CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

David Herbert Lawrence is one of the foremost writers of the twentieth century. He was a prolific writer, who during the twenty years of his literary career tried his hand at different genres of literature. During this creative period, not a year passed without the publication of something important from his pen. He was a versatile genius who could excel in many fields. His novels and short stories are his most important and interesting work. He was a good poet and a gifted writer of descriptive and expository essays. Lawrence was one of the greatest English letter writers and his letters rank with those of John Keats and Gerald Manly Hopkins. Many of his contemporaries like Bennett, Wells, Galsworthy, Kipling were as celebrated as Lawrence, yet none of them had the impact on their age and ours that Lawrence had and yet continues to wield.

David Herbert Lawrence was a genius. He was also blessed with a prophetic vision which he incorporated in all his writings. He did not hesitate to express his own ideas on a variety of topics such as politics, psychology, education, religion and many other spheres. His thinking was original and uninhibited as only of the greatest prophets, and he defied all current practices of fiction writing. His writings are highly original and thought-provoking. Like Bernard Shaw, he was an iconoclast, who throughout his
literary career waged a war against the conventional values and ideas. Modern science, modern intellectualism, modern education, he condemned as dead and mechanical and in their place he formulated a new science, a new morphology, a new cosmology of his own. He was not only a great artist and a great writer, but also a seer with a message of his own. His views have been expressed forcefully in one work after another. Thus fiction and doctrine co-exist in almost all his works.

Lawrence’s significant views on the main issues of life were evidently shaped by his childhood experiences and the important experiences of life in the subsequent years. Keeping this fact in mind, a very brief discussion of his life since his childhood has been brought forward here now.

Lawrence was born on September, 11, 1885, in the mining village of Eastwood, Nottinghamshire. He was the fourth child of John Arthur Lawrence, a miner who had commenced work when only seven years of age. Though his world was industrial it was not really urban, since a little beyond Eastwood was an unmolested rural world which was as much a part of Lawrence’s childhood as the colliery. He was brought up with the tension that arose from this dual environment, together with the violent social tension evident in his parents’ marriage. His mother was a Non-Conformist whose response to the spontaneous but irresponsible world of her husband was a conventional social aspiration sought to be realized through her children. It was his mother who tried
her best to give him the education which would uplift him above the working class environment in which he grew up. The strength of his mother's influence is shown in his great novel Sons and Lovers.

Lydia Lawrence belonged to a middle class family, her father being an engineer by profession. She was a fastidious person who read a great deal and never spoke the Derbyshire dialect of her husband and the other miners. She was quick and sensitive and rather proud of her superiority. As she was a member of the congregational church, it was through her that Lawrence came to be influenced by the Non-Conformist chapel. Lawrence was also connected through his mother to the English Puritan Tradition with its belief in freedom of spirit and salvation of soul. This religious training of his early life had an effect on his mind and at the end of his life he wrote that for him, the hymns which he learnt in his childhood were more important than the finest poetry. Vivian de Sola Pinto rightly comments on Lawrence's knowledge of the Bible: "Whatever may be said of Lawrence's writings, they are certainly those of a man who knows his Bible from cover to cover, as few Englishmen have known it in this century."

Another formative influence on Lawrence's mind was that of his father J.A. Lawrence. At first, Lawrence used to
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react strongly against his father and often sided with his mother in her quarrels with her husband. Later, however he realized how much he owed his father and pays him a magnificent tribute in his essay "Nottingham and the Mining Country."

Lawrence's father was an uneducated coal miner and as such he barely knew how to write his own name and could read with great difficulty. But for Lawrence he was the representative of instinctive sensuous life of pre-industrial England.

The third influence was that of a family who lived at a farm The Haggs, in a rural spot near Eastwood. It was The Haggs and the family living in it that brought Lawrence into contact with rural England. "This experience for the miner's son was a window opening on to a new world: the England of poetry, of Shakespeare and Milton. He never forgot what he owed to the family at the Haggs." It was the farmer's daughter, Jessie Chambers who shared Lawrence's love of reading books. It was she, who not only encouraged him to study but also helped his creative activity. In her

D.H. Lawrence. A Personal Record, she describes Lawrence's capacity for enjoyment and his ability to communicate it to others. "His own intense enjoyment gave a keener edge to our pleasure." In this book she also describes the excursions the two families used to go together under Lawrence's

leadership. When they were with Lawrence, "it was more than merely seeing these landmarks; it was a kind of immediate possession, as though to have missed seeing them would have been to lose an essential moment of life." Here Jessie Chambers seems to describe much of the quality of Lawrence's writing as we find in *Women in Love*, *The Rainbow* and many of his short stories and essays. Together they read and discussed a large number of books, most of them borrowed from the Mechanics Institute at Eastwood. The books of the great novelists opened for them a far more interesting world than the one in which they lived. "The Golden Treasury became 'a kind of Bible' and whatever they read together became not merely a text to be put away and forgotten but something to be felt along the heart, something that entered immediately into the imaginative life which Lawrence and Jessie shared during the years of their close friendship, roughly the first decade of the new century." Jessie also wrote in her memoir: "When we were alone together we were in a world apart where feeling and thought were intense, and we seemed to touch a reality that was beyond the ordinary workaday world." Thus Lawrence's identity grew up amidst a threefold influence - industrial and rural, community and social aspiration, convention and idealism. In the words of Bernard Bergonzi: "It makes for a pervasive rhythm in his work between a powerful need for

human relationship and an intense dynamic of self realization."

After finishing his education at Nottingham, Lawrence became a pupil teacher in his native village. He then joined the training course for the teacher’s certificate at University College, Nottingham and was for some time a teacher at Croydon. However, on the publication of The White Peacock in 1911, he gave up teaching in order to devote himself fully to literature. The year before in December, 1910, his mother who was a great influence died after five months of slowly increasing agony. In the year that followed her death, Lawrence did very little writing. In 1911, he met Frieda von Richthofen Weekley, the wife of his former instructor in French in Nottingham University College, Professor Earnest Weekley. Being a member of an aristocratic German family, she was disappointed in her existence as a provincial housewife. The relation between Lawrence who was trying to make his way into a higher social sphere and Frieda the disappointed aristocrat developed rapidly and in May, 1912 they left for Germany.

In 1914, Lawrence returned to England and married Frieda. Lawrence’s mind became matured at a time when the old provincial culture which had shaped his earlier development was dying due to the growth of rapid

industrialization and mechanization. He describes this realistically in his novels Sons and Lovers and Lady Chatterley's Lover. The literary world of London which had welcomed him earlier was also dying due to the First World War. Because of Lawrence's attitude towards the war and his wife's nationality, he was cruelly persecuted. This together with the banning of The Rainbow in 1915 as obscene and the banning of his paintings by the police made Lawrence try to leave England. But his passport was withheld and it was only in 1919 that he could go away. From then on he lived in Italy, Malta, Ceylon, Australia, California and New Mexico in search of a society suited for his ideals. He finally returned to Europe in 1929 and in 1930 died of tuberculosis at Vence in France.

A summary statement of Lawrence's philosophy of life cannot be easily made. It is many-faceted. Yet, an attempt is being made here now to recapture the unique quality of his greatness by referring to some of his most cherished convictions.

Lawrence had a set of passions and hatreds that he turned into beliefs. 'Blood' was the word he used for the human activity which was approved by him. He believed that western civilization since the times of Plato, was putting too much emphasis on the intellect and was totally neglecting the body. He describes his feelings in a letter to his friend Earnest Collins in 1913:
My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh as being wiser than the intellect. But what our blood feels and believes and says is always true. The intellect is only a bit and bridle. But what our blood feels and believes is always true. What do I care about knowledge. All I want to answer is my blood, direct without fribbling interference of mind or moral or what not ...

Lawrence had a horror of mere intellectuality. Mere cerebral knowledge was to him insignificant and worthless. "Like Blake, who had prayed to be delivered from "single vision and Newton's sleep"; like Keats, who had drunk destruction to Newton for having explained the rainbow, Lawrence disapproved of too much knowledge, on the score that it diminished men’s sense of wonder and blunted their sensitiveness to the great mystery."

According to him, man knows not only with the mind but also with a host of ganglia and the solar plexus and that for Lawrence was the real knowledge. "Scorning the merely intellectual faculties, he placed his trust in the experience of senses, which for him seem to gain in value as they become more violent." With the modern psychologists

he believed that there are layers within layers of consciousness - the conscious, the sub-conscious and even unconscious, and in his opinion it was even better to lapse back into the unconscious self. In other words, he wanted man to rely on his pre-natal instinct and impulse - dark gods and think and feel in unison with this primal consciousness. Lawrence loved the primitive and natural and at the same time he believed that each individuality was unique and had to be developed fully. Concurrently, he had a violent hatred of the values of the modern mechanized civilization. Man's primitive instincts and impulses which spring from his unconscious mind are regarded by him as the safest guides in life. He finds Christianity inadequate, no longer a living religion, and so he wants to give humanity a new faith to replace the old one. It is a religion of the blood that he preaches. He senses a dark mysterious god hovering behind the human conflict and asserts that victory would be with those who would identify themselves with this master of human destiny. Lawrence glorifies the primitive because "he has mystic apprehensions of being, of blood, of fibre and fires, which the cultivated man has carefully eliminated." Sensitiveness to obscure forces was Lawrence's characteristic gift and he could never forget the presence of the otherness which lies beyond man's conscious mind. In the words of Aldous Huxley, "Lawrence's

13. ibid., p.512.
special and characteristic gift was an extraordinary sensitiveness to what Wordsworth called "unknown modes of being." He was always intensely aware of the mystery of the world, and the mystery was always for him a numen, divine."

According to Lawrence, too much reliance on the intellect is the root cause of all evil. In Lady Chatterley’s Lover, he writes that "Ours is essentially a tragic age." This is Lawrence’s estimate of the predicament of contemporary man. "His whole career was a protest against mechanization, standardization, mass production and the worship of the machine, in which he saw the denial of the creative spirit of life." In The Rainbow, Ursula Brangwen finds school lesson bewildering and trivial except "... once when, with her blood, she heard a passage of Latin, and she knew how the blood beat in the Roman’s body; so that ever after she felt she knew the Romans by contact."

Lawrence believed that blood and instinct are better guides than the brain and that not mental consciousness but blood contact was essential between man and woman. According to him, human beings should make wordless cries like animals. In "The Fox", Henry talks to March "as if he were producing his voice in her blood." Sight was not an

17. Pinto, op.cit., pp.16-17.
essential factor in Lawrence's scheme of life. This notion is clearly illustrated in "The Blind Man." Maurice's wife, jumpy from education hates going to the stables while he tends the hot horses with sensual power and confidence, though he cannot see. 20 The drugged woman in "The Woman Who Rode Away" hears the womb of her pet bitch conceive, and the earth going round like an "immense arrowstring booming." 21 Hearing and touch play an important part in Lawrence's works and they are "further removed from the shallow world where people speak and think." In Lady Chatterley's Lover, Mellors rubs his face over Connie's body giving and receiving the "warm live beauty of contact, the beauty of vision." 22 In the tale "You Touched Me", a lady is forced to marry an ex-charity school boy because one night when he stays in their house, she goes into his bedroom and touches his face mistaking him for her father. 23 But at the same time, Lawrence was repelled by the endearments normally exchanged by lovers. According to him, real touch came from the blood, and was not a contact of surfaces. It was not amorous in the vulgar sense. Lawrence disliked love and believed that married couples "should not be united in love - 'stuck together like two jujube lozenges' - but fiercely

separate in their dynamic blood polarity, like copulating birds of prey 'two eagles in mid-air, grappling, whirling.'" Lawrence preferred mindless animals to human beings because he realized that they do not get involved with one another. In "St Mawr" Lou Witt declares of her horse, "I love St Mawr because, he is not intimate." Lawrence liked man to be clean in his habits and wanted them to conform to rules of civic decency. He wanted man to have the same impersonal aloofness of the trees, and also the aloofness of the trees and animals in their mating. Lawrence's characters like Connie, Birkin, Ursula and Gudrun or Juliet in "Sun" have a tendency to strip and enjoy themselves in the sun. This is a clear example of his belief in mankind's union with mindless plant life. According to many, Lawrence was somewhat favourably disposed to the notion of male superiority or male prerogative. He considered the modern civilized woman a great enemy of man trying to rob him of his greatest possession - his manhood. In nearly all his works he resisted the threatened domination by woman with hysterical violence. In Aaron's Rod, he writes, "I hate her, when she knows, and when she wills. I hate her when she will make of me that which serves her desire. She may love me, she may be soft and kind to me, she may give her life for me. But why, only because I am hers." For a woman, stitching and washing her man's shirt

is an important occupation. Count Dionys in "The Ladybird" announces that the males in his family always had their shirts made and washed by "a woman of our own blood." At times, Lawrence believed that mankind may be divided into natural aristocrats and natural slaves. His natural aristocrats often occupy low positions in society. For him the groom Lewis in "St Mawr" is an aristocrat. "But it was an aristocracy of the individual powers, the greater influences nothing to do with human society." The natural aristocrats in Lawrence's stories are often arrogant, sensual and selfish. In "The Virgin and the Gypsy", Yvette shows her aristocratic nature by stealing money from the Church War Memorial Window Fund to buy herself stockings. The Lawrentian aristocrat does not like to see people suffer but instead of wishing to cure them, he blames them of focusing his attention on their problems.

Lawrence rejected Christianity because it denied the wholeness of man and falsely renounced the primal source of consciousness in nature. For him, the flesh and the spirit were one and any division of the two was an evil. He was hostile to Christianity because it glorified ascetic life and thought that flesh was unholy. He found a living and creative God in the religion of such primitive people, as the Mexicans. He thus became a prophet of a new order, and his mission was to build up a new myth of the blood

consciousness that should save humanity from the sterile waste of spirit in a world hampered by too much stress on intellectuality.

One of the most important themes in Lawrence's work is the theme of "flow and recoil of sympathy." To quote Lawrence's own words:

After all one may hear the most private affairs of other people, but only in a spirit of respect for the struggling, battered thing which any human soul is, and in a spirit of fine, discriminative sympathy. For even satire is a form of sympathy. It is the way our sympathy flows and recoils that really determines our lives. And here lies the vast importance of the novel, properly handled. It can inform and lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness, and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead. Therefore the novel, properly handled, can reveal the most secret places of life: for it is in the passional secret places of life, above all, that the tide of sensitive awareness needs to ebb and flow, cleansing and freshening.

An analogous viewpoint is also expressed in his famous essay "The State of Funk." Arguing that a kind of irrational fear has gripped the twentieth century men and women,

Lawrence has called it an offshoot of a state of funk. "The time of change is upon us. The need for change has taken hold of us ... Intuitively, we know it. And we are frightened. Because change hurts." But Lawrence has enthusiastically advocated this change and he has said that this change is his real concern. He feels that men must have a more generous, more human system based on life values and not on the money values. To make such new feelings active, Lawrence has stated his standpoint in the following way:

"If I can really sympathize with a woman in her sexual self, it is just a form of warm-heartedness and compassionateness, the most natural life-flow in the world. But it may be a woman of seventy-five, or a child of two, it is the same. But our civilization, with its horrible fear and funk and repression and bullying, has almost destroyed the natural flow of common sympathy between men and men, and men and women. And it is this that I want to restore into life: just the natural warm flow of common sympathy between man and man, man and woman. Many people hate it, of course. Many men hate it that one should tacitly take them for sexual, physical men instead of mere social and mental personalities." We can assume that Lawrence's indictment of this attitude of fear is related to his lifelong quest for the notion of true and perfect love.

According to Bernard Bergonzi, this concept of

32. ibid., pp.100-101
"'Sympathy'" takes Lawrence straight back to George Eliot. Bergonzi has also asserted how positive is the concept of recoil, in the aforequoted lines from Lady Chatterley's Lover. He has also said that recoil is "throughout Lawrence's work, precisely from those values, values which make for integrity and accommodation, that we find in Jane Austen and George Eliot."

On this issue the opinion of another distinguished critic can also be quoted: "Love is in its essence reciprocal, a relationship of giving and taking, in the particular sense which Socrates appears to have understood so well in the Symposium. It is reciprocal in that it is based equally on penury and plenitude: on the need, the dependence, of each upon the other, which is their common penury; and upon that fullness of the loving heart that expresses itself in the adoration and the service of the other, which is the plenitude of love."

We can discuss this theme of flow and recoil of sympathy conveniently in relation to his novels. But this conviction which Lawrence cherished within his inmost self can also be traced in his short stories. In "Tickets Please", total lack of reciprocity of tenderness is responsible for the debased nature of the inspector John Thomas. "The Princess" can also be regarded as one version

34. ibid., pp.107-108
of Lawrence's treatment of the theme of flow and recoil of sympathy. In "England, My England", the relationship between Egbert and Winifred is clouded by a recoil of sympathy.

The theme of 'wholeness' obsessed Lawrence. According to him, man can develop an integrated personality only when he realizes that he is flesh, mind and body all rolled into one whole. The artificial division between the two, is the root cause of all the wretchedness and misery of modern man, and he can escape it only by going back to a life of pure sensation. With this end in view, he advocated a return to nature. Thus, for an integrated personality, the first essential is a satisfactory balance between the spirit and the flesh and secondly, the achievement of satisfactory relationship with others. He finds the principle of polarity running through the entire creation. Light and darkness, male and female, love and hate are eternal polarities and the reconciliation of such opposites is essential for a satisfactory relationship. The opposites male and female, the mind and the spirit are always in conflict, but the conflict must be satisfactorily resolved and a balance struck.

"A central feature of Lawrence's thought is its dualism," writes H.M. Daleski. Lawrence also proclaims his own duality in "The Crown." "I know I am compounded of two waves ... I am framed in the struggle and embrace of the

two opposite waves of darkness and of light." He asserts that everything that exists, even a stone has two sides to its nature. He regards this duality as an all pervading principle of life and expresses it symbolically in terms of opposed forces - in terms of darkness and light, the tiger and lamb or the lion and the unicorn. He also emphasizes that the opposition between these two forces must end and that the conflict between the two can be ended not by merger of the two into one, but in the external balance between them. In Twilight in Italy, Lawrence writes: "The two infinitives, negative and positive, they are always related but they are never identical. They are always opposite, but there exists a relation between them ... To say that the two are one, this is the inadmissible lie."

Lawrence views relationship between individuals in much the same way. If an individual endeavours to realize his complete self, it is essential for him to expand out and to get involved with the external universe. But this involvement does not imply the obliteration of the self, or a complete defiance of the external universe. He believed that for an ideal relationship, the self and the external universe have to be held in perfect balance.

According to Lawrence, this principle assumes a still greater importance where the relationship is that between a

man and a woman. The man and the woman are required not only to meet as opposites but also reconcile the opposing qualities within themselves. "The relationship is envisaged as a meeting on equal terms of two people who have themselves achieved full individuality and transcend their duality in the balance that is attained between them." This principle of duality runs through most of the novels of Lawrence. In *Sons and Lovers*, the conjugal happiness of Walter Morel is wrecked by Mrs Morel's persistent efforts to reform the personality of her husband according to her own middle class ideals:

The pity was, she was too much his opposite. She could not be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him.

In *Women in Love*, Gudrun destroys Gerald Crich through her desire to dominate him, whereas Ursula and Birkin find fulfillment in each other since the two respect the divine otherness of each other and do not aim at any unnatural domination.

Lawrence's dislike of abstract knowledge and pure spirituality made him, in the words of Aldous Huxley, "a

mystical materialist." This found expression in the cosmology and physiology of his speculative essays and his restatement of the Christian doctrine of resurrection of the body. Lawrence’s philosophy has been beautifully summarized by Bonamy Dobrée;

Throughout his career he has been anti-materialistic, since materialism for him blunts sensibility, but he is for shearing away the relics of dead faiths or philosophies that clog the free play of impulses, and he rejects Christianity and Platonism with equal scorn. He is, in short, anarchic, but anarchic with a formative purpose: he would like to found a new religion.

D. H. Lawrence attracted a large amount of commentary during his lifetime. In fact, he is one of the most disputed men of genius in the history of modern English literature. He has been excessively praised as well as excessively abused. Like William Blake, Lawrence had to endure an age that undervalued his craft, misunderstood his meaning or rejected his vision. After his novel The Rainbow was suppressed in 1915, he responded to his critics with defiance and contemptuousness, though before that he had been more willing to modify his work. He had an intense conviction of the importance of his art and he was quite

42. Dobrée, op.cit., pp.96-97.
unwilling to be deflected from his purpose. Towards the end of his life, his novel Lady Chatterley's Lover was met with outright hostility and even after his death, the obituaries were full of animosity rarely displayed on such occasions. Although after his initial discovery by Ford Maddox Ford, he was not quite popular in the literary circles, yet many important critics commented on his works and very few of his books were ignored.

In 1927, E.M. Forster and T.S. Eliot made their first comments on Lawrence. In Aspects of the Novel (1927), Forster made a favourable assessment of Lawrence’s novels placing him as "... the only prophetic novelist writing today ... the only living novelist in whom the song predominates, who has the rapt bardic quality, and whom it is idle to criticize ..." He made a further statement about Lawrence claiming him to be " ... the greatest imaginative novelist of our generation."

In an article for La Nouvelle Revue Française, Eliot wrote that Lawrence who was pre-occupied by the fashionable Freudian psychology was an example of false seriousness and also that he had a limited sense of reality. This theme was further developed in After Strange Gods. A Primer of Modern Heresy in which Lawrence was one of the main heretics. In the same book, Eliot finds Lawrence - the son of a Welsh coal miner

heretical and sinister, the inevitable result in the kind of tradition that a good education gives. Eliot asserted: "... Lawrence started life wholly free from any restriction of tradition or institution, that he had no guidance except the Inner Light, the most untrustworthy and deceitful guide that ever offered itself to wandering humanity." T. S. Eliot further emphasized Lawrence's "incapacity for what we ordinarily call thinking." and categorized him "a very sick man indeed." He further wrote about Lawrence's attitude to Christianity: "His attitude towards Christianity seems to me that of a man who had no emotional acquaintance with any but some debased and uncultured form ..." Eliot also commented that in Lawrence there was a lack of sense of humour and that there was "distinct sexual morbidity in Lawrence." In 1951, T.S. Eliot claimed, "Lawrence was an ignorant man in the sense that he was unaware of how much he did not know."

In the 1930s, John Middleton Murry in his Son of Woman (1931) offered the portrait of an artist whose lifelong obsession with his mother distorted his entire treatment of sex and entirely changed his art. In his introduction to his
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edited letters of Lawrence, Aldous Huxley tried to give a fitting reply to Murry's view, but most of the criticism of this period conformed to rather than disagreed with Murry's point of view. According to Huxley, Lawrence was primarily an artist and it was difficult "to write about Lawrence except as an artist." According to him, Lawrence's peculiar gift, his extraordinary sensitiveness to the mystery of the world and dark presence of the otherness "accounts for his attitude towards sex."

Tradition according to T.S. Eliot's well-known view means an artist's having the historical sense of the literature of his own country and the literature of Europe from Homer onwards. When Eliot spoke of the tradition and culture, he essentially meant the Christian culture. This view is held by the distinguished Indian critic Nahal Chaman. So far as Christian tradition is concerned eminent scholars like F.R. Leavis and Vivian de Sola Pinto have shown that Lawrence had as full and rich a share of this cultural heritage as anyone else.

In the 30's, F.R. Leavis who was to become D.H. Lawrence's most important critic, challenged Eliot's view in For Continuity (1933) and convincingly maintained: "In our time, when the gap in continuity is almost complete, [Lawrence] may be said to represent, concretely in his
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living person, the essential human tradition." Leavis continued to explain about Lawrence's success towards the transmission of a social and spiritual heritage in *The Great Tradition* (1948) and in *D.H. Lawrence. Novelist* (1955), which reprinted his rebuttal of Eliot's prejudices. He wrote about Lawrence:

He had a better education, one better calculated to develop his genius for its most fruitful use, than any other he could have got ... The Chapel, in the Lawrence circle, was the centre of a strong social life, and the focus of a still persistent cultural tradition that had as its main drive the religious tradition of which Mr Eliot is so contemptuous. To turn, as Lawrence did, the earnestness and moral seriousness of that tradition to the powering of a strenuous intellectual inquiringness was all in the Tradition.

Both Forster and Leavis pay less tribute to Lawrence the possessed preacher, giving priority to Lawrence the artist who excels in a concrete sense of life and stands for spontaneous and creative fullness of being. Forster points to Lawrence's dogmatic preaching as a "minor aspect of him which makes him so difficult and misleading." However he comes to the conclusion that in Lawrence's work, we cannot

55. F.R. Leavis, *For Continuity* (Cambridge, 1933), p.158.
56. F. R. Leavis, "Mr Eliot and Mr Lawrence" in *The Achievement of D.H. Lawrence* op.cit., pp.99-100.
separate the prophetical and the poetical qualities. Forster has also argued that Lawrence’s work should not be divorced from his art and consequently treated as two different aspects - a negative and a positive one. He further reiterates his emphasis on Lawrence’s intensity of beliefs which is indeed the most impressive feature of his genius.

Vivian de Sola Pinto regards D.H. Lawrence not only as a writer of genius but also as the greatest prophetic writer of the twentieth century:

He is, indeed, a very great English Prophet, inspite of the hard things he often said about England and the English, perhaps even because of those things; ... He is the voice of this England, as Blake was the voice of a corresponding England at the end of the eighteenth century, and Bunyan in the second half of the seventeenth century. Like theirs, his is a creed of the salvation of the individual soul: the dignity of man saved by divine grace without the intervention of priest and church.

Pinto further asserts: "Lawrence was not an ignorant man, as T.S. Eliot has called him, and he was not a crude,
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wild 'genius', but he came from a tradition and cultural background which are not understood by many people like Mr Eliot who came to England from abroad, and spend their lives among the gentlemanly upper middle class of London and the south of England, the world of Times and Punch and the London clubs. Pinto goes on to explain that living tradition comes more through a direct contact with the soil and Lawrence was a man of the soil. A glance at Lawrence's record in the various educational institutions he attended and the number of works he read privately with Jessie Chambers show how good a student he was.

Lawrence not only had the historical knowledge but he went a step further. Together with knowledge, he also had an openness of mind. This openness of mind enabled him to successfully fuse together heterogenous cultural traditions of Europe, of England and of the Midlands. Besides, Lawrence received the strength of Christian dogma from his mother and his early membership in the congregational church. In fact, his works show how acutely conscious he was of the Christian tradition. If it wasn't for this dominant pull, he could never have written a story like "The Man Who Died."

That D.H. Lawrence was a great artist came to be recognized later on by even his most hostile critic T. S. Eliot. Colin Wilson had reported that in a letter written to
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him in 1956, Eliot dismissed Colin Wilson's view that Shaw could be considered the most important writer of the twentieth century. Rather Eliot suggested that Lawrence might be a better choice than Shaw. In his statement for the Lady Chatterly trial of 1960 - a statement prepared on behalf of the defence, but not delivered - Eliot made a courageous retraction of what he had said in *After Strange Gods. A Primer of Modern Heresy*.

Dorothea Krook, who has attempted an interpretation of the history of English moral thought has traced three broadly distinct and equally fundamental interpretations of moral experience, - the Christian - Platonic or religious, the utilitarian or secular and the Humanist. She has, in this connection placed Lawrence in the moral tradition of Messianic humanism. She has stressed that Lawrence's famous story "The Man Who Died" shows the true prophetic temper, caring passionately about the salvation of the world. Here Lawrence is found serious in the highest degree in his treatment of moral and religious matters. The story according to this critic is an amplification of the Humanist conception of the Son of God, the true Saviour of mankind. In addition to this, Dorothea Krook has chosen St. Augustine's account of concupiscence in the Fourteenth Book of *The City of God* as a statement of the Christian view to sexual love. After analysing St. Augustine's view on

---

63. *ibid.*, p.36.
concupiscence she has made the following comment:

On the other side, the best works of D.H. Lawrence are intent upon exposing the very concupiscence that Augustine speaks of - the falsity and corruptness of a sexual relation that is purely mental, self-conscious in the most opprobrious sense of the word, 'fervent in the mind', as Augustine says and therefore 'frozen in the body'.

In D. H. Lawrence and Tradition, seven distinguished critics have analysed Lawrence's complex relation to the past. Summarizing the viewpoints of this group of seven critics, the editor of this aforementioned book has commented as follows: "Though Lawrence transcends any single literary influence, part of his receptive genius is the ability to select and learn from the traditions of the past. He had the persistence and courage to continue his struggle with the potent dead and, from this spiritual combat, to recreate a new art... Lawrence shares with most of the writers from Blake to Nietzsche a close connection to the line of Protestant Dissent; a belief in Darwinism; a plea for an organic as opposed to a mechanistic society; an emotional and spontaneous style; an immediacy, intensity and vitality; ..."
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Bonamy Dobrée in The Lamp and the Lute. Studies in Seven Authors regards Lawrence as a genius. According to him, "what it is that Mr Lawrence looks for to revivify a wearied generation is, then, a kind of phallic mysticism ... one of the flesh. Inspired by his genius, made alive by his immense literary talent, for causing a thing to exist, his vision is momentarily exciting, and even, at moments plausible. As a criticism of the enfeebled emotional life which drags on in most great cities, it has a deal of point." He places Lawrence in the same tradition of Emily Bronte and Thomas Hardy and regards him as a writer who has "something of the explosive vitality of Dickens, of much of the concentrated power of making a thing actual' which distinguished Tolstoy, more a touch of the ethical fervour of Dostoevsky."

Graham Hough finds him akin to the Victorian prophet Ruskin or Carlyle, a great writer who early in his career became an international writer.

Julian Moynahan regards Lawrence a great modern writer whose paramount importance lies in the fact that he more than any other modern English writer, looked at the feelings and instinct out of which human experience is woven for life and death and which tie ordinary men to one another.
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According to him Lawrence's books look towards the future than to the past or present and "by his awareness that modern man can recover from the material and spiritual devastations of industrial civilization only by creating a human community that is suffused with reverence for life."

David Cavitch asserts that Lawrence's works of art focus "chiefly upon the recesses of individual consciousness, where his characters encounter their generic, natural self, and must make a crucial adjustment to it. In writing to remind people of their fundamental identity - "we never know that we ourselves are anything" - Lawrence's stance is sometimes prophetic and visionary with apocalyptic utterances, but he is almost always, hortatory to some degree, as even his letters illustrate." He also believed that Lawrence's art had a "corrective moral effect; ..."

Gamini Salgado likens him to Blake. "Like Blake, Lawrence was a prophet, not in the vulgar sense of a foreteller of future events, but in the older Biblical sense of a crier forth of forgotten or unheeded truths." Sharing historian A.L. Rowse's view that Lawrence meant something special to the men of his generation and was an essential part of their awakening to maturity, Salgado points out that although the novel was a form in which Lawrence made his
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most lasting contribution of English literature, the long short story was a form in which he excelled. Salgādo further comments that Lawrence "liberated a vast area of human experience for English fiction and every subsequent writers treatment of sexual relations has been influenced by Lawrence's example, ... His technical discoveries, though profoundly original, were intimately related to his individual vision ..."

The comments on Lawrence hitherto quoted are primarily directed to his epoch making novels. An extension of his unique vision is also manifest in his short stories.

Lawrence's short stories may not form a very large part of his creative work, but despite this fact F.R. Leavis opines that the quality of Lawrence's tales is of such superbly excellent order that by itself it is enough to place Lawrence among the great writers.

T.O. Beachcroft has also supported Leavis's forthright and notable comments on Lawrence's short stories.

H.E. Bates himself a good short story writer feels that Lawrence was a better short story writer than a novelist. On the other hand, Graham Hough finds continuity
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only in the major fiction of D.H. Lawrence. According to him, "if we take as our text the shorter stories and tales, and study them chronologically as we did the novels, the sense of reading a series, of watching the gradual unfolding of a personality is absent. By themselves the stories present no consistent pattern; though they are full of illuminating parallels and cross references to the novels, the links among the tales are fewer." This view is open to debate and the inadequacy of this comment is sought to be pointed out in my dissertation. Further, Hough does not regard the short stories as growing parts of Lawrence's fiction. According to him the plot, range and the treatment of the short stories depend on the amount of material, time, energy which the longer fiction spared him. But at the same time he thinks that the short stories are often "superior in artistic organization" to the long novels because in the short stories there is no original exploration.

J.I.M. Stewart feels that the short stories of Lawrence are the works of a "man who has made up his mind about the problems which his theme presents." He further says that "the best of the short stories are more unflawed artistic successes than any of the novels." But he does not regard the short stories as the result of Lawrence's
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creative and questioning imagination.

According to Julian Moynahan, "Lawrence is a great writer of the shorter tale, and if he is less than Chekov he still has no equal among the English writers ..." He further thinks that the scope, originality and poise of Lawrence's stories establish him as a more considerable figure than Hemingway and Joyce, Faulkner and Sean O'Faolin.

Philip Hobsbaum regards the short stories of Lawrence as the core of his achievement. According to him, Lawrence's best tales "stand beside Melville's 'Benito Cereno' James's 'The Lesson of the Master' and Conrad's 'The Shadowline' as superb examples of a form more appreciated than analysed. Essentially the affinities are with such works as Wordsworth's 'Michael' or Crabbe's 'Resentment' ... Lawrence is one of the supreme masters of this form ... However I doubt whether in this prose semblance he has had significant successors."

For a long time, many critics have seen Lawrence's tales only as bits of material left over from the novels or holidays from major works of fiction. But in reality the truth is more various. Though novels and short stories have
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much in common and they employ many of the same literary elements, they are also distinct in fundamental ways. They, in fact make different types of demands on the author and create different expectations in the reader. Edgar Allan Poe understood these differences and his insistence that the short stories should have a unified effect has been shared by great practitioners of the art. The short story and the novel have different histories and have been written for different audiences and different reasons. The novels resemble a painter’s larger canvases while the short stories represent his or her smaller ones. The large may take years of work, the small only months or weeks. And for that reason, an artist may feel a degree of freedom or less concern towards the smaller work, and that casual attitude can lead to surprising developments. These very points pertain to Lawrence’s skill and attitude towards his novels and stories, to the field of short fiction as he found and left it. To see his short stories as leftovers is to miss all that is interesting in the relationship between his long and short fiction.

D.H. Lawrence’s short stories were written under most diverse circumstances. They were conceived over a period of twenty-three years in England, the Bavarian Alps, Germany, Italy, Ceylon, Australia, Mexico and New Mexico. In his letters, he sometimes moans as he revises them. Sometimes he does not mention them at all and this silence is in contrast to the situation with the novels, which he frequently writes
about, discussing their progress and design with a variety of correspondents. The tales are written more easily and steadily than the novels. During the dry periods between the novels, the short stories are often the only vehicles through which his narrative imagination continued to flow. During these periods, these stories are wonderful in their vibrancy, in the love and hope they betray, and are sometimes full of wit and power and at other times full of sound and fury.

Lawrence published his first story in 1907. In comparison with France and Russia where the realistic story had already been introduced by Flaubert and Maupassant, Gogol and Tolstoy, Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Chekov respectively, the modern short story in England blossomed late. Upto the last decade of the nineteenth century English readers were still spending time with fables, legends, anecdotes and tall tales. Joyce, Mansfield, Woolf and Lawrence who would follow the discoveries of Turgenev, Chekov and Verga were still school children and they began writing short stories only in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Among these writers, Lawrence is clearly the best writer in the range and quantity of masterpieces. He also stretched the conventions of the genre to include a variety of new possibilities.

During his own period, Lawrence speedily altered several of the premises of the nineteenth century short story, to serve his own talent. His first tales written in
1907 and 1908 are relatively traditional and consist of legends and anecdotes. In the last part of 1908, he however discovered the new school of realism. In his short fiction, Lawrence adopted the ideas of this new school at once. But he had to struggle with a variety of nineteenth century romantic notions about the novel for about three years, before he could adopt these ideas in his long fiction.

"Odour of Chrysanthemums" is the first of a cluster of tales to focus on the familiar than the fantastic. The early realistic tales written between 1909 and 1912 are important because they taught Lawrence the craft of writing a short story. These tales are also important because they lead to Sons and Lovers.

Lawrence's visionary tales saw him through great changes of thinking between 1913 and 1925, and this shows clearly the flexibility of the adaptation of realistic short stories to visionary perspectives. In his first visionary tales "The Prussian Officer" and "Vin Ordinaire" (the original version of "The Thorn in the Flesh") we are shown the life of an individual who encounters terror and eventual death because he leaves his community for an intense relationship. When the war broke out, Lawrence thought that this personal engagement would bring life to the people and societies which had gone dead. He felt that the only alternative to this mechanical mass movement was the passionate and sensual love between a man and a woman.
With the armistice and decadence that followed there was a period in Lawrence’s life which was highly chauvinistic. Like many others, he too began to regard the aristocracy as exclusively masculine. In his works, women are asked again and again to submit their will and desires to a male leader. He wrote "The Fox", "You Touched Me" and "The Border Line" during this period. This vision of masculine dominance soon ended and "The Overtone" and "St Mawr" mark that end. In Lawrence’s last visionary tales both masculine and feminine voices are honoured.

In the later stories, Lawrence moves towards fables and satires. He was thus inspired to write "The Rocking-Horse Winner", "The Man who Loved Islands" and "The Man who Died." The world presented in his late fables and satires is distorted and simplified. Here character is stylized, plot takes the form of an argument and the narrator takes the role of a story teller. Unlike his earlier shifts from realistic to visionary short fiction, Lawrence’s fables and satires consist of stages and experiments. The themes of these fables and satires vary from proclamations on the need for absolute patriarchy to satires on the patriarch. These short stories can directly present every kind of social issue from materialism to idealism, the woman’s movement and traditional Christianity. These stories are not affected by Frank O’Conner’s stricture, that short story cannot deal directly with large social issues and must focus on lonely
souls wandering on the fringes of society. It appears that Lawrence and his reader of short fiction were specially ready to appreciate this type of fiction after the strong emphasis on realistic work during the previous two decades. In these late stories and fables, Lawrence's energy, wit and formal beauty clearly suggest his delight and happiness in his last years in moving beyond all regulations of realism.