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Yeats, Pound, and the Little Review, 1914–1918

Clare Hutton

Writing to the French poet Henry Davray in 1896, Yeats expressed his sense of intended audience and purpose with energy and simplicity:

I am an Irish poet, looking to my own people for my ultimate best audience & trying to express the things that interest them & which will make them care for the land in which they live.¹

The commitment here is notable: if believed, it is that of a writer, aged just over thirty, who wishes to produce work which would appeal to Irish readers of all classes. Even in 1896 this is hardly to be trusted, and certainly by the time he reached his later forties Yeats’s attitude to the literary marketplace and his ideal intended readership had adjusted quite significantly. To make money as a poet, he had had to work out how to negotiate the complexities of London’s highly stratified literary marketplace, by positioning works within newspapers and periodicals, creating a context of appreciation for his work, and gradually and slowly gathering individual poems into shaped and intended volumes by publishers such as Elkin Mathews, A. H. Bullen, T. Fisher Unwin, and, from 1901, Macmillan and Company. As his career became more assured, it also became more international, and there is no doubt in this regard that his introduction to Ezra Pound in London at the end of April 1909 was particularly formative. Pound was younger and more energetic, and had a very different sense of the literary sphere in which he wished to make an impact. He wanted to ensure that his work and that of other writers that he valued would be read by the right sort of readers on both sides of the Atlantic. On Pound’s insistence Yeats made a small but interesting set of contributions to the avant-garde, US-published Little Review, a journal which is now enjoying a renewal of critical interest thanks to the energies of the New Modernist Studies and its remediation in digital form by the Modernist Journals Project.² In fact the Little Review, which ran from 1914 to 1929, has always been a source of considerable interest to scholars of modernist literature because it serialized much of Joyce’s Ulysses between March 1918 and December 1920, and was guest-edited by Pound for two years from May 1917.

The founding editor of the Little Review was Margaret Anderson (1886–1973), the feminist and littératour who was later joined by her partner, Jane Heap (1883–1964), a more shadowy but arguably more significant editorial presence behind the scenes, particularly during the Ulysses period and thereafter. In setting up her journal, Anderson had determined that it was to be her
own “personal enterprise” and “neither directly nor indirectly connected in any way with an organization, society, company, cult or movement.” Nonetheless Anderson had strategically positioned the first office of the *Little Review* within the Fine Arts Building in Chicago, where she was friendly with Harriet Monroe, who in October 1912 founded *Poetry: A Magazine of Verse*, one of the best known of modernism’s “little magazines.” This association with Monroe smoothed the way for the association with Yeats. *Poetry* had printed an address which Yeats made to “American Poets” during his visit to Chicago of March 1914, and the *Little Review* reprinted it in April 1914. The very act of reprinting such a specific item implies Anderson’s openness to European literary culture, and her tacit support of the advice Yeats gave to American poets. The address was predictably pompous. Though he was only forty-eight, Yeats’s address positions himself as an old man (“I have lived a good many years”), an expert reader, and one who has rebelled against “rhetorical poetry” and the artificiality of “poetic diction.” He continues by observing that American poetry is full of “sentimentality” and “rhetoric,” and that American poets suffer from being “too far from Paris.” Pound is presented as the one shining exception to all of this, and his poem “The Return” is commended by Yeats as “the most beautiful poem that has been written in the free form, one of the few in which I find real organic rhythm.” These comments provide an interesting frame for Yeats’s other contributions to the *Little Review*, which were all solicited and arranged by Pound during his tenure as “Foreign Editor” of the *Little Review*.

Despite her editorial brio and considerable charm, Anderson clearly found it difficult to sustain the *Little Review* and, according to Pound, the journal had become “scrappy and unselective” during 1916. It had certainly diminished in volume and regularity, only appearing seven times that year though labelled a “monthly.” Some issues only comprised thirty pages, and even those were padded out with advertisements. Pound had been angling to get the “corner” of a journal for some years, and during 1915 had contemplated setting up one himself, sponsored by John Quinn, his friend and patron. These plans, which were set out in a prospectus for Quinn, did not materialize. Nonetheless, and in view of what did emerge, the terms of Pound’s vision are worth considering. In private correspondence with Quinn, he described a journal which “could completely support Joyce, Eliot, Myself and asst-edtr,” and proposed that it be a “male review” published under the banner “No woman shall be allowed to write for this magazine” on the grounds that “active America is getting fed up on gynocracy.” While it might be appropriate to dismiss these comments as bluster, it is worth remembering that Pound’s plans for literary journalism ultimately led to collaborations with notable feminists, not just Anderson and Heap of the *Little Review* but also Dora Marsden and Harriet Shaw Weaver of *The Egoist* (which regularly advertised in the *Little Review*, and occasionally...
described itself in a slogan—which has a Poundian swagger—as a “journal of interest to virile readers only”). Anderson and Heap had not met Pound before his association with the Little Review began but Marsden had, and clearly had some sense of his chauvinism. Acting on behalf of The Egoist and against Weaver’s wishes, Marsden turned down an offer of cash from Pound in exchange for control of her magazine on the grounds that it would considerably reduce her editorial power. Anderson, by contrast, was more receptive to Pound’s offer to “help the Little Review” by bringing capital and offering to solicit and edit literary work. This is because the finances of the Little Review were genuinely perilous and because she knew that the Little Review would benefit from Pound’s international connections, which had done much for Poetry. The decision to accept Pound’s offer is also arguably a sign of Anderson’s confidence that she could work around whatever editorial pressures Pound exerted. After all, she had founded the Little Review and sustained it for three years without Pound’s assistance, and in the closing months of 1916 had already planned a move from Chicago to New York on the grounds that she and Heap “have an entirely new lease on life and were just starting with what we have to say.”

Let us return to Yeats, and to the context of his own contributions to the Little Review. What is notable about Pound’s plans for the journal is that Yeats was never part of them. In the leading editorial of May 1917, for example, Pound puts all the emphasis on his desire to publish the “current prose writings of James Joyce, Wyndham Lewis, T. S. Eliot and myself […] regularly, promptly, and together.” The same piece makes it clear that Pound has had several arguments with the editors of Poetry (who, in his opinion, have shown “an unflagging courtesy to a lot of old fools and fogies”); in addition, he regards the “elder generation of American magazines” with “contempt,” and describes Joyce, Lewis, and Eliot as authors of “the most important contributions to English literature of the past three years” and of “practically the only works of the time in which the creative element is present.” But the experience of actually obtaining copy from this ideal trio proved to be more difficult than Pound had anticipated. In a letter of June 21, 1917, for example, Pound told Anderson that contributions from Lewis had dried up, that Joyce was “incapacitated” with eye troubles and Eliot had done “no work for weeks” (he “returns from the bank, falls into a leaden slumber and remains therein until bedtime”). The crisis was bringing about something of a rethink and, ironically, saw Pound asking Anderson in the same letter to suggest “ANY English or continental authors […] whom you think it peculiarly desirable to grab.” Meanwhile he had suggestions of his own, including Lady Gregory, Ford Madox Ford, and Thomas Hardy. He also knew that he could count on Yeats, who was a personal friend, “to turn out a few more poems.” The implication of this exchange is that Yeats was being positioned within the Little Review as a kind of filler, until more committed modernist work could be
elicited. While it would be imprudent to overstate an argument of this kind, it is certainly the case that a lack of the right kind of copy is one among a number of factors working behind the scenes at the *Little Review* and should be borne in mind in assessing intertextual dialogues within the journal.

Yeats’s contributions to the *Little Review* are listed in Figure 1:

**Figure 1:** Yeats’s Contributions to the *Little Review*, compiled by the author from the *Little Review* and *VP*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little Review Date</th>
<th>Content by Yeats</th>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Further Publication Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1918</td>
<td>“Major Robert Gregory”</td>
<td>Obituary</td>
<td>From the <em>Observer</em>, Feb. 17, 1918.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1919</td>
<td><em>The Dreaming of the Bones</em></td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Published in <em>Two Plays for Dancers</em> (Dublin: Cuala Press, Jan. 1919).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In June 1917 Yeats was in the midst of creating *The Wild Swans at Coole* as a volume, and was preparing a draft version and arrangement of the volume for private press publication with his sister’s Cuala Press. His mood was elegiac. The war had stretched out over several seasons, and was the source of continuing turmoil. He sensed his ageing intensely, but the intimacies of his life were by no means settled. Following the execution of John MacBride for his role in the uprising of Easter 1916, Yeats proposed to Maud Gonne, was rejected (again), and then proposed to her daughter, Iseult, who also turned him down. He was also having to come to terms with the huge political and cultural upheavals brought about by the events of Easter 1916. In the face of so much uncertainty writing was particularly important. As he wrote to his sister, “there is nothing to be done but do one’s work” (*Life* 2:46). Draft publication was especially important, and a necessary step before commitment to Macmillan, his major commercial publisher in London. For early versions of works which he had yet to fully finish, he could choose to publish a few individual poems in a serial (such as the *Little Review*), or he could issue a larger arrangement of work in a small and limited private edition (as with the Cuala Press).

Yeats's commitment to serial publication, a central facet of his professional writerly practice, was not just about aesthetics. It was also, crucially, about payment and copyright, and perhaps to a lesser extent about securing readerships beyond his immediate and local worlds in London and Dublin. Publication in the *Little Review* gave Yeats a means by which he could secure his copyright in the United States, a necessary step owing to the “manufacturing clause” of the 1891 International Copyright Act. This stipulated that foreign works needed to be printed from *type set in the US*, in order to be copyright-protected. Yeats had toured the US extensively, was popular among the Irish American literati, and was thus particularly vulnerable to piracy. Publication in the *Little Review* was a means of mitigating that risk. It was also a source of payment, and here it is worth remembering that Pound’s involvement with the *Little Review* unleashed a source of payment for the authors he selected, a crucial “pull” factor in the chain of events which led to the compilation of the twenty-two issues of the *Little Review* to which Pound contributed as editor between May 1917 and April 1919. The money came from Quinn and, for those two years from the spring of 1917, Pound was paid at least $300 per annum as editor, and received an allowance of $450 per annum to pay contributors. Though the evidence on exactly who was paid, for what, and how much remains patchy, it is clear that the appointment of Pound led to the creation of a dual economy, comprising the paid (mainly European, male, and chosen by Pound) and the mostly unpaid (mainly American, sometimes women, and chosen by Anderson and Heap). Yeats, along with Eliot, Joyce, and Lewis, was on the paid list; the unpaid included figures such as Djuna Barnes, Dorothy Richardson, and Baroness Elsa
von Freytag-Loringhoven. The correspondence of the period makes it clear that Anderson and Heap were perpetually broke: sometimes to the point of being hungry, usually unable to pay their rent, and often struggling to meet production costs. Pound’s open checkbook was thus an inevitable source of tension, but was tolerated because his contributors were a continuing source of copy and energy, and thus attracted new and more obscure writers to the pages of the journal. Pound’s paid list of European contributors facilitated the continuation of the *Little Review* and helped to create a context for a distinctive American avant-garde, which included writers such as Sherwood Anderson, Marianne Moore, and William Carlos Williams.

Anderson and Heap had ready eyes for the sustaining appeal of being transgressive, and Pound was a brilliant sloganeer. By June 1917, just a month after he had become Foreign Editor, the *Little Review* had remodeled its format, masthead, and banner to reflect these aims, switching the rather bland strapline of “Literature Drama Music Art” for the rather more riven and adversarial “Making No Compromise with The Public Taste,” a slogan which suggests a determination to shock and challenge readers. This proved prescient given the serialization of *Ulysses* and the prosecution, in February 1921, of the *Little Review* editors on the grounds of the “obscenity” of the third instalment of chapter 13 (in which Bloom masturbates on Sandymount Strand).20 Behind the scenes there were multiple editorial compromises, and certainly any close reading of the contents of the *Little Review* should proceed with an awareness of gendered, national, and material economies. Consider for example Yeats’s “A Deep Sworn Vow,” a six-line poem which appeared in the issue of June 1917:

Others, because you did not keep
That deep sworn vow, have been friends of mind,
Yet always when I look death in the face,
When I clamber to the heights of sleep,
Or when I grow excited with wine,
Suddenly I meet your face.

*October 17, 1915*21

It is impossible not to read this poem in biographical terms, even if they are reductive. It is about the “vow” which Maud Gonne apparently made to Yeats (that she would not marry anyone), his despair that she married MacBride in 1903, his friendship with Lady Gregory, and Gonne’s continuing presence in the life of his mind. The personal tragedy is too close to the poem, and the elaborate syntactical movement (beginning with the word “others”) is artificial and labored. Writing about his decision not to write free verse, Yeats would later comment:
all that is personal soon rots. It must be packed in ice or salt. [...] If I wrote of personal love or sorrow in free verse, or in any rhythm that left it unchanged, amid all its accidence, I would be full of self-contempt because of egotism and indiscretion, and foresee the boredom of my reader. I must choose a traditional stanza, even what I alter must seem traditional. [...] Ancient salt is best packing. (E&I 522)

Certainly this poem has “traditional” formal elements: a tight and unexpected rhyme scheme (ABC/ABC), and an irregular mix of trimeter, tetrameter, and pentameter lines. Yet there is an egotism and indiscretion in the poem, particularly when read next to “Broken Dreams,” which appeared on the same page of the Little Review and opens with “There is grey in your hair. / Young men no longer suddenly catch their breath / When you are passing.” Yeats seems determined to haunt the addressee of these poems, and by including the dates in the serial publication (October 17, 1915 for “A Deep Sworn Vow” and November 1915 for “Broken Dreams”) he is pointing, egotistically, not just to the act of composition but to a specific moment of emotional suffering. Yeats has not escaped from the “accidence” which produced the idea for each text. Or, to suggest the case another way, perhaps he should have used less “salt” and written about his feelings with less labor and more immediacy.

Yeats’s contributions to the Little Review are a navigational point from which one can orient a reading of the contextual dissonances of an emerging modernism. This is particularly true for the September 1918 issue, which included “In Memory of Robert Gregory” alongside four poems by T. S. Eliot (“Sweeney among the Nightingales,” “Whispers of Immortality,” “Dans le Restaurant,” and “Mr. Eliot’s Sunday Morning Service”), chapter 6 of Ulysses, and an excerpt from the novel Women and Men by Ford Madox Ford (who was known as Ford Madox Hueffer at this time). To complement these works (which were arranged by Pound), Anderson and Heap arranged for the publication of two stories—“Senility” by Sherwood Anderson and “Decay” by Ben Hecht—and they arranged the contents of the infamous “Reader Critic” column, which featured the responses of readers to earlier issues. Stretching to twenty-two of the issue’s sixty-four pages, Joyce’s contribution, labelled “Episode VI,” is the longest of all. It appears without any editorial or introductory casing, and though complete in itself, is a considerably shorter version of what is now known as the “Hades” episode of Ulysses. The chapter is a group portrait, and reveals Bloom’s social interactions among his male peers. It divides neatly into two halves, with the first meticulously describing the journey across the city by horse-drawn carriage to Prospect Cemetery in Glasnevin and the second describing the arrival of the cortège, a service of committal in the chapel, and the burial of Paddy Dignam. It concludes with Bloom’s thoughts and experiences as he meanders
among the gravestones. Apart from the occasional moments of humor, often supplied in Bloom’s musings and through dialogue involving Simon Dedalus (“Most amusing expressions that man finds”), the atmosphere of the text is somber and elegiac. It thus links, in thematic terms, with what was billed as the leading text of this issue, Yeats’s “In Memory of Robert Gregory,” one of
the elegies for Lady Gregory’s son, Robert Gregory (1881–1918), a Major in the Royal Air Force who was killed in action in January 1918. Though Yeats and Joyce are often viewed as belonging to quite different cultural and literary constituencies, what is striking in viewing the adjacent publication of these two texts is the way in which both build on multiple Irish cultural and historic specificities, which must have been difficult for American readers to grasp.

An implicit recognition of these difficulties in respect of Yeats’s poem is suggested by the republication of Yeats’s obituary for Gregory in the Little Review of November 1918, in response to “so many letters asking for particulars about Robert Gregory.” One such particular is that Gregory died fighting in the war, a fact that is omitted in the poem; the word “Major,” included in the title of the poem in volume editions from 1919 onward, is not present in the Little Review. As James Pethica has argued, the poem does not make “any kind of conventional claim for Robert’s death as an heroic contribution to a valiant or necessary war.” Instead it attempts to make “appropriate commentary” (in its own rather hollow phrase) by promoting a view of Gregory as an all-round Renaissance man who loved painting (“that stern colour and that delicate line”), playing the host (“your heartiest welcomer”), and craftsmanship (he “understood / All work in metal or in wood / In moulded plaster or in carven stone?”). The poem is technically accomplished—it has a “stately rhetoric and architecture,” with twelve stanzas written in the Cowley eight-line form, in lines which rhyme aabbcddc. It is full of reminiscence, with stanza eight reading as follows:

When with the Galway foxhounds he would ride
From Castle Taylor to the Roxborough side
Or Esserkelly plains, few kept his pace;
At Moneen he had leaped a place
So perilous that half the astonished meet
Had shut their eyes; and where was it
He rode a race without a bit?
And yet his mind outran the horses’ feet.

The work is replete with political and emotional evasion. Lady Gregory had asked Yeats to “write something down that we may keep,” a task which Yeats found particularly awkward. This particular stanza “commending Robert's courage in the hunting-field” is a case in point: Lady Gregory had hoped for mention of “aero planes & the blue Italian sky” in which Gregory had met his death, but Yeats firmly resisted such suggestions (Life 2 126). Gregory’s enlistment was partly motivated by a desire to escape a conflicted home situation, brought about by his wife’s discovery of his extramarital affair. Yeats knew of this, and of Gregory’s Unionist leanings and general aimlessness. He knew too
that Gregory had been particularly cruel to his wife, and that even his mother regarded him as a “cad.” Thus the description of Gregory as “Our Sidney and our perfect man” is quite an imaginative feat.

Interestingly this poem, positioned within this Little Review context, has been read in very different terms by Jeffrey Drouin, author of “Close- and Distant-Reading Modernism: Network Analysis, Text Mining, and Teaching the Little Review,” an article which uses techniques in network analysis in order to understand the journal’s general emphasis on “life and vitality” and the specific features of the September 1918 issue, particularly its “mention of the First World War and thematic coherence around death.” For Drouin, Yeats’s poem is one of the Little Review’s “few direct references to the First World War.” Yet it is worth stressing that the poem does not make any “direct” reference to the war at all. Without being aware of Gregory’s biography, American readers could not reasonably surmise that Gregory had died in the war. The poem simply does not state this fact, but meanders through a description of the dead “friends that cannot sup with us.” Awkwardly, Yeats suggests he can accept the passing of those he names (Lionel Johnson, John Synge, and George Pollexfen) but he stumbles on “my dear friend’s dear son” who is only named in the title of the poem. Naming and not naming are crucial strategies in this poem, as in “An Irish Airman Foresees His Death,” a poem which was similarly inspired by Gregory’s death, but derives considerable power from not naming him (though it does specify “My country is Kiltartan Cross / My countrymen Kiltartan’s poor”). Interestingly, this poem—a more ambivalent appraisal of Gregory (“The years to come seemed waste of breath”)—was not in the public domain in September 1918; it was not published until the Macmillan version of The Wild Swans at Coole appeared in March 1919. Perhaps Yeats wanted to hold it back from serial publication for fear that he might offend Lady Gregory.

Sean Latham has argued that the particular value of reading historical periodicals is that it enables the study of “emergence,” “a particular kind of complexity that arises not from the individual elements of a system, but only from their interaction.” For scholars of magazines, he suggests, “emergence provides a powerful way of thinking” and “moments of emergence are exciting, but also provisional, unstable, and sometimes even difficult to capture using our current theoretical and historical frames.” Emergence is certainly an interesting way of thinking about “In Memory of Robert Gregory” as it was published in the Little Review, because the magazine was deliberate in its omission of any discussion of the war. This is apparent from a reading of the content from 1914 to 1918, and a particular exchange which was published in the “Reader Critic” column of August 1917. Under the heading “War Art,” a reader from Kansas praises the Little Review for being “the only magazine I have laid eyes on in months that hasn’t had a word in it about this blasted war.” In response Heap
comments that “none of us considers this war a legitimate or an interesting subject for Art, not being the focal point of any fundamental emotion for any of the people engaged in it.” She rejects the widely held critical commonplace that the literature of war and suffering is “deeply touching and of poignant appeal” and offers the view that “nine tenths of the stuff written is a rotten impertinence to be discouraged.”

There was, of course, a political context to the non-mention of the war, and it related ultimately to the interest which Anderson and Heap had in anarchism and the thinking of Emma Goldman (1869–1940), a leading political activist whom Anderson first heard lecture in Chicago in the spring of 1914. For Anderson, this experience was formative. She “turned anarchist before the presses closed” and rushed an article on “The Challenge of Emma Goldman” into print in May 1914. Goldman and Anderson became close friends, and may even have been lovers. This association was to have a lasting and shaping impact on the Little Review. Advertisers shied away from being associated with a journal which openly espoused anarchism, and other tenants of the Fine Arts Building complained that Emma Goldman was among Anderson’s regular visitors. By spring 1917, when Quinn and Pound became associated with the Little Review, the political context for the publication of casual articles about anarchism had changed quite decisively, owing to the war in Europe. Diplomatic relations between the US and Germany broke down in February 1917, and Congress voted to declare war against Germany on April 6, 1917. This decision, which brought conscription in its wake—and a vigorous anti-conscription movement spearheaded by Emma Goldman—quickly led to the introduction of the Espionage Act. There were many first-generation German immigrants in the US, and the Espionage Act was designed to ensure that they would be patriotic to their new country. It specifically prohibited the support of America’s enemies during wartime, any attempt to interfere with military operations, any action which promoted insubordination, and any action which interfered with military recruitment. Under the terms of that act Goldman and her partner Alexander Berkman were arrested on June 15, 1917, and charged with inducing “persons not to register.” Heap and Anderson attended the ensuing trial, and Anderson circulated a formal letter—written by Heap, but signed by her—asserting that “protesting” had become “a crime overnight.”

Objecting to conscription, in Heap’s eloquent and reasoned argument, had nothing to do with anarchism and everything to do with the cherished principle of free speech, an argument Goldman herself invoked by way of defense in her trial (“We say that if America has entered the war to make the world safe for democracy, she must first make democracy safe in America”). These arguments work around the First Amendment to the US Constitution (the amendment that prohibits the making of any law abridging the freedom of
speech) in crucial ways. They also point to the complicated and varied political positions held in the US at this precise moment. Quinn, for example, was in favor of US participation in the war, but he was opposed to conscription and, of course, opposed to anarchism. His views were shared by Pound. When the US entered the war Pound told Anderson, with characteristic and emphatic confidence: “I am very glad America is in AT LAST, and think we should have been in long ago, BUT I prefer volunteer armies.” Anderson and Heap meanwhile continued to support Goldman, and were opposed to the war and conscription to an extent which both men failed to grasp.

These editorial tensions are relevant to my reading of “In Memory of Robert Gregory,” a poem which does not acknowledge Gregory’s active service for very different reasons. Yeats did not want to be associated with a poetic tradition which valorized the efforts of those on the Western Front, and omitted to mention the circumstances in which Gregory died, as noted. “On Being Asked for a War Poem,” written in February 1915 and published in an anthology edited by Edith Wharton in 1916, is another evasion, and fails to acknowledge Irish nationalism—the real reason for his silence

I think it better that in times like these
A poet’s mouth be silent, for in truth
We have no gift to set a statesman right;
He has had enough of meddling who can please
A young girl in the indolence of her youth,
Or an old man upon a winter’s night.  

As the war progressed and war poetry became a popular critical category associated with figures such as Rupert Brooke and Wilfred Owen, Yeats’s dislike for this work and its reception intensified. This antipathy found ultimate critical form in his work as editor of The Oxford Book of Modern Verse (1936), a volume which omits Owen’s poetry on the grounds that “passive suffering is not a theme for poetry.” (OBMV xxxiv) These comments, read alongside the commitment of Anderson and Heap to Goldman and the anti-Conscription campaign, point to the complexities of what was going on behind the scenes at the Little Review, and the importance of studying “emergence.” Yeats published different versions of his works in different contexts, and with an anticipated sense of different types of reader and interpretive community. He was prepared to publish “In Memory of Robert Gregory” in the US because he wanted Pound’s check and a secure copyright. But out of respect for the grief-stricken Lady Gregory, who had been such a loyal friend and patron, he needed to publish the work in London too. At her request, and that of her now-widowed daughter-in-law, the poem was published in The English Review in August 1918. Interestingly, in
that context Yeats appears to have been willing to acknowledge the significance of the war. The text appears with a subtitle immediately after the title, which insists on listing Gregory’s distinguished military credentials and honors: “Major Robert Gregory, R. F. C., M. C., Legion of Honour, was killed in action on the Italian Front, January 23, 1918.” Perhaps that note was intended for publication in the Little Review. Perhaps it was lost in transmission. Or perhaps, and this seems plausible given Heap’s insistence that the war is not “an interesting subject for Art,” the editors decided not to include it.

Bibliographical scholarship attends to the specificities of what was published, when and where. In Yeats's case, there is much work still be done on the versions of self he presented to readers in the US. This involves recovering versions of texts which have long been buried in periodicals, a task which is easier now given digital resources such as the Modernist Journals Project. Scholarship of this kind also involves considering the choices being made by writers in selecting what and where to publish. Yeats knew that the determinedly avant-garde Little Review courted controversy. When the October 1917 issue was “suppressed” by the New York Post Office because of a story by Wyndham Lewis, he told Pound that “the suppression of the October number is great luck and ought to be the making of the magazine.” Yet he did not wish to join the editors in contributing to controversy. His controversial poems of the period are not those that appeared in the Little Review, but those that comment on Irish politics, including “Easter 1916” (completed September 25, 1916), “Sixteen Dead Men” (completed by December 17, 1917), “The Rose Tree” (completed April 7, 1917), and “On a Political Prisoner” (completed January 1919). “Sixteen Dead Men,” which includes the lines “You say that we should still the land / Till German’s overcome; / But who is there to argue that / Now Pearse is deaf and dumb?”, might have persuaded Anderson and Heap that the war could be “an interesting subject for Art.” But it was not to be. Yeats did not offer these poems to Pound: he was wily and cautious, and did not, at this time, wish to court extreme reaction or controversy on the question of what could or should happen in Ireland. As a result these texts, which might have been included in the expanded The Wild Swans at Coole (published by Macmillan in March 1919), were not published in any form in either Britain or the US until November 1920. By that time, the War of Independence had superseded the Rising as the crisis of the moment and, as Foster notes, “the political situation in Ireland and Anglo-Irish relations with it, had changed more utterly than anyone could have foreseen” (Life 2 66).
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