histories of the visual arts. By attending to Pound’s early writing on Brancusi and contemporary sculptors a more refined understanding of modern sculptural aesthetics and Yeats’s subsequent responses can be delineated.

The schismatic shift from modeled statuary to direct carving was principally fought on the pages of little magazines and in words more than actions.¹⁶ The title of Pound and Gaudier-Brzeska’s 1914 manifesto, “The New Sculpture,” appropriated the masthead of a group of nineteenth-century Royal Academy

sculptors and art writers that they condemned: Edmund Gosse, Frederic Leighton, Hamo Thornycroft, and F. W. Pomeroy. The *new* New Sculptors could summarize their aesthetic in a series of epithets akin to Pound's pithy Imagist credos and in opposition to the *old* New Sculpture movement. According to Gaudier-Brzeska, "every inch of surface is won at the point of a chisel—every stroke of the hammer is a physical and a mental effort,"¹⁷ in contradistinction to the industrial scale of nineteenth-century sculptural practice where it might be said, "*sculptors did not make their own sculpture*."¹⁸ The distinction between the individual labor of the direct carver and the team of academy sculptors working in wax to produce casts, and translating clay or plaster models into marble, could not be clearer: "No more arbitrary translations of a design in any material." Gaudier-Brzeska, alongside Jacob Epstein and Brancusi, "are fully aware of the different qualities and possibilities of woods, stones, and metals."¹⁹

Penelope Curtis contends that a Vorticist master narrative around the tradition of direct carving shackled early-twentieth-century British sculpture and its subsequent historiography.²⁰ Traditions of modeling ran concurrently and complementarily to those of carving, despite the claims of Pound and Gaudier-Brzeska in various *Egoist* and *Blast* polemics. Furthermore, figurative statuary that was not merely derived from but dependent on the human figure, was still considered modern and innovative across continental Europe. Several of Yeats's favored sculptors for Dublin monument commissions and the Free State coinage commission were lifelong modelers: Oliver Sheppard, John Hughes, Carl Milles, Paul Manship, and Ivan Meštrović to name a few.²¹ Curtis notes that even the chief practitioners of direct carving, including Epstein, Gaudier-Brzeska, and Brancusi, often built up their forms in clay or wax before reproducing the work in stone or metal. Nevertheless, an opposition emerged in Britain between modernist carving and the dated practice of modeling, an opposition which was formalized by the Vorticist manifestos of the 1910s, the book-length studies of Herbert Read and Adrian Stokes in the 1930s, and the critical prose of Henry Moore and Barbara Hepworth from the 1930s–'50s. The importance of Yeats's overlooked commentary on the sculptors of his time and sculptural aesthetics can be recovered by identifying the deliberate omissions from a Vorticist historiography of sculpture, and examining the language in which these distinctions were established between carving and modeling.

II

The classical idealism of nineteenth-century sculpture and its self-authorizing art writing were equally undermined by the "new wild sculpture" of Epstein and Gaudier-Brzeska. According to Pound, primitive, Vorticist art "is to be admired rather than explained. The jargon of these sculptors is beyond

me,” and inconsequential to an appreciation of the work.²² Epstein’s contorted *Female Figure in Flenite* (1913) serves as a foil to an academic language of sculpture that entrenched “beauty” in the perfect human form as the aim of plastic art. Pound confesses, “I do not precisely know why I admire a green granite, female, apparently pregnant monster with one eye going around a square corner.”²³ Its angularity and asymmetry cannot be validated by scales of representative bodily beauty, but the “work permits no argument. They do not strive after plausibility.” In an elevation of direct carving, Pound conflates the smooth, modeled statuary of earlier sculptors with a smooth hucksterism in the art criticism that surrounds it: “we are sick to death of plausibilities; of smooth answers; of preachers who ‘prophecy not the deaths of kings.’”²⁴ Epstein’s *Female Figure* resists conventional expectations of realism and beauty by “the mass, the half-educated simpering general, the semi-connoisseur, the sometimes collector, and still less the readers of the ‘Spectator’ and the ‘English Review.’”²⁵ As Pound’s polemic suggests, there is a war of words underway between English art periodicals. Art critics of the academy are implicated in an entrenchment of debased tastes through favorable reviews of modeled, monumental statuary. For the emerging Vorticists, the universally acclaimed sculpture of the Ancient Greeks is merely reminiscent of “cake-icing” and “plaster-of-Paris,” while the present day “Rodin at his plaster-castiest” is overrated and derivative.

Consequently, Pound dismissed negative reviews of Epstein and Gaudier-Brzeska on the grounds that art writing cannot quantify or characterize the most admirable properties of this new sculpture. In an exhibition review for the *Egoist* in March 1914, Pound reaffirmed his belief that the spectator cannot affect or even interpret abstract sculpture, writing of Epstein’s marble *Group of Birds*:

These things are great art because they are sufficient in themselves. They exist apart, unperturbed by the pettiness and the daily irritation of a world full of Claude Phillipses, and Saintsburys and of the constant bickerings of uncomprehending minds. They infuriate the denizens of the superficial world because they ignore it. Its impotences and its importances do not affect them [...] This work infuriates the superficial mind, it takes no count of this morning’s leader; of transient conditions. It has the solemnity of Egypt.²⁶

Pound caricatures the prolific art critics Claude Phillips and George Saintsbury as connoisseurs, creating their own readership of semi-connoisseurs and collectors. Pound’s claim for the apolitical status of Epstein’s birds, in a periodical that advanced an anarchist individualist agenda under the editorship of Dora Marsden, is suspect. Further, his insistence that Epstein’s sculptures do not permit verbal commentary or prescribed measures of appreciation in articles

that inaugurated a “New Sculpture” and enumerated its properties, is clearly casuistic.

Pound’s assault on an academic language of sculpture persisted into his early articles on Constantin Brancusi, several years after the death of Gaudier-Brzeska in the First World War. Pound saw Brancusi “doing what Gaudier might have done in thirty years [*sic*] time” while also appending the sculpture of Brancusi to a Vorticist history of sculpture.²⁷ The growing popularity of modern European sculptors working from the model, such as the Croatian sculptor and architect Ivan Meštrović, could be dismissed with recourse to the legacy of Gaudier-Brzeska and the continuing work of Brancusi: “no one who understood Gaudier was fooled by the cheap Viennese Michaelangelism and rhetoric of Mestrovic.”²⁸ The echo of evangelism in Pound’s coinage bundles Auguste Rodin, Aristide Maillol, and Meštrović together as second-rate disciples of Michaelangelo and his teachings. Brancusi and Gaudier-Brzeska represent a purer language of sculpture beyond the cheap rhetoric of sculptors working from the model.

The pejorative “rhetoric” is connected to public appeal, an artwork that would compel a mass audience to think or feel merely as the sculptor intended. In a series of articles for *Blast* and *The New Age* in 1915, Pound castigated “[a] public which has always gushed over the sentimentalities of Rodin,” promoting Epstein and Gaudier-Brzeska instead.²⁹ By 1921–22 Brancusi could fit within the same formula: “he is distinct from the futurist sculptors, and he is perhaps unique in the degree of his objection to the ‘Kolossal,’ the rhetorical, the Mestrovician, the sculpture of nerve-crisis, the sculpture made to be photographed.”³⁰ Pound is alluding to his own favorite distinction between poetry and rhetoric, a binary famously reworked by Yeats in *Per Amica Silentia Lunae*: “We make out of the quarrel with others, rhetoric, but of the quarrel with ourselves, poetry” (CW5 8). These monumental sculptors are implicated in a debased, rhetorical appeal to the masses and the demands of the mass-market. Brancusi’s language of sculpture is closer to poetry than rhetoric, deserving parity with Guido Cavalcanti and Dante in Pound’s 1921 *Little Review* essay, while in his “Paris Letter” of the following January, “the serene sculpture of Brancusi” is set “apart from the economic squabble, the philosophic wavering, the diminishing aesthetic hubbub” of the crowd.³¹

Yeats’s interventions and self-positioning in these polemical exchanges over Vorticism, sculpture, and sculptural aesthetics are subtle but can be recovered through close reading and by attending to the overlapping chronologies of Yeats and Pound’s careers during the period. James Longenbach demonstrates how Pound’s statements about Imagism and an emerging Vorticism were much more assured and precise after his winters discussing symbolism with Yeats at Stone Cottage, whether in agreement or marked disagreement.³² Recently

Tom Walker and Lauren Arrington have shown the extent to which Yeats and Pound's concurrent magazine contributions in *The New Weekly* and *The Exile* offer a dialogue or "quarrel" on poetry, politics, and inter-arts aesthetics.³³

If Yeats's comments on Vorticist sculpture in the 1910s were indirect and uncommon, his interest and writing on other contemporary sculptors might complicate some of the master-narratives of modernist sculpture inscribed by Pound, Gaudier-Brzeska, and the Vorticists. Upon viewing Ivan Meštrović's statues for the first time at the V&A Museum in the summer of 1915, Yeats wrote enthusiastically to Lady Gregory: "To me it seems at the moment that they are the only sculptures I ever cared for—supernatural & heroic & yet full of tenderness. I can think of little else. It is 'Gods & Fighting Men' in stone" (2 July 1915, *CL InteLex*). In 1926 the Croatian sculptor was chosen by Yeats and the Free State coinage committee as one of several prospective designers for Ireland's new coinage. However, his letter of invitation was sent to the wrong address and he missed the deadline for the competition "What we did or tried to do."³⁴ On the same 1915 visit to London, Yeats encountered the sketches of the British sculptor Ernest A. Cole, writing to John Quinn:

He is a thorn in the Futurist and Cubist flesh for he draws incomparably in the style of Michael Angelo. If his sculpture which no one seems to have seen, is as fine as his drawings, it will be like the publication of 'Paradise Lost' in the very year when Dryden announced the final disappearance of blank verse (24 June 1915, *CL InteLex*).

This is a bold claim about a sculptor whose work Yeats had not seen and perhaps never saw. Nor is Ernest A. Cole a household name in the canon of twentieth-century plastic arts. Yet Yeats hoped for the revival—or revenge—of figurative statues over early abstract sculpture. He writes in anticipation of a new generation of sculptors modeling the human form at the precise moment Ezra Pound had declared their obsolescence. As will be seen, Yeats's later critical and poetic responses to the rhetoric of Pound suggest an alternative modernist model of sculpture and "sculptural poetics," one that is achieved by Yeats through the same terminology employed by Pound in his art writing of the 1920s.

III

Constantin Brancusi was the subject of several articles and letters by Pound from 1919–22, most significantly the autumn 1921 issue of the *Little Review*, which featured twenty-four photographs of Brancusi's sculpture and studio.³⁵ His introductory 'Brancusi' (1921) essay was the first substantive essay on the Romanian sculptor to appear in English, and Rebecca Beasley notes that it is

one of Pound's most important and influential writings on art.³⁶ In terms of sculptural aesthetics, Alex Potts has described the essay as "the most important early apologia for Brancusi's work."³⁷ Pound returns to his Vorticist credos of the 1910s to begin the essay, and generally reads Brancusi under the auspices of Gaudier-Brzeska:

'A work of art has in it no idea which is separable from the form.' I believe this conviction can be found in either vorticist explanations, and in a world where so few people have yet dissociated form from representation, one may or at least I may as well approach Brancusi via the formulations of Gaudier-Brzeska, or by myself in my study of Gaudier.³⁸

At the time of writing Pound admits to only "a few weeks acquaintance" with Brancusi, compared to "several years' friendship" with Gaudier-Brzeska, and yet he insists, "I have found, to date, nothing in vorticist formulae which contradicts the work of Brancusi."³⁹ As Beasley notes, Pound reiterates his pre-war assault on representational, democratic art and reaffirms his commitment to abstract form in the essay.⁴⁰ Pound restates an opposition to traditional monumental statues by praising Brancusi's small scale works, as he did the handheld carvings of Gaudier-Brzeska, and insisting that: "[t]he great black-stone Egyptian patera in the British museum is perhaps more formally interesting than the statues of Memnon." Epstein and Gaudier-Brzeska were both heavily influenced by Brancusi when his work was first exhibited in England at the 1913 Allied Artists' Association. Yet if Vorticism was the lodestar for Pound's "Brancusi" essay, a Vorticist vernacular sat uneasily with Brancusi's art. Pound couches his formulations in uncertainty, reminding his readers that, "No critic has the right to pretend that he fully understands an artist," or that "It is perhaps no more impossible to give a vague idea of Brancusi's sculpture in words than to give it in photographs, but it is equally impossible to give an exact sculptural idea in either words or photography."⁴¹ This of course contradicts Brancusi's tongue-in-cheek aphorism that a photograph would suffice in place of writing about his sculptures. Yet Pound's essay is at its most contradictory and fascinating when it goes beyond the comfort of his earlier Vorticist formulations.

The ovoids of Brancusi are unlike anything created by Gaudier-Brzeska in his brief career, Pound acknowledges, and "the metaphysic of Brancusi is outside and unrelated to vorticist manners of thinking." Where Gaudier-Brzeska's carvings suggest a corresponding "combination of forms" in the marble and bronze ovoids, "Brancusi has set out on the maddeningly more difficult exploration toward getting all the forms into one form."⁴² Appropriately, the *Little Review's* twenty-four photographs of Brancusi's work switch between close-ups of single shapes and wider shots of Brancusi's studio that showed a clutter of

similar sculptural forms. The seemingly pell-mell assortment of ovoids and other forms in the artist's studio photographs are distinct from a typical exhibition of works in a gallery. Yet as Alex Potts has noted, a deliberate pattern of corresponding shapes and forms is achieved in Brancusi's studio photographs, where successive versions in different materials—from rough-cut oak, to veined and abraded marble, to polished bronze—suggest an incremental process of abstraction by the removal of material imperfections.⁴³ Brancusi's fixation on the ovoid, captured by multiple photographs in the *Little Review*, allows Pound to make the case for a sculptural style that "is an approach to the infinite *by form*, by precisely the highest possible degree of consciousness of formal perfection; as free of accident as any of the philosophical demands of a 'Paradiso' can make it."⁴⁴ Incomparable in his own art form, Brancusi is paired with Dante and Cavalcanti in the quixotic endeavor to perfect his art. The sculptor's ovoids represent a higher ideal, like the glowing sphere of Dante's Paradiso: "Perhaps every artist at one time or another believes in a sort of elixir or philosopher's stone produced by the sheer perfection of his art; by the alchemical sublimation of the medium; the elimination of accidentals and imperfections."⁴⁵

Pound elaborates that from a certain angle the bronze ovoids might appear to be lifelike or levitating. However, Pound faces his own crisis of representation when writing about Brancusi's perfect sculpture:

In the case of the ovoid, I take it Brancusi is meditating upon pure form free from all terrestrial gravitation; form as free in its own life as the form of the analytic geometers; and the measure of his success in this experiment (unfinished and probably unfinishable) is that from some angles at least the ovoid does come to life and appear ready to levitate. (Or this is perhaps merely a fortuitous anecdote, like any other expression.)⁴⁶

This is an unwanted *accident* of viewing the object, being caught up in its superficial "polished brass surfaces," and being transported beyond the "thing in itself" to imagine something else, an experience akin to "crystal-gazing." It is the spectator's attempt to describe the object in words that misleads or misdirects his thinking. The "levitation" of an object formerly praised as non-mimetic, "free from all *terrestrial gravitation*," is a fortuitous association, a happy accident of his own language as he describes an image. If Pound reaches for the word "levitate" to describe the ovoid's "pure form" he must resist his verbal virtuosity:

Crystal-gazing?? No. Admitting the possibility of self-hypnosis by means of highly polished brass surfaces, the polish, from the sculptural point of view, results merely from a desire for greater precision of the form, it is also a transient glory. But the contemplation of form or of formal-beauty leading into

the infinite must be dissociated from the dazzle of crystal [...] with the crystal it is a hypnosis, or a contemplative fixation of thought.⁴⁷

The “pure form” of the bronze ovoid must be dissociated from the “dazzle” of outward physical appearances. In visual arts parlance, and in Pound’s usage, the fortuitous “anecdote”⁴⁸ means the depiction of small or extraneous incidents at the expense of the overall artwork’s unity of design. Yet Pound admits to being momentarily seduced by these surface features, the shine of polished bronze appearing to levitate and abandon its base. These are “transient visual interests” that threaten or undermine the autonomy of the artwork, opening it up to accidents or contingencies such as where the viewer happens to stand in relation to the object, and what appears to be reflected or distorted in the chrome surface.⁴⁹

“Crystal-gazing” is one such spurious but fortuitous anecdote that emerges in the verbal description of the appearance and effect of Brancusi’s smooth, polished ovoids in bronze. The chipped, abraded marbles or coarse-grained wooden sculptures avoid a hypnotic oscillation between the form and its myriad, imagined referents that the dazzle of bronze invites. As early as 1909, Pound’s fiancée Dorothy Shakespear recalled asking if he had ever “seen things in a crystal?”; to which Pound answered in jest, “I see things without a crystal.”⁵⁰

Pound’s reference to crystal-gazing might also be a swipe at Yeats, who recalled his early interest in crystallogomancy and other Hermetic practices in *Reveries Over Childhood and Youth* (CW3 97). T. S. Eliot mocked Yeats for his fascination with “self-induced trance states, calculated symbolism, mediums, theosophy, crystal-gazing, folklore and hobgoblins” in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (1933) and *After Strange Gods* (1934), interpreting his early poems as concerted efforts to get an equivalent trance-like experience or self-hypnotism into verse.⁵¹ The crystal-gazing of Yeats and his circle was also ridiculed by George Bernard Shaw and George Orwell in later years.⁵² And indeed in an unpublished essay on “Brancusi and Human Sculpture” (1934), Pound sought to dissociate Brancusi’s work from the mythical or supernatural:

The white stillness of marble. The rough eternity of the tree trunks. No mystic shilly shally, no spooks, no god damn Celtic Twilight, no Freud, no Viennese complex, no attempt to cure disease of the age by pasting up pimple. And no god damn aesthetics, as the term is understood in Bloomsbury [...] He (Constantin Brancusi) wanted to get all the forms BACK into one form.⁵³

The ovoids do not represent or seek affinity with antiquated mysticism or modern psychoanalysis. According to Pound the ovoid is a solid, durable form—the thing itself—as opposed to a fluid, durational medium that is contingent upon

time and audience, and which adopts the attributes of things beyond itself that it might appear to represent.

Yeats's most sustained exercise of crystal-gazing in verse occurs in "Lapis Lazuli." The lapis carving, given to the poet on his seventieth birthday by Harry Clifton, is reshaped by outside forces, whether by time or by the participation of the viewer who might accidentally drop or damage the stone. In the final two stanzas of Yeats's poem, the significance of the sculpture and its referents have changed with the passage of time. The fading of the upper parts of the lapis from an intense blue color to white becomes a snow-covered slope in the poet's imagination. The various cracks and dents are interpreted as newly formed rivers and streams running through the sculpture:

Two Chinamen, behind them a third,
Are carved in Lapis Lazuli,
Over them flies a long-legged bird
A symbol of longevity;
The third, doubtless a serving-man,
Carries a musical instrument.

Every discoloration of the stone,
Every accidental crack or dent,
Seems a water-course or an avalanche,
Or lofty slope where it still snows (VP 566-67)

The sculpture in Yeats's verse is unstable, multi-faceted, contingent upon time and audience, and subject to erosion or erasure. The cracks, imperfections, and faults—perhaps fault-lines—of the stone and the poem are defining characteristics of each. In the above lines the consistent *abab* rhyme scheme of the overall poem is supplemented by an internal rhyme scheme: "dent" echoing "accidental," and the assonance of "discoloration" with "water-course," as if to suggest that the changing shape of the stone has reshaped, or is mirrored by the reshaping of, the poem's form. These are the happy accidents of viewing and an ingenious interplay of word and image, wherein cracks can be interpreted as watercourses and discoloration as snow. If Pound is resistant to the material contingencies of viewing a sculpture, which might interrupt an apprehension of its perfect wholeness or "pure form," form unsubordinated to representation, these accidental cracks or dents are essential features of the sculpture in Yeats's poem. They prove to be creatively enabling as the speaker imagines the stone as a mountain, the imperfections as geological features. In line 45, the word "seems" indicates the speaker's self-conscious awareness of his role in seeing, or making, this ideal in art. Contrarily, Pound asserts that the sculpture itself was the locus of the ideal, eliminating accident or fancy from the contemplation

of “pure form.” If a close reading of “Lapis Lazuli” uncovers an alternative sculptural poetics in Yeats’s work, a more precise engagement with sculptural aesthetics in Poundian terms and its alternatives can be traced in Yeats’s prose.

IV

Yeats’s first and lengthiest discussion of Brancusi appears in the “Dove or Swan” section of *AVA*, where he appears alongside his contemporaries Wyndham Lewis, Ivan Meštrović, Pound, T. S. Eliot, and James Joyce. Throughout “Dove or Swan,” examples from poetry, prose, painting, and particularly sculpture are invoked to explain the sequential, if at times cyclical, “phases” of human history. Matthew DeForrest notes that the section is preserved almost in its entirety between *AVA* and *AVB*. This is perhaps due to what De Forrest describes as the concreteness of “Dove or Swan,” which is “constantly grounded in particulars and [...] illustrative examples,” as opposed to “the sections that deal in the abstractions of the more theoretical and philosophical concepts.”⁵⁴ Yeats draws on a wide range of art writing, from classic tomes to contemporary magazine articles, that discuss these artworks or illustrative examples. In the case of modern art this inevitably means revisiting the discourses of Imagism and Vorticism: “I discover already the first phase—Phase 23—of the last quarter in certain friends of mine, and in writers, poets and sculptors admired by these friends” (*AVA* 174–75). Yeats’s commentary on “Phase 23” is bound up in the language and discriminations of Pound’s manifestos and polemical art writing: “It is with them a matter of conscience to live in their own exact instant of time, and they defend their conscience like theologians” (*AVA* 174). Here, Yeats is borrowing a phrase from Pound’s “A Few Don’ts by an Imagiste,” published in the Chicago-based periodical *Poetry* at the outset of his Imagist phase: “An ‘Image’ is that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time.”⁵⁵ Before introducing Brancusi and other abstract artists, Yeats echoes Pound’s early impressions of the sculptor’s work that, “it isn’t like work of a human being at all.”⁵⁶ In Yeats’s words: “It is as though the forms in stone or in their reverie began to move with an energy which is not that of the human mind.” Finally, Yeats alludes to the Vorticists’ penchant for verbally blasting and bombarding the artists and art critics with whom they disagreed: “these friends, who have a form of strong love and hate hitherto unknown in the arts” (*AVA* 174).

Brancusi and Lewis are introduced as the prime examples of the twenty-third phase and its turn towards mechanical and geometric forms:

Very often these forms are mechanical [...] I think of the work of Mr Wyndham Lewis, his powerful ‘cacophony of sardine tins’, and of those marble eggs,

or objects of burnished steel too drawn up or tapered out to be called eggs, of M. Brancusi, who has gone further than Mr Wyndham Lewis from recognizable subject matter and so from personality [...] (AVA 174)

Crucially, Yeats distinguishes between Brancusi's "marble eggs" and his bronze ovoids (which he miscasts as "burnished steel"), an acknowledgement of Pound's view that the polished bronze sought a "greater precision of the form" abstracted from living things or recognizable, "terrestrial" referents. Yeats also acknowledges the distinction between direct carving and modeling established by the Vorticists: "I compare them to sculpture or painting where now the artist now the model imposes his personality," alluding to Rodin's *Gates of Hell* as "images out of a personal dream," and the antithesis of Brancusi and Lewis's impersonal, abstract artworks.

In addition to Rodin, Yeats alludes to two contemporary European sculptors who fell outside the Vorticist standards and parameters of Pound's circle: "of sculptors who would certainly be rejected as impure by a true sectary of this moment, the Scandinavian Milles, Mestrovic perhaps, masters of a geometrical pattern or rhythm which seems to impose itself wholly from beyond the mind." The "true sectar[ies] of this moment" echoes Yeats's reference to his friends and acquaintances—Pound, Lewis, Gaudier-Brzeska—who are said to be living in their "exact instant of time" and defending their conscience like theologians (AVA 174). The impurities of a Milles or Meštrović are rejected in the same art criticism that dished out benevolent approval and promotion of Brancusi, Epstein, Eric Gill and Gaudier-Brzeska. Yet Yeats reads these sculptors as consistent with the sculptural practice and critical vocabularies advanced by his friends. Milles and Meštrović are equally "masters of a geometrical pattern or rhythm which seems to impose itself wholly from beyond the mind, the artist 'standing outside himself'" (AVA 174). Consequently, Yeats calls attention to a tradition of representational art that thrived alongside and in conversation with abstraction. The revisionist art history elaborated by Curtis and Turner identifies a wider European circle of modernist sculptors who were not tied to the dichotomy of direct carving and modeling that persisted in Britain. Where Pound dismissed the cheap "Michaelangelism and rhetoric of Mestrovic" in Yeats's "Dove or Swan," the Croatian Meštrović and the Swede Carl Milles are deliberately paired with Lewis and Brancusi and are set in opposition to an antecedent phase of "sculpture or painting where now the artist now the model imposes his personality" (AVA 174). If there is an effort in Yeats's elaborate systematizing across "Dove or Swan" to make artists of each phase cohere, in "Phase 23" there is nevertheless a precise reference to passages from Pound's early art criticism and an attempt to widen the circle of artists to which these principles applied. In Yeats's dismissal of a purist or true sectary's distinction between carved and modeled statuary of

the period, he is in curious alignment with Adrian Stokes, for whom the terms carving and modeling became less a strict dichotomy of technical processes, but rather discreet attitudes that sculptors and viewers brought to certain artworks in their execution and subsequent written reception.⁵⁷

Although “Dove or Swan” was largely preserved between the 1925 and 1937 versions of *A Vision*, this dense paragraph on the artists of “Phase 23” was excised from the later version. A passage from the first published version of “Packet for Ezra Pound” might explain Yeats’s reasoning for the removal. Namely, his unease about predicting the trend of modern writers and his successors:

It is almost impossible to understand the art of a generation younger than one’s own. I was wrong about “Ulysses” when I had read but some first fragments, and I do not want to be wrong again—above all in judging verse. (AVB 309–10, n14)

If Yeats was uncertain about casting permanent judgments on the writing of Joyce, Pound, and Eliot, this article has shown that the ephemeral art criticism of Yeats’s contemporaries remained influential and central to his diagnosis of modern sculpture. The removal of these paragraphs from AVB does not necessarily mean an indiscriminate rejection or suppression of these aesthetic debates. The incorporation of Brancusi’s ovoids and the cubes of Wyndham Lewis into “A Packet for Ezra Pound” suggests a compression of earlier ideas, just as Pound paraphrased his art writing of the 1910s into what Beasley described as “a repository of analogies to be manipulated at will” by the 1930s.⁵⁸ While due attention has been paid in Yeats studies to the esoteric art histories of Eugenie Sellers Strong, Josef Strzygowski, and Salomon Reinach that informed both versions of *A Vision*,⁵⁹ the significance of “ephemeral” art criticism by Pound, Lewis, and Gaudier-Brzeska in modernist little magazines remains underexplored. The utility of Brancusi and his configurations in art history remained important to the later Yeats. Beyond AVA, the abstract ovoid served as a potent and protean image in Yeats’s schema.

In an untitled and uncollected ten-line poem from the introduction to the 1934 Cuala Press edition of *The Words upon the Window-Pane*, Yeats reiterates the importance of accident to sculpture whilst engaging directly with Pound’s writing on Brancusi:

Let images of basalt, black, immovable,
Chiselled in Egypt, or ovoids of bright steel
Hammered and polished by Brancusi’s hand,
Represent spirits. If spirits seem to stand
Before the bodily eyes, speak into the bodily ears,

They are not present but their messengers.
 Of double nature these, one nature is
 Compounded of accidental phantasies.
 We question; it but answers what we would
 Or as phantasy directs—because they have drunk the blood. (*VPI* 969)

The colossal statues in Egypt and the abstract ovoids of Brancusi bookend the entire history of sculpture in the poem. Each sculpted work, whether chiseled basalt or polished bronze, has the capacity to represent divine entities, to make them seem present and palpable “before the bodily eyes” and ears. However, these manmade images, interpreted *as* the spirits they represent, are also an imaginative departure, “[c]ompounded of *accidental* phantasies,” answering to the spectator, or perhaps even the believer, with what he wants to hear: “We question; it but answers what we would / Or as phantasy directs.” The medium alters the message by virtue of its appearance; the material, the accidental details of the object, and the misdirection of the observer’s phantasies.

The obscure poem and the play it accompanies, *The Words upon the Window-Pane*, provide an exploration of séances and the veracity of spirit mediums.⁶⁰ W. B. Yeats inserted the poem-fragment into the second section of a commentary on the play, following discussions with George Yeats about the nature of séances and automatic writing. His conclusion that the answers given by spirits in a séance were the collaboration of the medium and audience as active spectators speaks to his own automatic writing sessions of past decades: “Remember how many of what seems the laws of spirit life are but the pre-possession of the living.”⁶¹ In redrafting his commentary from 1931–32, the ten-line poem appears as a distillation of multiple correspondences with George Yeats on the nature of mediumship. Yet the beginning of the poem is chiefly concerned with the means by which the *sculpted medium* represents spirits. Yeats chooses precisely the materials that Pound stated an uncertainty or resistance to in his 1921 “Brancusi” essay: the polished bright steel of Brancusi’s ovoids as opposed to marble or wood, and the “Kolossal” figurative Egyptian statues chiseled from basalt, opposed to the smaller “Egyptian patera in the British Museum.”⁶² Where the polished bronze material of Brancusi’s ovoids is interpreted by Pound as a means of eliminating “accidentals and imperfections,” the “bright steel” surface and its “transient visual interests”⁶³ are seized upon by Yeats as a model for mediumship and crystal-gazing, compounded of “accidental phantasies.”

Yeats’s later reflection on the gyres and lunar phases in “A Packet” bears the same mix of measured skepticism and susceptibility to fantasy expressed in his ten-line poem from the introduction to *The Words upon the Window-Pane*: “Now that the system stands out clearly in my imagination I regard them as

stylistic arrangements of experience comparable to the cubes in the drawing of Wyndham Lewis and to the ovoids in the sculpture of Brancusi. They have helped me to hold in a single thought reality and justice" (AVB 19). The earlier 1929 Cuala Press volume of *A Packet for Ezra Pound* did not refer to the painterly and sculptural analogies of Lewis's cubes or Brancusi's ovoids (AVB 325, n68). Their inclusion in AVB might be read as a compression of ideas raised in the untitled ten-line poem on sculpture and its fantasized potential for mediumship.

Despite Pound's objections in the "Brancusi" (1921) and "Brancusi and Human Sculpture" (1934) essays, the natural vocabulary of abstract art was spiritualist in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. "I was made to look at a colmetric form and then, closing my eyes, see it again in the mind's eye," recalled Yeats on the trance techniques taught in the Order of the Golden Dawn; "I was then shown how to allow my reveries to drift, following the suggestion of the symbol" (*Mem* 27). Evidently, Yeats embraces his own "fortuitous anecdotes" and associations that emerge in the contemplation of Brancusi's abstract ovoids turned symbols. If this implies an unorthodox reading of Pound's polemics, Yeats's art writing contributions and poem on Brancusi nevertheless complicate a prevailing narrative of modern sculpture, offering one of many approaches to the inter-arts aesthetics of the period that resist the elision of Modernism with Vorticism. Taken together, Yeats's commentaries seek to reclaim "accident," "crystal-gazing," and the beholder's fancy, or fantasy, for the language of sculptural aesthetics. Mina Loy's free verse poem "Brancusi's Golden Bird," published in *The Dial* one year after the *Little Review's* Brancusi number, suggests another poetic response to Pound's writing on Vorticist sculpture and photography.⁶⁴ The range of appropriations and inversions of Pound's sculptural vernacular during his lifetime and by his contemporaries indicates a more diverse visual culture in the Modernist period. Yeats's infamous description of Pound in the opening of "A Packet" does not foreclose the possibility of a cross-fertilization of aesthetics, or indeed sculptural poetics. In recent Yeats criticism the characterization might emblemize their paradoxical inter-arts exchanges: "Ezra Pound, whose art is the opposite of mine, whose criticism commends what I most condemn, a man with whom I should quarrel more than anyone else if we were not united by affection" (AVB 3).

Notes

1. Quoted in Ann Saddlemyer, *Becoming George: The Life of Mrs W. B. Yeats* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 250.
2. Quoted in Milton W. Brown, *The Story of the Armory Show* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1988), 139.
3. Ezra Pound, "Paris Letter, December 1921," *The Dial*, January 1922, 73–8.

4. Quoted in Saddlemyer, *Becoming George*, 250.
5. W. B. Yeats, *The Words upon the Window-Pane* (Dublin: Cuala Press, 1934); hereafter *TWU-WP* 1934.
6. Giorgio Melchiori, *The Whole Mystery of Art* (London: Routledge, 1960), 164–99, 271–273; Timothy Materer, *Modernist Alchemy: Poetry and the Occult* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1995), 32–40; Miranda B. Hickman, *The Geometry of Modernism: The Vorticist Idiom in Lewis, Pound, H.D. and Yeats* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005), 187–244.
7. Elizabeth Bergmann Loizeaux, *Yeats and the Visual Arts* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003), 161–63.
8. Peter L. Caracciolo and Paul Edwards, “In Fundamental Agreement: Yeats and Wyndham Lewis,” *YA* 13 (1998), 110–57; Peter L. Caracciolo, “‘What rough beast’: Yeatsian glimpses of ‘Utopia’ in Wyndham Lewis’s *The Human Age* and *America and Cosmic Man*,” *Journal of Wyndham Lewis Studies* 1.1 (2010), 81–108.
9. Yeats’s “Packet” could be interpreted as an open letter, first published by Cuala Press in 1929 and separately from the contents of *A Vision*. See “Editors’ Introduction,” *AVB*, xxxii–xxxvi.
10. Pound, “1934 in the Autumn [letter],” *Criterion*, 14, 1935; rpt. in *Jefferson and/or Mussolini* (New York: Liveright, 1936), vii–ix.
11. Rebecca Beasley, *Ezra Pound and the Visual Culture of Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 207.
12. Constantin Brancusi, quoted in Ashley Lazevnick, “Impossible descriptions in Mina Loy and Constantin Brancusi’s *Golden Bird*,” *Word & Image* 29.2 (2013), 192, 200(n5).
13. Rachel Teukolsky, *The Literate Eye* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 47.
14. Teukolsky, *The Literate Eye*, 238; W.J.T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 232–35.
15. Sarah Victoria Turner, “‘Reuniting What Never Should Have Been Separated’: The Arts and Crafts Movements, Modernism and Sculpture in Britain 1890–1914,” *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 14.2 (Summer 2015).
16. Mark Antliff, “Politicizing the New Sculpture,” in *Vorticism: New Perspectives*, eds. Mark Antliff and Scott W. Klein (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 102–18. Sarah Victoria Turner, “Ezra Pound’s New Order of Artists: ‘The New Sculpture’ and the critical formation of a sculptural avant-garde in early twentieth-century Britain,” *Sculpture Journal* 21.2 (2012), 9–21.
17. Henri Gaudier-Brzeska, “Allied Artists Association Ltd.,” *The Egoist* 1, no. 12 (15 June 1914), 227–29: 227.
18. Tim Armstrong, *The Logic of Slavery: Debt, Technology and Pain in American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 102. See also Martina Droth, Jason Edwards, and Michael Hatt, eds. *Sculpture Victorious: Art in an Age of Invention, 1837–1901* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 15–55.
19. Gaudier-Brzeska, “Allied Artists,” 227.
20. Penelope Curtis, ‘How direct carving stole the idea of Modern British Sculpture,’ in *Sculpture and the Pursuit of a Modern Ideal in Britain c. 1880–1930*, ed. David J. Getsy (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 291–318.
21. Warwick Gould, John Kelly, and Deirdre Toomey, eds. *The Collected Letters of W. B. Yeats, Volume 2: 1896–1900* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 269–71, 484. W. B. Yeats ‘What we did or tried to do,’ in *W. B. Yeats & the Designing of Ireland’s Coinage*, ed. Brian Cleeve (Dublin: The Dolmen Press, 1972), 9–16.
22. Pound, “The New Sculpture” *Egoist*, 16 February 1914, 67–68: 68.
23. Pound, “The New Sculpture,” 68.
24. Pound, “The New Sculpture,” 68.
25. Pound, “The New Sculpture,” 68.

26. Pound, "Exhibition at the Goupil Gallery," *Egoist*, 16 March 1914, 109.
27. Pound, quoted in A.D. Moody, *Ezra Pound: Poet: The Epic Years, 1921–1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 4.
28. Pound, "Brancusi," *The Little Review* 8.1 (Autumn, 1921), 3–7: 3.
29. Pound, "Affirmations: Vorticism," *The New Age*, 14 January, 1915, 277; "Affirmations: Jacob Epstein," *The New Age*, 21 January, 1915, 311; Pound, "Et Faim Sallir le Loup des Boys," *Blast* 2, July 1915, 22.
30. Pound, "Paris Letter, December 1921," 73–78: 76.
31. Pound, "Paris Letter, December 1921," 73–78: 75.
32. James Longenbach, *Stone Cottage: Pound, Yeats and Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 81.
33. Tom Walker, "Our More Profound Pre-Raphaelitism': Yeats, Aestheticism and *Blast*," in *Blast at 100*, eds. Philip Coleman, Kathryn Milligan, and Nathan O'Donnell (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming 2017). Lauren Arrington, "Feeding the Cats: Yeats and Pound at Rapallo, 1928," *Uncertain Futures: Essays about the Irish Past for Roy Foster*, ed. Senia Paseta (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 188–98.
34. W. B. Yeats, "What we did or tried to do," in Brian Cleeve, ed. *W. B. Yeats & the Designing of Ireland's Coinage* (Dublin: Dolmen Press, 1972), 9–16.
35. Pound, "Wyndham Lewis at the Goupil," *The New Age*, 20 February 1919, 263–64; Pound, "Paris Letter, December 1921," 73–78.
36. Beasley, *Ezra Pound*, 176–84, 177.
37. Alex Potts, *The Sculptural Imagination* (London: Yale University Press, 2000), 135.
38. Pound, "Brancusi," 3.
39. Pound, "Brancusi," 3–4.
40. Beasley, *Ezra Pound*, 179.
41. Pound, "Brancusi," 3.
42. Pound, "Brancusi," 6.
43. See Potts, *Sculptural Imagination*, 132–34, 140, for suitable examples of Brancusi's studio layout.
44. Pound, "Brancusi," 7.
45. Pound, "Brancusi," 5.
46. Pound, "Brancusi," 6.
47. Pound, "Brancusi," 6.
48. *OED Online*, February 2017, s.v. "anecdote, n, 2c." Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/7367>.
49. Pound, "Brancusi," 6.
50. Omar Pound and A. Walton Litz, eds. *Ezra Pound and Dorothy Shakespear: Their Letters: 1909–1914* (New York: New Directions, 1984), 3.
51. T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (London: Faber, 1964), 140. Eliot, *After Strange Gods* (London: Faber and Faber, 1934), 48.
52. George Bernard Shaw, quoted in Janet Oppenheim, *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 28; George Orwell, "W. B. Yeats," in *Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell* vol. 2, eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (Middlesex: Seeker & Warburg, 1968), 175–79.
53. Pound, "Brancusi and Human Sculpture," in *Ezra Pound and the Visual Arts*, ed. Harriet Zinnes (New York: New Directions, 1980), 307–08.
54. Matthew DeForrest, "W. B. Yeats's *A Vision*: 'Dove or Swan,'" in *W. B. Yeats's A Vision: Explorations and Contexts*, eds. Neil Mann, Matthew Gibson and Claire V. Nally (Clemson: Clemson University Press, 2012), 136–58: 136.
55. Pound, "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste," *Poetry*, 6 March 1913, 200–06: 200.

56. Pound, "Paris Letter, December 1921," 73–78.
57. Adrian Stokes, *The Quattro Cento and Stones of Rimini* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 28; *The Image in Form* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972) 47–48.
58. Beasley, *Ezra Pound*, 207.
59. T. R. Henn, *Lonely Tower* (Oxford: Routledge, 1965), 191–219; Matthew Gibson, "Timeless and Spaceless?," in *W. B. Yeats's A Vision*, eds. Mann et al., 103–135; Brian Arkins, *Builders of My Soul: Greek and Roman Themes in Yeats* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1990), 182.
60. The manuscript and typescript introductions to the "Coole Edition" of *Plays* and *TWUWP* 1934, dated 7 October 1932 and 1934 respectively, suggest that the verse fragment was an addition to the prose commentary on séances and "cheating mediums," originally published in the *Dublin Magazine* in February 1932. See the National Library of Ireland, *Yeats Papers*: NLI MS 30,185 and MS 30,211.
61. Yeats, quoted in *The Words Upon the Window Pane: Manuscript Materials*, ed. Mary Fitzgerald (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2002), xxviii. See the National Library of Ireland, *Yeats Papers*: NLI MS 30,185, MS 30,211, MS 30,324, and MS 30,545 in private hands.
62. Pound, "Brancusi," 6; Pound, "Paris Letter, December 1921," 73–78.
63. Pound, "Brancusi," 5–6.
64. See Ashley Lazevnick, "Mina Loy and Constantin Brancusi," in *Word & Image*, 192–202.