Jay Dougherty

"VEIN OF FIRE": *RELATIONSHIPS AMONG LAWRENCE'S* PANSIES

MOST CRITICS AGREE THAT LAWRENCE was not at his artistic best when composing his *Pansies*; their explanations for why this is so are interesting, if not always uniform. F. B. Pinion says that "Lawrence wrote too easily [in *Pansies*]," "did not avoid becoming a bore," and was "apt to repeat himself 'like the flushing of a W.C.,' to quote [Lawrence's] own phrase."[1] Philip Hobsbaum says that most of the *Pansies* "would have carried more weight if linked with some show of mimetic expression," that "there is a limit to the amount of protest and admonition one can take, even when it is trenchantly expressed."[2] Sandra Gilbert says of the short *Pansies* that "it is as though in the later years of his life Lawrence's illness and disillusionment made it increasingly difficult for him to focus his attention on anything . . . for any length of time" and of others that they "seem to have been written out of a strong belief that the content itself could *be* the form . . . . Therefore he felt justified in writing poems some critics would consider mere self-expression."[3] Ross C. Murfin says that many "sacrifice all subtlety on an altar of urgent necessity" and "fall into the ways of excess."[4]

From such statements, the general opinion that *Pansies* are, by and large, bad poems is unmistakable. Hobsbaum gives some indication of just what, in his estimation, this ratio of good to bad *Pansies* is: "between eleven and twenty, according to where one sets one's sights, deserve a place among Lawrence's classics. This is not many out of a total roll call of some 690 pieces."[5] Indeed, the effect of such poor critical response has been that critics have singled out a few "good" poems from *Pansies* and ignored the other poems in the volume.

Yet separating the so-called "good" poems in *Pansies* from the other poems is not only difficult but, by Lawrence's own implication, a mistake. For, as Lawrence states in the Introduction to *Pansies*, each [poem combines] with all the others to make up a complete state of mind."[6] That is not to say that all *Pansies* are created equal; it is to say, rather, that the "lesser" poems—those ignored by the critics—are related to the "good" poems in such a way that to ignore them during discussions of the better poems is to limit accordingly the explication of those better poems. It is my aim here to illustrate this point by discussing the various types of "good" poems in *Pansies* in relation to the lesser, though more abundant, poems—and to point out, along the way, the nature of the relationships among the various types of poems.[7]

Pansies, as a whole, can be generally divided into three groups, differentiated according to compositional characteristics: 1.) exclamatory poems, which simply rail against things the poet is obviously upset about; 2.) declarative poems, which pronounce dogmatically how things *are*—with either a blatantly implicit or downright explicit call for change; 3.) illustrative poems—those which illustrate a point, using various poetic techniques which will be discussed later, rather than expounding a point.[8] It is the poems in the first two groups that irritate critics the most, and a brief examination of those here will quickly elucidate why this is so.

Both exclamatory and declarative poems emanate from an unidentified though consistently acerbic persona, which can be all too easily (though perhaps wrongly) identified with the poet himself. An example of an exclamatory poem is "Let Us Be Men" (*CP* 450). Here the persona is most vituperative:

> For God's sake, let us be men
> not monkeys minding machines
> or sitting with our tails curled
> while the machine amuses us, the radio or film or gramophone.
>
> Monkeys with a bland grin on our faces.
>
> [*CP* 450]

Obviously, here the persona is angered at what he sees as the stultifying, lobotomizing effect of machines on "men." But the poem itself offers nothing for the reader to grasp onto besides the persona's virulent denunciation of the machines. Instead, the poem relies entirely on the supposition that the reader himself has experienced such stultification through contact with machines and is angry enough about it to attach a specific meaning to such an effusion. The success of the poem therefore depends upon such prior experience and feeling in the reader; if the reader lacks these, the poem fails. And it is this fact—not to mention the dogmatic tone of the speaker—that leaves critics "bored." One might experience the same type of boredom when listening to a fanatical politician or religious leader speaking to a group of followers (interestingly, Lawrence, in an essay called "Hymns in a Man's Life," written around the same time *Pansies* was composed, condemns this type of persuasion, claiming that "didactic science is as dead and boring as *dogmatic religion* [my emphasis]. Both are wonderless and productive of boredom, endless boredom"[9]). In any case, such technique—or, rather, lack of it—is not normally associated with good poetry.

The second group of poems—the declarative poems—differ from the first primarily because the personae do not evince the same degree of emotional heatedness; their tone is more even and composed, more matter-of-fact, though still assertive and uncompromising. There are, by far, more declarative poems in *Pansies* than any other type. "All That We Have Is Life" (*CP* 449-50) exemplifies this kind of poem:

> Men should refuse to be lifelessly at work.
> Men should refuse to be heaps of wage-earning dung.
> Men should refuse to work at all, as wage-slaves.
> Men should demand to work for themselves, of themselves,
> and put their life in it.
> For if a man has no life in his work, he is mostly a heap of dung.
>
> [*CP* 450]

Though the tone is less hysterical, the problem with this poem is basically the same as that with "Let Us Be Men": the poem's success depends upon whether the reader agrees that a "wage-slave" is "a heap of dung," a rather radical point of view. A more fundamental interpretational problem also arises in the poem with phrases like "lifelessly at work" and "put . . . life in it," which, while crucial to the poem's meaning, are abstract rather than concrete and thus difficult to define. It is no wonder that the poem has disgruntled both critics and casual readers.

The illustrative poems—by far the fewest and, most critics imply, the best in *Pansies*[10]—illustrate or exemplify their point rather than force it. It is not to be forgotten, though, that these poems, too, carry with them a didactic purpose. They achieve that didactic end in three ways: 1.) through a created dialogue between two identifiable speakers ("What Is He?"); 2.) through a created monologue with an identifiable speaker who is not, ostensibly, the persona of the declarative or exclamatory poems ("The Risen Lord"); and 3.) through third-person descriptions of objects or animals which are representatives of (usually) positive qualities ("Two Performing Elephants"). Most of the illustrative poems in *Pansies* employ one of the first two techniques—poems such as "Natural Complexion" (*CP* 433), "To Be Superior" (*CP* 435), "I am In A Novel" (*CP* 489), "What Matters" (*CP* 531), "What Ails Thee?" (*CP* 540), "Canvassing For the Election" (*CP* 546), and so on—and, because they are largely if not wholly created dialogue or monologue, it is easy to view them as natural extensions of the majority of *Pansies*, which are largely the monologues of an unidentified persona.

An example of the first type of illustrative poem—the created dialogue—is "What Is He?" (*CP* 452), only the first four lines of which are quoted below:

> What is he?
> —A man, of course.
> Yes, but what does he do?
> —He lives and is a man.
>
> [*CP* 452]

Such poems, in general, are more effective as poems because they allow more reader participation; they do not force upon the reader a "take-it-or-leave-it" statement, as do the exclamatory and declarative poems; and, as will be more evident later, they show more authorial design, seeming less like "squibs" designed to shoot off and fizzle out, once and only once. Even though each type of illustrative poem could be and has been singled out and examined, a full understanding of each only follows when the reader considers each in its ideological context within *Pansies*.[11] For the exclamatory and the declarative poems become, in a sense, prose tracts to which one can refer and, in some cases, needs to refer when explicating the illustrative poems.

The three poems discussed so far can serve as an example of this, since each deals, in its own way, with the theme of "work and the machine." "Let Us Be Men" (*CP* 450) deals on the most abstract level with what being a "man" at work is not: "minding machines," "sitting with our tails curled," and being amused by "radio or film or / gramophone." Such activity, one can only assume at this point, emasculates men because it requires of them no more effect or imagination than a monkey possesses. "All That We Have Is Life" (*CP* 449) bears out this assumption and adds a few more specifics: that "work is life, and life is lived in work / unless you're a wage slave," that "Men should refuse to be lifelessly at work," and that "Men should demand to work for themselves, of themselves, and put their life in it." With this the previous inference that to be a fulfilled "man" one must undertake work that is not mindless is confirmed; and, further, "mindless work" is defined as any work that does not allow men "to work for themselves, of themselves, and put their life in it." Though, because Lawrence's terms ("for themselves, of themselves," etc.) are fairly general, the ideological position is arguable, with these poems as a background one nevertheless approaches "What Is He?" (*CP* 452), the illustrative poem in the "work" group, with a fairly specific context:

> Yes, but what does he do?
> —He lives and is a man.

Oh quite! but he must work. He must have a job of some sort.
—Why?
Because obviously he's not one of the leisured classes.
—I don't know. He has lots of leisure. And he makes
quite beautiful chairs.—
There you are then! He's a cabinet maker.
—No no!
Anyhow a carpenter and joiner.
—Not at all.
But you said so . . .
—Perhaps! Would you say a thrush was a professional
flautist, or just an amateur?
I'd say it was just a bird.
—And I'd say he is just a man.
All right. You always did quibble.

[*CP* 452]

"What Is He?" can, obviously, stand on its own in a way that the others cannot: it creates its own context, as the illustrative poems in *Pansies* generally do. But in the context of these other poems, "What Is He?" elucidates more than just its own sad point about how men tend to be categorized and labeled in terms of what they "do"; to this, one may also add one's general knowledge of "work" gleaned from the previous two poems discussed. In this context, one can see the questioner in "What Is He?" as a product and propagator of the society of "wage-slaves" and the answerer as similar to the personae of the other poems, revealing what a despicable ass—and, in the end, fool—the questioner is. In a sense, then, the exclamatory, declarative, and illustrative poems all build upon and contribute to one another—though, partly because they have a clearer context, the illustrative poems stand on their own as more than a "bunch of fragments" (*CP* 417).

"The Risen Lord" (*CP* 459), which exemplifies the second type of illustrative poem—the created monologue of an identifiable speaker—works in a slightly different way. In it the reader gets a picture of a new Lord, one who has seen "the other side of the

grave" and "conquered the fear of death" and now has "risen in the flesh" and wishes to confront and conquer the last fear, "the fear of life." This is a Lord who, like flesh itself, "moves," "ripples, and all the time / . . . changes"; who acknowledges the call of the "wild loins," the "warm heart," and the "wondering spirit"; who proclaims of them that "They ask, and they must be answered." Here is a Lord very unlike, one can imagine, the one followed by the questioner in "What Is He?," a man who, by his very insistence that a man "be" something, implicitly casts off any idea of life as something waving, rippling, and all the time changing. And since that questioner was obviously set up in the context in which "What Is He?" appears as an example of the limited repressedness of most people, and since *he* is in such stark contrast to the Risen Lord, one can only assume that Lawrence presents this Risen Lord as a positive example, one people would do well to follow, one people would do well to imitate.

Yet still some questions arise concerning this new Lord and why he has risen again. Why, for example, was it necessary for Him to rise "in the flesh"? And may one assume, after all, that He is here to exemplify "the way" to mankind? One can, it is true, infer the answers to such questions from the poem itself; but it is clear that one purpose of the other, non-illustrative poems is to provide explicit, if not always clear, answers to such mysteries. In "Climb Down, O Lordly Mind" (*CP* 473-74), the persona states:

A man is many things, he is not only a mind.
But in his consciousness, he is two-fold at least:
he is cerebral, intellectual, mental, spiritual,
but also he is instinctive, intuitive, and in touch.

[*CP* 473]

And he goes on to equate the "blood" with intuition and instinct, averring that "The blood also knows religiously, / and of this, the mind is incapable . . . to my white mind / gods and love alike are but an idea, / a kind of fiction" (*CP* 474).

One may now combine these statements with the inferences gathered from "The Risen Lord" and tentatively conclude that man, according to Lawrence, has been living as "only a mind," that any pretensions to having known a Lord in this state were only pretensions, and that, finally, the poet here is renouncing, however figuratively, the concept of a "crucified" Lord, for it is this concept of a "fleshless" Lord that is causing man to live cerebrally, ignoring his own flesh, ignoring the duality of human consciousness.

Confirmation of the first two conclusions can be obtained by, again, referring to other, non-illustrative poems, which, looked at in isolation, would initially seem unrelated to "The Risen Lord." Witness just four lines of "Touch" (*CP* 468):

> Since we have become so cerebral
> we can't bear to touch or be touched.
>
> Since we are so cerebral
> we are humanly out of touch.
>
> [*CP* 468]

And, in "The Primal Passions" (*CP* 481-82), the poet says:

> Communion with the Godhead . . .
> is human-tainted now,
> tainted with ego and personality.
>
> [*CP* 481]

"Ego" and "personality" are products, as Lawrence sees them, of the cerebrality in "Touch" (*CP* 468), of the "limited mental consciousness" in "Ego Bound" (*CP* 474). So such non-illustrative poems make more specific the concepts drawn from illustrative poems like "The Risen Lord."

Yet there remains one question, the answer to which seems part of the occasion for "The Risen Lord," which is not answered by such declarative poems as "Climb Down, O Lordly Mind"—

namely, why "to [the] white mind / gods . . . [are] but an idea, / a kind of fiction" (*CP* 474). The "white" mind, one can infer from both "The Risen Lord" and "Climb Down, O Lordly Mind," is the "cerebral, intellectual, mental" (*CP* 473) half of man's consciousness ("Man is an alternating consciousness" [*CP* 474], Lawrence states later), and so one may be inclined to speculate that any inability to conceive of a Lord as more than an "idea" is the fault of the conceiver (i. e., a problem arising from each man's limited consciousness). But, interestingly, the shortcoming, the fault, if it can be called such, is placed on the Lord himself, not man; and, in "The Risen Lord," He is made to confess it, as He laments upon seeing man, alive and "flowing":

> I never have seen them before,
> these people of the flesh;
> these are no spirits caught and sore
> in the physical mesh.
>
> [*CP* 460]

Here one really only gets a glimmer of the theory behind this poem—that the Lord Himself has been wrong to think of man in a fallen, wretched state, "caught and sore." And, though this idea is implied elsewhere in *Pansies*, the only clear statement of Lawrence's reasoning behind this belief is found in the essay "The Risen lord" (*P II*, 571-77). In it, Lawrence explains that the churches of his time had been wrong in asserting that "We preach Christ crucified!" (*P II* 571), that to do so was suffocating the minds of the young, who "came into life, and found everything finished . . . the empty crosses . . . the closed tombs . . . the manless, bitter or overassertive woman . . . the closed grey disillusion of Christ Crucified, dead, and buried" (*P II* 573), and that to rectify this the churches should begin emphasizing the Lord risen " 'again from the dead' " (*P II* 571):

> Christ risen in the flesh! We must accept the image complete, if we accept it at all. We must take the mystery in its fulness and in fact. It is only the image of our own experience.
>
> [*P II* 574]

Expanding upon his point of "our own experience," Lawrence goes on to affirm that any claim of Christ's being "Flesh . . . feet and bowels and teeth and eyes . . . taken up into heaven in a cloud, and never put down again" (*P II* 574) is absurd because it is something "all our experience will [never] confirm" (*P II* 574):

> If aeroplanes take us up, they bring us down, or let us down. Flesh and blood belong to the earth, and only to the earth. We know it.
>
> [*P II* 574]

Thus, Lawrence implies, the reason behind the call that "The Risen Lord" (the poem) makes is that men have, wrongly but out of necessity, envisioned the Lord with only the "white" part of their minds, as only a thought, an idea, because ideas are all the "white" (or cerebral) part of the mind is capable of—and man can only conceive of a *fleshless* Lord as a cold idea. Though "The Risen Lord" pictures the Lord himself taking the blame for man's one-sided consciousness ("I have never seen them before"), it is clear, from the other poems, from the article "The Risen Lord," and by implication, that "The Risen Lord" is really a call for a change in the way men (and the church) conceive of Christ.

Interestingly, too, since Lawrence was by his own admission not a conventionally religious man (though his spirituality is obvious), he knew that the mass of people such poems are directed toward was religious; and, it could be argued, he therefore chose the means employed in "The Risen Lord"—the personification of the Lord—to reach that "mass" and thereby promulgate his vision. This point simply underscores the fact that *Pansies* is a volume

with a truly didactic purpose and that all of the poems are working toward that educative end.

Of all the illustrative poems in *Pansies*, the third type—those which employ the third-person description of objects and animals (e.g., "Two Performing Elephants")—are the least obviously didactic and, at the same time, the most dangerous to extract from the whole of *Pansies*, for they rely more than any other illustrative poems on the explicit poems for their explication. "Two Performing Elephants" (*CP* 426) is one of only two poems in this group of any length ("The Elephant Is Slow to Mate" is the other), and it is characteristic of them all in that it uses animals, this time elephants, to represent qualities that the modern civilized person lacks. Here the poem's focus is on describing a male and female elephant, their interaction as they perform circus "tricks," and, later, the reaction of "the wispy, modern children" to this sight:

> On her knees, in utmost caution
> all agog, and curling up her trunk
> she edges through without upsetting him.
> Triumph! the ancient, pig-tailed monster!
>
> When her trick is to climb over him
> with what shadow-like slow carefulness
> she skims him, sensitive
> as shadows from the ages gone and perished
> in touching him, and planting her round feet.
>
> While the wispy, modern children, half-afraid
> watch silent. The looming of the hoary far-gone ages
> is too much for them.
>
> [*CP* 426]

The elephants and the "wispy, modern children" are set in opposition here; the opposition is underscored and partly defined by the poet's use of mimetics (an element that's hard to find in most *Pansies*): the slowness and patience with which the elephants

interact is, in the first three stanzas, onomatopoetically "sounded out" through phrases such as "the old one, the pallid, hoary female / must creep her great bulk beneath the bridge of him" and "with what shadow-like slow carefulness / she skims him, sensitive." But when, in the fourth stanza, the attention of the narrative turns to the children, all mimesis ends, and the lines become as prosaic as, undoubtedly, the lives of the children themselves: "the wispy, modern children, half-afraid / watch silent." There is an obvious juxtaposition in these lines between the elephants' antiquity ("old one," "ancient" "ages gone and perished") and the children's modernity, and one can only assume, if viewing the poem out of context, that the children come out somehow deficient ("wispy" and "half-afraid") because of their being "modern." It is some attribute of the "far-gone ages," one senses, that is "too much for" the modern children—and one is likely, if reading the poem out of context, to assume that that attribute is simply the sensitivity with which the great beasts interact, since that element more than any other is stressed in the poem, through such terms as "caution," "edges," "without upsetting him," "carefulness," "skims," and "sensitive."

But through the non-illustrative poems that deal with this theme, one can see more in "Two Performing Elephants" and thereby augment that initial interpretation. "When I Went To The Circus" (*CP* 444-45), another poem which describes, in part, elephants but which ends up as a declarative poem, talks in more detail about audience reaction to these animals and exactly what attributes of the animals warrant such reaction:

> . . . the audience, compelled to wonder
> compelled to admire the bright rhythms of moving bodies . . .
> they were not really happy.
> There was no gushing response, as there is at the film.
> When modern people see the carnal body dauntless and
> flickering gay
> playing among the elements neatly, beyond competition
> and displaying no personality,
> modern people are depressed.
>
> [*CP* 445]

Here, unlike in "Two Performing Elephants," the poet explains that it is partly the "rhythms of moving bodies," "the carnal body dauntless and flickering gay," which depresses the "modern people."

And this information one may take back to "Two Performing Elephants." Here we *see*, along with being told of the elephants' sensitivity, careful descriptions of the elephants' physical presence: "He stands with his forefeet on the drum"; "the pallid hoary female"; "her great bulk"; "the bridge of him"; "pig-tailed monster"; "touching him, and planting her round feet." These descriptions and images of the elephants were here, of course, in "Two Performing elephants" all along; yet it is not clear until one reads a poem like "When I Went To The Circus" that the children of "Two Performing Elephants" are as much "afraid" of the foreignness of the elephants' open carnality or, if you will, sexuality, as their sensitivity. The elephants roam around in their "antiquated" state, naked and "touching" one another.

Such "touching" makes modern people "depressed," as "When I Went To The Circus" makes clear, and also "half-afraid," as "Two Performing Elephants" asserts. To find out why this is so, one must, once again, consult another declarative poem. "Touch" reminds the reader that it is, once again, the modern person's cerebrality which causes this unnatural aversion to carnality or acceptance of the body. And such an aversion, as "Touch" points out, is destructive:

> Since we have become so cerebral
> we can't bear to touch or be touched . . .
>
> if, cerebrally, we force ourselves into touch,
> into contact
> physical and fleshly,
> we violate ourselves,
> we become vicious.
>
> [*CP* 468]

The result of such cerebrality on the physical presence of modern man can be seen in "Paltry-Looking People" (*CP* 530), another declarative poem, in which the poet once again contrasts the "splendour" of animals with the way people look: ". . . paltry, mingy and dingy and squalid people look . . . (*CP* 530). The description of the people here is, significantly, not unlike that of the children in "Two Performing Elephants": "wispy" and "half-afraid." So one could, at this point, venture to say that the children in "Two Performing Elephants" are suffering from the same "disease" that the "Paltry-Looking People" are—the disease which is really explained in "Touch": an over-worked mentality.

The thematic intertwining of all these poems is, for the point of argument, significant. The poems build upon one another and rely on one another for their explication. This is especially true of the illustrative poems like "Two Performing Elephants." One can demonstrate, as Lawrence claims in his Introduction to *Pansies*, that "if you hold up [the] *Pansies* properly to the light, they may show a running verin of fire" and that it is particularly difficult to obtain a satisfactory explication of any of the so-called "good" poems in *Pansies*, like "Two Performing Elephants," without "holding up" the others to it and discussing them as well. For through reading such declarative poems as "When I Went To The Circus," "Touch," and "Paltry-Looking People" in conjunction with "Two Performing Elephants," one's initial interpretation that the children were reacting mainly to the elephants' sensitivity toward one another is enlarged: their sensitivity toward one another becomes a reflection (through "When I Went To The Circus") of two beings who are comfortable with their carnality, their sexuality; and, as "Touch" makes clear, the children are victims of their generation's focus on cerebrality ("Man is an alternating consciousness," Lawrence said earlier, in "Climb Down, O Lordly Mind") and end up, in their reaction to the elephants, looking "wispy," like those in "Paltry-Looking People."

Yet it is not to be understood that the children here are merely representative of already vitiated men. They *are* children. And one can see that these children, not entirely "conditioned" by their society, still possess traces of the "far-gone ages" in their consciousness, since they are only "half-afraid" and "silent"—not screaming out, as the questioner in "What Is He?" might, "What purpose do those elephants serve?" And the poem itself, just as it can be discussed as an illustration of the prose-like *Pansies* ("When I Went To The Circus," "Touch," "Paltry-Looking People"), also hearkens back to Lawrence's prose works themselves (many of which seem, in fact, the origin of many *Pansies*)—in this case, *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, which Lawrence, in fact, calls "an essay on child consciousness."[12] There the theme of "touch" in "Two Performing Elephants" rings out:

> . . . this is the way to educate children: the instinctive way of mothers. There should be no effort to teach children to think, to have ideas. Only to lift them and urge them into dynamic activity . . . . Damn understanding. Gestures, and touch, and expression of the face, not theory.
>
> [*Fantasia* 78]

"Two Performing Elephants" thus becomes all the more representational, representing not only the overly-mental men and children of "modern" society but also Lawrence's prescription, as stated in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, for a cure as well. And, through this poem, at least, Lawrence's vision is implicity optimistic.

The aim here has been to suggest not that the exclamatory and declarative poems in *Pansies* are strong poems in their own right but, rather, that they exist in an organic relationship with the illustrative poems and that any reading of the illustrative poems without them, as so often has happened when considered previously, is bound to be unnecessarily incomplete. The exclamatory and declarative poems, as is obvious at this point, are direct condemnations of things that disrupt Lawrence's vision of how

thigs should be, though more often than not they contain no specific explanations of the way life would be if the things inveighed against were abolished. "All That We Have Is Life," for example, spends plenty of time explaining what men "should refuse to be" but none at all on what life would be like if these dicta were carried out.

This is what, to a great degree, the illustrative poems do. They present the enactment of Lawrence's ideal vision, many times through a juxtaposition of two kinds of mentalities (or, as in "What Is He?," a confrontation of two kinds of mentalities): the kind of mentality Lawrence feels has produced the problems and the mentality which he presents as an ideal. And, very often, in order to grasp the full import of an illustrative poem, one must "know" the negative mentality, which is presented through the overtly didactic poems. For often the "juxtaposition" is allusive, requiring further inference. This is the case, for example, with "Two Performing Elephants," in which the knowledge of exactly what makes the modern children "wispy" and "half-afraid" at the sight of the starkly described elephants is greatly enhanced through the didactic poems—even ones which, like "Paltry-Looking People," do not seem immediately relevant. The "vein of fire" is present throughout *Pansies*, and a contextualized reading of any of its poems serves to prove that these poems come not from a machine spitting fragments but from a man knitting together ideas, piece by piece.

NOTES

[1] F. B. Pinion, *A D. H. Lawrence Companion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), pp. 115-16.

[2] Philip Hobsbaum, *A Reader's Guide to D. H. Lawrence* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1981), p. 138.

[3] Sandra M. Gilbert, *Acts of Attention: The Poems of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Cornell University Press, 1972), pp. 254-56.

[4] Ross C. Murfin, *The Poetry of D. H. Lawrence: Texts & Contexts* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), pp. 228-29.

[5] Hobsbaum, p. 138.

[6] *The Complete Poems of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Vivian de Sola Pinto and F. Warren Roberts (New York: Penguin Books, 1977), p. 417. All subsequent references are cited parenthetically by the abbreviation *CP* and the page number.

[7] I'm leaving out of this discussion *More Pansies* because, as has been pointed out by critics, they are almost all technically alike ("declarative" in style).

[8] The only poem in *Pansies* which eludes these categories is "Destiny," which is more contemplative in nature than any of the others and deserves separate treatment.

[9] "Hymns in a Man's Life," in *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished, and Other Prose Works by D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore (New York: Penguin Books, 1978), p. 599. Subsequent references to *Phoenix II* are cited parenthetically by the abbreviation *P II* and the page number.

[10] Of the 232 *Pansies* (not including *More Pansies*), only some 47 could be considered, by my definitions, "illustrative"; and yet in discussions in which *Pansies* are considered at any length—namely, in those of Gilbert, Pinion, and Murfin—quotations of illustrative poems outnumber those of non-illustrative poems by roughly two to one. And, as with Pinion and Murfin especially, quotations of non-illustrative poems are usually made to point out negative rather than positive aspects of Lawrence's *Pansies*.

[11] Pinion, p. 116, point out that throughout *Pansies* flow basically six themes: "sex in the head and not in the loins, bourgeois conformity, industrialization and the machine, the money curse, four-lettered words, and *Lady Chatterley*."

[12] D. H. Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (New York: Penguin Books, 1977), p. 148. Subsequent references are cited parenthetically by the abbreviation *Fantasia* and the page number.