

THE STORY OF AN AFFINITY

*D. G. Jones, Archibald Lampman, and
“Kate These Flowers”*

Anne Archer

(To the memory of Chuck Steele)

A CURIOUS SILENCE SURROUNDS the poetry and criticism of D. G. Jones. Though a colleague writes of Jones in *Ellipse* (1983) that he “est aujourd’hui un des noms le mieux connus de la poésie et de la critique littéraire canadiennes,”¹ his supporters tend to be a quiet lot. With the exception of ECW Press, who recently added Jones to its monograph series, and *Canadian Literature*, which can boast publication of two substantial articles on Jones, no other major publisher or journal has yet tackled an examination of Jones’s canon. Given his influence as poet, critic, editor, teacher, and translator, such reticence is surprising. What may account for the dearth of criticism, however, is the fact that Jones’s first three books of poetry have elicited a rather lukewarm response from key reviewers. These critics seem unduly wary of Jones’s technical mastery. Both Eli Mandel and Milton Wilson, for instance, indicate that Jones’s concern with form is a sort of liability, that the well-wrought constructions of a volume such as *Phrases from Orpheus* are somehow evidence of a limited imaginative range. As Wilson, who damns with faint praise, argues:

[Jones] does his best work on the vivid edge of dullness. . . . A thin blade of perception and a wise tolerance of the limits of the possible: these are his riches of mind and body. We can expect from him no religious ultimatums, no violent moral struggles, no sensual ecstasies, just a nice balance of sense and sensibility, pierced now and then by splinters of brightness or grief.²

Publication of *Under the Thunder*, which earned Jones the Governor General’s Award in 1977, helped to stem but not to eradicate such less than flattering remarks. For on *Under the Thunder* Mandel writes: “The final sense is that it may be politeness at fault here. Not enough was risked. Though it was a daring attempt.”³

I would like to explicate this “daring attempt” by focusing on the long-poem sequence that lies at the heart of *Under the Thunder*, “Kate These Flowers” (The

Lampman Poems).” The irony in my choice is that of all Jones’s poems to date, “The Lampman Poems” has been the most enthusiastically received. With characteristic zeal, Douglas Barbour considers them to be “love lyrics of an extraordinary power in which the natural and erotic worlds are fused in a myriad of ways,”⁴ and even Robert Kroetsch, whose poetic preferences tend to be Western Canadian, is compelled to devote a page in his study of the contemporary Canadian long poem, “For Play and Entrance,” to Jones’s sequence. Indeed, Kroetsch’s comments serve well as a springboard for my approach to “Kate These Flowers,” for it is within the context of the long poem that Jones’s sequence warrants special investigation. Kroetsch, for example, ascribes the strength of “The Lampman Poems” to the tension between “the erotic and [the] erratic erotic.” He elaborates:

Jones: the wonderful temptation to read nature as woman: behold (but cannot, quite) the sweet cunt of the world. The man as word-monger (remembering Archibald Lampman, remembering Shakespeare, writing versions of the sonnet) . . .⁵

MUCH HAS BEEN WRITTEN in recent years on the contemporary Canadian long poem. Though the plethora of articles on this phenomenon suggest that it is a nebulous item, Stephen Scobie, in “*Amelia*, or: Who Do You Think You Are . . .,” provides us with one of the best working definitions of the long poem. To Scobie, the long poem or poem sequence is a manifestation of the documentary impulse. It is

usually of book length, and narrative in structure. The events which make up this narrative are documented, historical happenings, although the poet will frequently modify or shuffle those events, or add to them purely fictional incidents. The poem often focuses on a single character who took part in those events . . . [and many] of the poems adopt the persona or speaking voice of this central character. The idea of the “document” remains within the poems, as a source of historical fact, and as an element of intertextuality: the central characters are frequently artists (writers or painters), or else keep journals, draw maps, or in some other way produce “collected works” which the poem may either quote directly or else refer to.⁶

Like Margaret Atwood’s *The Journals of Susanna Moodie* or Michael Ondaatje’s *The Collected Works of Billy the Kid*, Jones’s “The Lampman Poems” also fits Scobie’s paradigm. Not only is “Kate These Flowers” seminal with regard to Jones’s canon, but it is indicative of Canadian experiments with the long poem in general.

In the thirteen short, filigreed lyrics of which Jones’s poem consists, Archibald Lampman and his mistress, Katherine Waddell, appear as two moderate Anglicans trying to preserve their passion in a land part “arctic,” part “temperate” — “this country where / desire becomes restraint.”⁷ They move through a love which, like

Jones's poetic universe itself, is both creative and destructive. Nursing a "kind of spare / wordless joy," Archie and Kate advance through sex (a "ransacking," "a carnal music" amid the "elementary joys" of their "Arcadia" [81]) and separation ("loneliness becomes us" [85]) to an acceptance of the "absurdity" of their love which "fits out an underground / resistance" (87).

For Archie and Kate, the fragility of their love and their sexual uneasiness rest in an unstable balance. Poised against their loss — as "the last high / hail and farewell of birds / arrow south / wilderness / waste fields become us" (85) — is the promise of spring. In the final phrase, wherein "heaven" becomes a "mortal-flower," Jones presents us, as he does throughout *Under the Thunder*, with the tension between paradise lost and paradise regained. It is "some mixed thing" Archie and Kate "care about," "not this or that" but the weathering of their garden of love. As Jones (Archie) reveals in a single bitter-sweet, layered image:

it is, under all pain, silent
 laughter
 bird, flower
 you, Kate, briefly on a day in June. (75)

Though Kroetsch's playfully candid adumbration of the poet's concerns is somewhat clumsy next to Jones's exquisite delicacy, it nevertheless alerts us to the central problematics in Jones's sequence. 'Man as word-monger beholds (but cannot, quite) the sweet cunt of the world.' Archie and Kate lack "the stomach to be real / animals" (81). Lampman admits, "we wished / noetic clouds, a marble frieze" (81). For the world of sheer sensuality is a wilderness, a "windswept" underworld. To Archie, whose sensibility is akin to Hawthorne's Arthur Dimmesdale, love-making can signify an act of destruction:

Guard yourself, Kate, like the wild
 orchid, with neglect, with worse
 loneliness
 what can escape
 destructiveness, man's damage
 emu, dodo, wild pigeon
 numerous herds and flocks

 secret places of themselves invite
 lovers, and new violence
 flowers
 in deep woods, beside
 pools, moist rocky soil
 petals twisted like brown hair

 even I could not resist
 ransacking the rare, delicate purse. (80)

Such a passage is vintage Jones: this taut juxtaposition of images combined with a slippery syntax may bear witness to a thwarted sexuality (“thistles matted with their own seed”) or to a suppressed but potent vitality (“reticulations of the wind”). The sequence relies on this ambiguity.

IT APPEARS, THEN, that Jones’s experiments with language, syntax, and image are double-edged, in that they convey his (and Lampman’s) “perverse” propensity to order as well as his delight in the word (world) made flesh. Neither Jones nor Lampman (rather, Jones’s Lampman) can abandon himself fully to process or flux. Archie picks and arranges his wildflowers. Initials of lines spell the names of various flowers, and this conceit, which leads us to accept the poem as a bouquet, is the work of what George Bowering calls an “intelligence noetic.”¹⁰ That is, here as in his earlier volumes of poetry, Jones seems to want to observe rather than participate completely in the minute and often hazardous particulars of his world. In such long poems as “Little Night Journey” and “Soliloquy to Absent Friends” from *The Sun is Axeman*, “Phrases from Orpheus” from the volume of the same title, and “Sequence of Night,” published discretely (and discreetly) in *The Tamarack Review* (1969), his attitude toward raw as opposed to domesticated nature and experience is ambivalent and duplicitous. (This, by the way, is less evidence of a limited imaginative range than it is proof of a sensibility almost too susceptible to the possibilities of darkness and disaster.) And though we may sense a movement in Jones’s canon from an “intelligence noetic” to an “intelligence heuristic”¹¹ — an intelligence that is open, receptive, vulnerable, and sometimes careless — it seems, to appropriate again the language of *Butterfly on Rock*, that the old Adam in Archie and Jones dies hard.

Aside from the virtuosity of Jones’s performance in “Kate These Flowers,” what impels the sequence is Jones’s sympathy for the figure of Archibald Lampman. Jones does not simply articulate Archie’s concerns, as he does for David Milne (“A Garland of Milne”) and Alex Colville (“Pictures from Colville”), but he becomes Lampman. This adoption of a persona follows the lines traced by Scobie in “*Amelia*, or: Who Do You Think You Are?”: to “dare to get away with it,” to borrow someone else’s identity, is synonymous with “alterity” or the “self-defining aspect of the documentary.” It signifies “the attempt to define the identity of the self by a dialectic process of contrast to the other,”¹² where the other or *alter ego* or double is someone “who is / is not yourself.”¹³ That is, in a documentary poem, the poet “calls to his or her own opposite” (we think of Phyllis Webb and Peter Kropotkin in *The Kropotkin Poems*) and/or communes with his or her “secret sharer” (we recall the bond between Scobie and Robert McAlmon in *McAlmon’s Chinese Opera*).

Butterfly on Rock contains the seeds of Jones's affinity for Lampman. According to Jones, "Lampman's attempt to escape from boredom and sterility [i.e., his Ottawa life as a civil servant] led him to search for the vital in nature and language" (96); he "knew that the life of the spirit arose from an inner vitality, not from an external order" (97). This vitality, moreover, was to be found not "in the active impulse to dominate nature" but "in nature's embrace" (98). Thus Lampman, who emphasizes in his poetry a "primal energy" rooted in "the irrational vitality of nature,"

becomes a spokesman for the God of Job, who recommends all his creatures are equally good. . . . At the centre of his poetry we may find a celebration of the abundant well of universal energy and of its embodiment or epiphany in the manifold variety of life. (99)

But, notes Jones, regardless of Lampman's apparent acceptance of "nature's embrace," he stresses "the white-throat and the calm of windless days" rather than "the hawk and . . . the hours of storm" (102).

Just as *Butterfly on Rock* in general doubles as a prose gloss for Jones's development as a poet, the poet's assessment of Lampman, in particular, echoes Jones's own aesthetic. Lampman's "primal energy," for instance, has a counterpart in a statement Jones uses as a preface to *Frost on the Sun*. Jones writes, in 1957, that his own poems are

attempts to apprehend and understand fragments of experience . . . to capture and suggest that the universe is a vast pool, globe, or continuum of energy — mysterious and potent — in which the individual thing or creature participates, changes, or dies.¹⁴

Both poets build on the sun as a symbol for cosmic energy (while Lampman sometimes associates the sun and its energy with the divine, Jones is less specifically religious), and both are concerned with how "the individual thing or creature" manifests this energy. And Lampman and Jones, both of whom possess a "painter's eye for detail," are nature poets who express a common attitude toward the world. It is significant that both poets, when confronting the "Problem of Job" — how "to affirm, to live, and celebrate a world that sooner or later demands of [us] the sacrifice of [our] lives" (8) — favour light over darkness. Indeed, this preference and its ramifications ("we wished / noetic clouds, a marble frieze") inform "Kate These Flowers."

As Kroetsch reminds us, "The Lampman Poems" is also "a book on books": Jones as "word-monger (remembering Archibald Lampman, remembering Shakespeare, writing versions of the sonnet)." In terms of such intertextuality, Jones's love sequence is a sort of sequel to the love poetry written by Lampman to Katherine Waddell. During the last decade of his life, Lampman wrote a number of poems in which Kate figures either directly or indirectly as subject. While Lamp-

man actually presented Kate with "A Portrait in Six Sonnets" (a stylized picture of his beloved), his recently collected late love poems and a long narrative poem, *The Story of an Affinity*, also trace his relationship or "friendship" with his fellow civil servant.

Despite what emerges as a conventional portrait of a grey-eyed woman, "beautiful" and "wise," Lampman's sonnet sequence contains several passages worthy of note. In Sonnet III we witness, as in Jones's sequence, the fusion of the natural and the erotic. Woman becomes nature; nature is woman:

For when I think of her I seem to see
 April herself among the sunny woods
 With laughing brooks and little clouds that pass,
 I dream of bluebirds and hepaticas.¹⁵

As L. R. Early notes, Lampman's "imaginative responses to nature, and the meaning of romantic love" merge "in an apparition of April in human form."¹⁶ The lines by which Lampman brings his sequence to a graceful close are also significant:

Touched by her,
 A world of finer vision I have found;
 Less heedful of the common fret and stir,
 I tread, grave-hearted, upon loftier ground.¹⁷

Albeit inspired by his beloved, the poet is curiously made more melancholy. This paradox imbues not just "A Portrait in Six Sonnets" but Lampman's love poetry in general, and is an issue to which Jones responds. As we have seen, Jones treats this conundrum and Lampman's "dream" of Kate in a single conflated image. To repeat, in a new context:

like grave eyes in the afternoon
 it is, under all pain, silent
 laughter
 bird, flower
 You, Kate, briefly on a day in June. (75)

Against the formal, decorous sketch of a friendship in "A Portrait in Six Sonnets" is the more open, less circumscribed account of the poet's love in a set of poems also written in the 1890's, collected and edited by Margaret Coulby Whitridge. Granted, Lampman's previously unpublished lyrics also bear marks of poetic conventions; his "tender stoic," Kate, is still "beautiful and bright" like "the spirit of a star."¹⁸ But the poet's response to his beloved is rather more uncertain here. Plagued by a "restless heart," Lampman pays homage to a friendship which, while doubtless full of "value" and "purpose," is essentially problematic. The bond which the poet seeks — a meeting of "kindred spirits" in which lover and beloved are "companions of the soul, and mates / Devoted by the same instinctive need" (45) — seems more an illusion than a deeply held truth. Lampman's assertion regarding

the oneness of himself and Kate frequently rings with a false bravado: "Between us lives, I know — you know — / The deepest likeness of the heart" (51). The repetition ("I know — you know") undercuts rather than reinforces a conviction of "mutuality."¹⁹ Similarly, a semi-pleading note informs the following lines: "It cannot fail; it must endure, / The friendship that we value most" (51). That Lampman uses a negative construction followed by "must" instead of "will" is, of course, telling. His friendship with Katherine may be the stuff of which dreams are made (*cf.* "A Summer Dream," where the sleeping poet derives "speechless bliss" from a slight caress from his beloved) but its basis in reality seems tenuous indeed. Driven by "fate" and "nature's own decree," the poet appears caught in the maelstrom of a one-sided passion. As he admits:

I travail in great grief for you, my friend,
My dearest friend and comrade, whom, suited so,
I may not love, and yet must love, I know,
With blind and sad persistence to the end. (45)

Emotional and sexual frustration permeate Lampman's love lyrics of the late 1890's; on the other hand, fulfilment is the dominant note in *The Story of an Affinity* (1894). Following D. M. R. Bentley, who suggests that Lampman's narrative poem is "vicarious autobiography,"²⁰ I would suggest that while the late love poems form a reading of what was, *The Story of an Affinity* concerns what should have been. The eventual and inevitable union of Richard Stahlberg and Margaret Hawthorne is, to a large extent, a prophetic recasting of Lampman's uncertain relationship with Katherine Waddell.

In *The Story of an Affinity*, Lampman, as the title suggests, elaborates on his notion of mutuality. When Richard returns to his family and Margaret after a lengthy hiatus in the "great city," Lampman writes:

When Richard passed that evening through the lanes,
And up the well-remembered orchard path,
He had the sense of one that went with power
To claim a fortune given by destiny.
He could not think that that mysterious spell —
He deemed its source to be affinity —
Whose touch had spurred his clouded soul to life,
Would miss its fated goal, and not demand
Reaction on the heart from which it sprang. (53)

Richard and Margaret are soul-mates, doubles, both *alter egos* and secret sharers. As Lampman emphasizes, Richard's passion for Margaret — a passion which guides him to a state of spiritual and intellectual enlightenment — is both cause and effect of an affinity. What the poet could only tentatively proffer in his love poetry to Kate, Richard asserts with conviction. Richard cries to Margaret:

This light, I know, could never have flashed forth
 With such quick charm, such fruitful potency,
 Unless our answering spirits had been charged
 With a like force, and fated sympathy. (59)

The love that Richard and Margaret share is “sacred,” a “law” which overrides any previous commitment, such as Margaret’s imminent marriage to the lawyer, John Vantassel.²¹

This narcissistic union of Richard and Margaret, self with self, so vital to nineteenth-century literature as a whole, seems to signal lasting bliss rather than impending doom. Yet Margaret’s response to Richard’s ardour is equivocal, and reminds us of Lampman’s own response to his beloved in the late love poems:

. . . A strange light broke in upon her soul,
 A rushing thought, so sudden, so enforced,
 It robbed her of control, and made her sense
 A trembling tumult, whereat joy and pain
 Were equal parts. (54)

Correspondingly, the conclusion of *The Story of an Affinity* is double-edged. The deliberate echo of *Paradise Lost*, in addition to the somewhat odd description of the delirious couple, simultaneously affirms and belies the lovers’ happiness:

. . . without a word
 They took each other’s hands, and turned and passed
 Up the cool path between the orchard trees,
 Wrapt in such thoughts as only they can know,
 Whose hearts through tears and effort have attained
 The portals of the perfect fields of life,
 And thence, half-dazzled by the glow, perceive
 The endless road before them, clear and free. (68)

Early’s following remark helps to explain such duplicity: “*The Story of an Affinity* deals . . . with an issue at the centre of Lampman’s love poetry: the potential in sexual energy for creation or destruction, in relation to the social order.”²²

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN Lampman’s three related tributes to Kate and Jones’s “The Lampman Poems” is not one-to-one. Though Jones appropriates the guise of an “idle poem-maker” addressing a fellow “wander-spirit” who manages to keep above a “world of dreamless vision” (*LK*, 25), his borrowings from Lampman are more indirect than direct. In much the same manner as Atwood subverts the text of *Roughing it in the Bush* to produce in *The Journals of Susanna Moodie* a twentieth-century, “fictionalized” picture of Mrs. Moodie (and, for that matter, as Lampman reworks his liaison with Katherine

Waddell), so Jones rewrites the love affair between Archie and Kate. But Jones has clearly assimilated Lampman; fascinated by Lampman's portrait of poet and beloved spirits, Jones extrapolates on the sexual potential of this bond. As Lampman's double, Jones attempts to explore the enigma of Lampman and Kate, of their "strange likeness of heart," and of the ambivalence Lampman himself refers to in "Magic":

Some magic about you, above you
Increases and will not die.
I feel you, I dread you, I love you —
And I know not why. (LK, 32)

In both Lampman's poetry and Jones's sequence, joy and pain, restraint and desire rest in an uneasy balance. The final quatrain of Lampman's poem, "Memories," illustrates such tension:

Though but dreams and memories unsleeping
Must she give,
Some for joy and much for weeping,
By these I live. (LK, 39)

Though Lampman is Jones's *alter ego* and secret sharer, it may be argued that Jones triumphs where Archie falters. As Tom Marshall contends, Jones, in "Kate These Flowers," writes "for Lampman the kind of love poems he could not manage himself."²³ Moving freely in the language of "the petalled flesh" (*Under the Thunder*, 79) — the language that Lampman only dreamed of using — Jones renders "silence" an "orator" for his nineteenth-century mentor and his "Lady." As well, in both "The Lampman Poems" in particular and in *Under the Thunder* in general, Jones "appears as a rueful survivor, aware and ironic, able to continue in his love for an unobliging and shifty world."²⁴ Jones might have it otherwise, but lacking in Lampman's poetry is a genuine celebration of such a "shifty world." Even Richard Stahlberg, Lampman's own double and an ostensibly invincible protagonist, is marked by a debilitating fear of a recurring darkness, or what he terms the return of his "former impotent cloud-life" (61). Charles Steele, whose comments pertain not just to Lampman's "In November" and "In October" but to his "Kate poems" as well, suggests:

Nature, on the whole, was not for Lampman a convenient and simple environment providing cure and compensation for his sense of social alienation. His first person personae find themselves fundamentally isolated there too, even at the best of times. . . . Finally, the only thing to be done about the conviction of one's isolation may be simply to accept it, and consequently, to make of that stoic gesture some quiet virtue.²⁵

While critics may level the same sort of criticism at Jones's poetry, the poet of *Under the Thunder* is not content with such stoicism. Despite a lingering reluctance

to soil his feet in the “fertile muck” of experience, Jones advocates engagement, active participation. A “Preface to *Mainstream: An Unpublished Anthology*,” like *Butterfly on Rock*, delineates Jones’s bias:

Beyond the desire to preserve nature, there is a need to recognize a world beyond human intelligence, beyond man’s capacity to preserve or destroy. . . . [In] its extreme form [it] demands an *encounter* with the world, not for the sake of harmony, not certainly for the sake of comfort, and not even for the sake of survival, but — at the risk of death — to feel absolutely real under the touch of the *other*.²⁶

The “other” may be the wilderness or it may be woman or it may be the wilderness as woman as it is in “The Lampman Poems” wherein Lampman, Jones’s double, confronts his other — the world as it is embodied in Kate. As in *The Scarlet Letter*, where Dimmesdale quakes in the arms of his other or opposite, Hester Prynne, the doubling here has its negative as well as positive aspects. (As Mandel points out and as I have already suggested with regard to Lampman’s Richard and Margaret, the encounter with one’s double may signify destruction or the onset of prophecy.²⁷) That Jones emphasizes the sexual nature of the bond between Archie and Kate is significant, for it heightens the sense of urgency. Jones’s Lampman confesses: “Truth, Kate, all your virtues / harrow my flesh” (83). As Kroetsch cautions, “*Danger*: deferral (delay deferred) of the encounter.”²⁸ Or, as Jones remarks in a comment which is particularly resonant in view of the story of his affinity for Lampman: “As long as this dream of earth and this hunger for the naked encounter with it remains inarticulate, unconscious or underground, it will remain sinister, perverse, a crazy distorting force in our lives.”²⁹ There are, however, no guarantees; whether voiced or consummated, the encounter may still leave us lonely. Jones’s Lampman realizes:

Gone, love’s body, like a field
reclaimed by winter
all its flowers, exhausted
sick of passion, flesh itself
surrendered to the uniform
Euclidian space. (84)

More importantly, however, this confrontation has the potential to leave us, as it does in Jones’s account of the union of Archie and Kate, “each more nakedly alive” (82). Unlike the doomed Arthur Dimmesdale, unlike Lampman himself, Jones’s Lampman, like Jones himself, is indeed a “rueful survivor.” In a segment which reminds us of the historical context of the lovers, as well as the close connection between the process/progress of love and of poetry, Archie notes:

Milkweed unpacks itself
riddling the wind with packaged
roots, parachutes, poems
ordnance for a spring offensive. (87)

As Jones-*qua*-Lampman indicates, then, desire to be touched by the other (wilderness, woman) and fear of submitting to this encounter form a shifting relation, a relation characteristic not only of “Kate These Flowers” and the other sequences which comprise *Under the Thunder* but of Jones’s entire canon. For the key to Jones’s poetry is metamorphosis. Antinomies are not fixed and rigid but fluid and protean; self becomes other, other becomes self in a constantly changing dialogue. Though Jones (like Lampman before him) seems to draw on a dualistic, heirarchical, patriarchal system (i.e., self *versus* other), his impulse is towards the abolition of these polarities. To support this approach to experience, Jones and his personae must learn to forego knowledge and certainty (any totalizing vision) for a “constant/reintegration.” Jones may write with a gentle irony of our paradoxical propensity to control change, shape metamorphosis — we think, for instance, of Archie’s floral arrangement; in “Winter Comes Hardly” from *Under the Thunder*, Jones comments similarly on “policy,” the “five-year plan,” and the fact that “who expects, though Bacon wrote ‘Of Gardens’ / roses at Cape Kennedy” (109) — but he also stresses, more convincingly than his nineteenth-century counterpart, the need to relish the wild rose and to accept the worm within the rose. Throughout his numerous poem sequences and by means of his documentaries or retailorings of historical figures like Archibald Lampman and Katherine Waddell, Jones is almost at home with the notion that

the world keeps
dismantling the syntax, escaping
a final sentence
Penelope weaving
and unweaving, night, day, to
avoid closure. (98)

NOTES

- ¹ *Ellipse* 13 (1983), 4.
- ² M. Wilson, [Review of *The Sun is Axeman*,] *University of Toronto Quarterly* 31 (1961-62), 437.
- ³ E. Mandel, [Review of *Under the Thunder*,] *Queen’s Quarterly* 86 (Spring 1979), 171.
- ⁴ D. Barbour, [Review of *Under the Thunder*,] *The Dalhousie Review* 58 (Autumn 1978), 575.
- ⁵ R. Kroetsch, “For Play and Entrance: The Contemporary Canadian Long Poem,” *Dandelion* 8, no. 1 (1981), 75.
- ⁶ S. Scobie, “*Amelia*, or: Who Do You Think You Are? Documentary and Identity in Canadian Literature,” *Canadian Literature* 100 (Spring 1984), 269.
- ⁷ D. G. Jones, *Under the Thunder The Flowers Light Up the Earth* (Toronto: Coach House, 1977), 79. All future references to *Under the Thunder* are to this edition, and page numbers are included (within parentheses) in the text.

- ⁸ D. G. Jones, *Butterfly on Rock* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1979), 181. All future references to *Butterfly on Rock* are to this edition, and page numbers are included (within parentheses) in the text.
- ⁹ Mandel, 172.
- ¹⁰ G. Bowering, "Coming Home to the World," *Canadian Literature* 58 (Spring 1962), 7.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 7.
- ¹² Scobie, 270.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 276.
- ¹⁴ D. G. Jones, *Frost on the Sun* (Toronto: Contact, 1957), dust-jacket notes. Lampman, in fact, uses the phrase "universal energy" in his poem, "Man," from *Lampman's Kate: The Late Love Poems of Archibald Lampman, 1887-1897*, ed. M. C. Whitridge (Ottawa: Borealis, 1975), 38.
- ¹⁵ A. Lampman, *The Poems of Archibald Lampman* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1974), 44.
- ¹⁶ L. R. Early, "Lampman's Love Poetry," *Essays on Canadian Writing* 27 (Winter 1983-84), 140. Early also directs us to Lampman's poem, "A Vision of April."
- ¹⁷ Lampman, *The Poems of Archibald Lampman*, 45.
- ¹⁸ Lampman, *Lampman's Kate*, 48. All future references to *Lampman's Kate* are to this edition, and page numbers are included (within parentheses) in the text.
- ¹⁹ This is a term used by Early, "Lampman's Love Poetry," 133.
- ²⁰ D. M. R. Bentley, ed., *The Story of an Affinity* (London: Canadian Poetry Press, 1986), xiv. All future references to *The Story of an Affinity* are to this edition, and page numbers are included (within parentheses) in the text.
- ²¹ *Shades of The Scarlet Letters* also colour *The Story of an Affinity*. Before the natural bond that exists between Richard and Margaret (Hawthorne!), the man-made tie between Margaret and Vantassel dissolves. In Hawthorne's novel, Hester places her faith in the laws of nature (i.e., her union with Dimmesdale), not in the laws of man, as exemplified in her union with the doctor, Roger Chillingworth.
- ²² Early, 134.
- ²³ T. Marshall, [Review of *The Lampman Symposium* and *The E. J. Pratt Symposium*.] *English Studies in Canada* 5, no. 3 (Fall 1979), 371.
- ²⁴ T. Marshall, *Harsh and Lovely Land* (Vancouver: Univ. of British Columbia Press, 1979), 116.
- ²⁵ C. Steele, "The Isolate 'I' (Eye) : Lampman's Persona," *Essays on Canadian Writing* 16 (Fall-Winter 1979-80), 68.
- ²⁶ D. G. Jones, "Preface to *Mainstream: An Unpublished Anthology*," *The Insecurity of Art: Essays on Poetics*, ed. K. Norris, P. Van Toorn (Montreal: Véhicule, 1982), 65.
- ²⁷ Cf. E. Mandel, *Another Time* (Erin: Press Porcépic, 1977), 143.
- ²⁸ Kroetsch, 72.
- ²⁹ Jones, "Preface to *Mainstream*," 64.