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A distinguished novelist, great poet, and writer of tales D.H. Lawrence (1885-1929) remains unsurpassed within the novelistic writing. The author of works such as *Sons and Lovers*, *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* D.H. Lawrence was also the author of several critical essays on the novel and novelists. Known for his thematic innovations and romantic characters he was a controversial figure in the literary scene both before and after his death. In spite of the differing critical attitudes towards the man and his work even the most unsympathetic of the critics was not unwilling to recognise his genius. E.M. Forster paid a great tribute to Lawrence after his death.

Now he is dead, and the low-brows whom he scandalised have united with the high-brows whom he bored to ignore his greatness. This cannot be helped: no one who alienates both Mrs. Grundy and Aspasia can hope for a good obituary press. All that we can do ... is to say straight out that he was the greatest imaginative novelist of our generation.
The above suggests the prevailing attitude to Lawrence among the elite when he was dead. If for L. M. Forster Lawrence was "the great imaginative novelist of our generation," for Leavis, who was engaged in a long battle to win recognition for Lawrence and to kill the gross misconceptions and prejudices, the questions and stresses that preoccupied him are very relevant. Lawrence's genius has very striking manifestations outside his novels and tales. But his supreme intelligence and mark of genius could be seen in his literary criticism. For Leavis Lawrence is by far the best critic.

That Leavis is convinced about Lawrence's great creative genius and his estimate that he is one of the greatest figures in literature would be clear in his attack on Eliot who did not rate Lawrence high. For Eliot Lawrence "started life wholly free from any restriction of tradition or institution," he suffered from "a lack, not so much of information as of the critical faculties which education should give, and an incapacity for what is ordinarily called thinking." Eliot also speaks of Lawrence's "lack of intellectual and social training." The most cruel statement that Eliot made was of the "crippling effect upon men of letters
of not having been brought up in the environment of a living and the central tradition.” This attitude of Eliot suggests the disadvantages suffered by low-born writers such as Hardy and George Eliot and D.H. Lawrence. In fairness one could obviate the snobbery of Eliot by a reference to the genius with which Lawrence was born and the extraordinarily active intellectual life enjoyed by him. For in Lawrence there was the earnestness and moral seriousness to grasp the English cultural tradition and the intellectual inquiriness that goes with it. As Leavis puts it:

Lawrence was brought up in a living and central tradition - there it seems to me is where to be the stress .... Lawrence's intelligence, in its superlative fineness and vitality, always seems to me - and in the closely argued prose treatise and in the criticism as much as anywhere else - essentially the intelligence of the creative artist.

Reviewing The Letters of D.H. Lawrence for The New Statesman, Harold Nicolson says that the Letters in the words of Aldous Huxley are "beautiful and absorbingly interesting
in themselves." For Nicolson the *Letters* provides an explanation of Lawrence's life and characters such as exceeds the most exacting requirements: "Not only do they fortify admiration and illumine understanding; they create a mark upon the mind." Nicolson refers to fingering the soul of D.H. Lawrence by less fastidious hands splitting it into psychological fibres, disintegrating a man whose whole purpose was integration. According to Nicolson the main barrier between Lawrence and the reading public is his constant preoccupation with sexual experience, which at moments took extreme forms. Lawrence wrote, "My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh as being wiser than the intellect." Lawrence, it is clear, rejected the intelligence as he rejected the emotions, falling back on those elements in human nature which are most akin to the darkness of plant growth. Nicolson warns that one should not be puzzled by his methods and it is ignorance and unfairness to attribute them to morbidity. He (Nicolson) recommends Lawrence's *Letters* for any proof of his spiritual interests. Lawrence has said "there is a principle in the universe, towards which men turn religiously - a life of the universe
itself. And the hero is he who touches and transmits the life of the universe." Lawrence kept this aim, this mission, this quest, constantly before himself for twenty years and more of adult life. It is this principle and the quest, says Nicolson, this search for 'truth in being' which made Lawrence seek in remote civilizations and obscure rites. Finding no answers in his journeys to Shillong, to Australia, to New Mexico Lawrence finally sought it in his own instincts. He never wavered in his search and never compromised. He said "primarily I am a passionately religious man." Nicolson refers to certain tendencies of certain critics to regard D.H. Lawrence as a neurotic and insane person but maintains that Lawrence was obviously exceptional even eccentric but he was not a neurotic.

For Aldous Huxley the importance of D.H. Lawrence lies in his being a psychological diviner. He says that Lawrence was extraordinarily sensitive to the life that is buried in every fragment of matter: "He (Lawrence) felt its quality and its intensity, as the dowser feels the quantity and the subterranean distance of the water of the metal which knows his twig of hazel."
In his Introduction to *The Letters of J.H. Lawrence* Aldous Huxley points to the inescapable fact of Lawrence being a novelist. Citing Lawrence's motto "Art for my sake," Huxley says, there are moments when he complained against the art, but they are caused by pains and humiliations attendant on the practising artist. There is a strange force within him which created his works of art and to this force Lawrence submitted himself completely. Referring to Middleton Murry's *Son of Woman* Huxley says that it is a book which "for all its metaphysical subleties and its Freudian ingenuities, very largely irrelevant." Huxley dismisses Murry's critical method which ignores the artist in Lawrence saying that a man born with a special talent is less deeply affected by nature than the one who is less gifted. The achievement of Mozart or Blake would have remained fundamentally the same even if their nurture had been different. So to discuss Lawrence or his work in Freudian terms cannot adequately assess his gifts.

Huxley says that "Lawrence's special and characteristic gift was an extraordinary sensitiveness to what Wordsworth called 'unknown modes of being.'" Deeply aware of the mystery of the world Lawrence never forgot the dark presence of
the otherness that lies beyond the boundaries of man's conscious mind. This special sensibility was rendered in terms of literary art by a prodigious power in him. Setting Lawrence off from others Huxley says that "to be with Lawrence was a kind of adventure, a voyage of discovery into newness and otherness." Lawrence belonged to a different quarter inhabiting a different universe from that of common men - a brighter and intenser world.

It is intriguing that Leavis who devoted most of his critical writing in defence of Lawrence has chosen to be indifferent to Thomas Hardy. For him the great English novelists are Jane Austen, George Eliot, Henry James and Joseph Conrad. For him these major novelists count because they, besides changing the possibilities of the art for practitioners and readers, offer also to promote human awareness of the possibilities of life. Leavis says that Jane Austen provides an exceptionally illuminating study of the nature of humanity and exemplifies beautifully the relations of the individual talent to tradition: "... her relation to tradition is a creative one. She not only makes tradition for those coming after but her achievement has for us a retrogressive effect; as we look back but her achievement
has for us a retroactive effect: as we look back beyond her we see in what goes before, and see because of her, potentialities and significances brought out in such a way that, for us, she creates the tradition we see leading down to her.6

Jane Austen's intense moral interest in life is, her preoccupations with certain problems of life, her intelligence to impersonalise moral tensions— it is these which make her, according to Leavis, the first modern novelist. Leavis would agree with Lord David Cecil who says that "the laws conditioning the form of Jane Austen's novels are the same laws that condition those of George Eliot and Henry James and Conrad."

Although Henry James is American by birth Leavis places him in the English tradition: "His (Henry James's) registration of sophisticated human consciousness is one of the classical creative achievements; it added something as only genius can. And when he set his best that something is seen to be of great human significance. He creates an ideal civilized sensibility; a humanity capable of communicating by the first shades of inflection and implication; a nuance may engage a whole complex moral economy and the
Joseph Conrad, in spite of his Polish origin, is placed in the English tradition. "What needs to be stressed is the great novelist.... We have a master of the English language, who chose it for its distinctive qualities and because of the moral tradition associated with it, and whose concern with art—he being like Jane Austen and George Eliot and Henry James an innovator in 'form' and method—is the servant of a profoundly serious interest in life."  

As for Dickens, Leavis does not place him in the line of great novelists. Leavis says that "Dickens was a great genius and is permanently among the classics. But the genius was that of a great entertainer, and he had for the most part no profounder responsibility as creative artist than this description suggests." Yet another reason offered by Leavis for exclusion of Dickens from the great novelists is that the adult mind doesn't find in Dickens a challenge to an unusual and sustained seriousness. However, *Hard Times* is singled out as an example of perfection and distinctive creative genius controlled by unifying and orga-
It is surprising that Leavis who is so lavish of praise should be so frigid to Thomas Hardy. He was less than sympathetic to Hardy and Meredith when he said that "they are both supposed to be philosophically profound" but suggests that neither Hardy nor Meredith can support his reputation. "It is all the same a little comic that Hardy should have been taken in the early nineteen twenties - the Chekhov period - as preeminently the representative of the 'modern consciousness' or the modern "sense of the human situation." Leavis also dismisses Meredith by quoting E.M. Forster in support of his contention. He includes D.H. Lawrence in the Great Tradition and considers D.H. Lawrence as one "committed himself to be hardest and most sustained creative labour ... representative of vital and significant development." He continues: "he is a most daring and radical innovator in "form, method, technique. And his innovations and experiments are dictated by the most serious and urgent kind of interest in life." Leavis quotes Lawrence's Letters where he speaks of the "faculty for receiving the hidden waves that come from the depths of lives and for transferring them to the un receptive world." It is this spirit of
Lawrence which springs from the depth of his religious experience, according to Leavis that makes Lawrence so much more significant in relation to the past and future "so much more truly creative as a technical inventor and an innovator and a master of language than James Joyce."  

The foregoing shows the mixed approach to Lawrence’s fiction. On the one hand there is the overwhelming enthusiasm for the kind of writing that Lawrence gave in his lifetime. And on the other hand there are quite a few dissenting voices raised against him. It is paradoxical that one who was a victim of adverse criticism should be so adversely disposed to Thomas Hardy and his novels. It is true that Lawrence created bold characters and preached a new ethic in his novels but he seems to ignore the intellectual and philosophical ethos against which Hardy created his men and women. If one compares the novels of Hardy and Lawrence one becomes aware of Lawrence’s indebtedness to his illustrious predecessor. The long lyrical descriptions of the English landscape have their echoes in Lawrence. Lawrence himself acknowledges his indebtedness to Hardy although his Study of Thomas Hardy is lukewarm in its assessment. It is difficult to say whether Lawrence was exploiting the public
reaction against Jude so that he would become more popular among the reading public. The questions that pose themselves are: wasn't Lawrence ranking himself above Thomas Hardy? Wasn't he recommending himself and his fiction to the reading public? Questions such as these focus on Lawrence's credentials as a critic and the tools that he employs.

Like many writers who made critical statements about works of other writers and like a few others who discussed their own works Lawrence also discussed literary texts and theory of the novel. It is not easy to categorize the literary criticism of Lawrence as coming under or as belonging to any school of criticism although some of his remarks have a remote bearing on the critical theory handed down to his own age from the past. Lawrence's literary criticism could be described, to use Coleridge's description of Horace's Ars Poetica as "unmethodical miscellany." His ideas about the novel and art are contained in several of his essays. Since Lawrence knew a number of European languages he had read literary texts in their original languages without reading them in translations.
Phoenix published in 1936 contains the finest body of criticism and it is invaluable as a collection of essays. Leavis says, "the interest and profit it yields seem to me inexhaustive. I still find, every time I open it, new things to remember and to use." The Phoenix shows Lawrence as an incomparable reviewer who had set before himself a high standard of literary excellence. In his essay on Galsworthy Lawrence says "we judge a work of art by its effect on our sincere and vital emotion, and nothing else. All the critical twiddle-twaddle about style and form ... is mere impertinence and mostly dull jargon." A critic must be able to feel the impact of a work of art in all its complexity and its force. To do so, he must be a man of complexity and force himself. A man with a paltry, impudent nature will never write anything but paltry, impudent criticism. And a man who is emotionally educated is as rare as a phoenix ... More than this, even an artistically and emotionally educated man must be a man of good faith ... A critic must be emotionally alive in every fibre, intellectually capable and skilful in essential logic, and morally very honest." Although there are echoes of classical criticism in the above criticism there is nevertheless an originality and freedom.
which were his own. There is a vitality and intelligence of a phoenix, the bird known for its genius.

Lawrence as a critic of fiction shows himself an observer of life and civilization. With a marvellous insight into the human psyche in all its manifestations it is not a mere comment on the characters and the times in which they lived that one finds in his. He probes deep into depths of human consciousness and it is this probing which makes him a literary critic at the highest. He is a versatile critic ready to comment on any book sent to him — novel, memoir, psychology, poetry. In all his criticism subtlety and penetration could be seen. It has been said that he writes from a deep centre and from this centre he does all his thinking. He never claimed to be a philosopher although his criticism marked by depth and coherence marked him as powerful original thinker.

Leavis in his The Common Pursuit compared Lawrence to T.S. Eliot and Martin Turnell and observed that Lawrence's Studies in Classic American Literature and Phoenix show him with his immense emphasis on life possessed incomparably the most powerful personality among modern European critics.
Lawrence's essay Why The Novel Matters, was first published in Phoenix (1936). This essay reveals Lawrence's views on novel and why a novel matters to him. The essay begins with a vigorous attack on ideas which he thinks spurious. For Lawrence the total being of a human being is all that one is totally alive. Being a novelist one learns what it is to be alive as a human being. Because of this the novelist is superior to a philosopher or a scientist or even a stupid person for philosopher speaks of theories or variety of similar ideas, saints speak of salvation and scientist speaks of several theories. Life is more important than every thing else. According to Lawrence "the spirit which is communicated to you, is more important than your living body is nonsense - as nonsense as to say that a potato at the dinner is more important." He further proceeds to say that a man alive is greater than his soul, spirit, body, mind or consciousness or anything that is merely a part of his being. The novelist is considered to be superior to the saint, the scientist, the philosopher and the poet, who are undoubtedly great masters of small bits of man alive, but never of the total being. He considers The Bible, Homer and Shakespeare as supreme old novels. He gives the definition
as "the novel is the one bright book of life."

The novel matters to him as it depicts the whole man alive. His essay Why The Novel Matters offers comprehensive vital principle. We find him telling us the most vital thing about the novel, about the other novelists, books and authors. His judgment on books, authors and particularly his view on Why The Novel Matters are evolved directly from life than from aesthetic imperatives. His critical ability is as powerful as his creative genius.

The novel falls dead if the character ceases to live. The novel matters because the characters got to live or it is nothing. It matters because in life we have got to live, or we are nothing. For Lawrence to be alive is to be whole man alive. The novel only can present the real pulse of life.

What Lawrence professed in this essay he practised in his work. Since the novel was to perform a kind of vital living relationship between man and his instincts, he made his characters very relevant. It was his faith in his novel which made him develop this kind of theory. His discussion of the novel also reveals Lawrence's secondary stress on
the structure and art. For him the novel is a medium to explore, to verbalise and to communicate the life of things. "Why the Novel Matters" although shows an unconcern for form and structure of the novel reveals Lawrence's concept of the novelist. The novel as the bright book of life can present the real pulse of life through art speech. The form of the novel is shaped by the flow of life it presents and its structure is decided by the subtle texture of life. This might lead to formlessness and lack of verisimilitude.

Although it has been said that Lawrence lacked intellectual and social training it seems probable that he was no less trained intellectually than any including Eliot. His command of his capacities and resources was known as able. The essence of tradition he had adequately. With Lawrence, it has been argued, genius "manifests itself in an aquisitiveness that is a miraculous fitness of insight, comprehension and understanding."

The Study of Thomas Hardy, (1914) a long essay he wrote about the time he wrote The Rainbow and the Women in Love, and published in 1936 is Lawrence's "most sustained piece of constructive explorative thinking. It is difficult,
but will amply repay the young student's trouble—not primarily as a critique of Hardy, but as emancipating and vitalising exemplification of the nature of creative thought (which, of course, it could hardly be, if the ideas themselves are of high value). This essay shows the extraordinary range and comprehensiveness of Lawrence's culture and intellectual equipment. He makes use of ideas of Nietzsche, Tylor, Fraser, Bateson, Freud all of whom contributed to the sensibility of the modern man. This does not suggest that he was unenglish but that he was a great writer of the present century to have written out of Europe.

Leavis conjectures that the Study of Thomas Hardy might have occasioned Eliot's charge that Lawrence had an incapacity "for what we call thinking." Eliot considered Hardy Study "an early work and hasn't much to do with Hardy." but Leavis refers to Lawrence's own admission that he has used Hardy as an occasion and a means and his real purpose was to explore, "refine and develop certain ideas and intuitions of his own." Further, Leavis says, he found the work difficult to read through. It was diffuse and repetitive. Lawrence had dealt with the same ideas better elsewhere. Yet the persistent integrity with which Lawrence explored the ideas
revealed a genius and which paved the way for the later work *Fantasia of the Unconscious* which had ease, poise and economy. The soundness of Lawrence's criticism is due to the sound criteria and an application of an extraordinarily penetrating, persistent and vital kind of thinking.¹²

Frank Kermode in his essay "D. H. Lawrence and the Apocalyptic Types" says that *Study of Thomas Hardy* is significant because it contains Lawrence's observation that man can only view the universe in light of a theory and since the novel is a microcosm it has to reflect a micro-theory, "some theory of being, some metaphysic." Kermode suggests that Lawrence was obsessed with apocalypse from early youth and considered the world to be undergoing rapid decline which should issue in renovation. Further, Kermode observes, Lawrence was a Joachite. Joachitism postulates three historical epochs, one for each person of the Trinity, with a transitional age between each, so the war-time Hardy study speaks of mankind having reached an end, or a pause of finality which is not an end. It is the moment of Transition. There has been an epoch of Law, and an epoch of
'knowledge of love,' and out of the synthesis of the two will develop new age, which will be the age of the Holy Spirit .... Lawrence holds that the principle of Law is strongest in women, and that of love in men. Out of their true union in consummate marriage will grow that ethic which is the product of Law and love but is a third distinct thing, like the Holy Ghost. Lawrence's The Rainbow and Women in Love were an attempt to reflect the point of transition.

J.V. Davies in his introduction to the study of Thomas Hardy says that the Hardy study is central "to the study of Lawrence's own work ... also an important piece of sustained exploratory thinking in its own right - arguably as important as, say, Nietzsche's Beyond Good and Evil or the Genealogy of Morals." Davies says that Lawrence was indebted to Nietzsche in that the latter was a confounding presence in the war and pre-war years in England. For one who was alive to all the intellectual forces of his age Nietzsche did contribute to the thought about tragedy on which Hardy essay centers.

Several hints have been thrown as regards the influence of Nietzsche's conception of art in general and tragedy
in particular on Lawrence although none elaborated at length and with reference to Lawrence's novels. In the Birth of Tragedy Nietzsche describes "the highest and truly serious task of art is to deliver the eye from gazing into the terrors of night and to rescue the subject from the spasms of the activities of the will through the healing balm of the illusion." This sense derives from Nietzsche's own description on the nature and purpose of art: "Truth is not beautiful but not ugly, dreadful or to endure. Art is a mask set over the face of truth." The Greek knew and felt the terrors and horrors of existence; in order to be able to believe at all he had to set before it the glittering dream image of the Olympians." This formulation asserts that art is an illusion, its objective being to falsify and obscure an unendurable reality so that life is possible:

Art is mightier than knowledge for art desires life and knowledge attains as its final goal only - annihilation." Nietzsche also says in the Birth of tragedy: "art and nothing but art. It is the great possibiliser of life, the great seductress of life, the great stimulant to life ... art is worth more than truth."
For Nietzsche, artistic creation is a consequence of some shortcoming or sense or insufficiency in the artist which makes him create an Achilles or a Faust. He says, "It is the exceptional states which condition the artist: those which are profoundly related to and involve with morbid phenomena; so that it does not seem possible to be an artist and not be sick." This notion was later modified to the view that existence in the world is not in itself an aesthetic phenomena at all, but that it is man who interprets it aesthetically so that the correct formula would be aesthetic interpretation of phenomena is an attempt at the eternal justification of existence and the world. This conception of the artist whose activities are a compensation for a self-deficiency goes with his conception of tragedy. Nietzsche says that art presupposes suffering and sufferers. There are two kinds of sufferers: firstly he who suffers from super-abundance of life, who desires a Dionysian art and likewise a tragic view and insight into life - and then he who suffers from poverty of life, who seeks in art and knowledge either rest, there a smooth sea, delivering from himself, intoxication, paroxism, stupefaction, madness.

"The Dionysian and romantic tragedy employs art as a means of
affirming life. Artists continually glorify, they do nothing else ... there is no such thing as pessimistic art ... art affirms. Job affirms." According to Nietzsche, the nature of the aesthetic interpretation of phenomena rules out as impossible a work of art that is not an affirmation of existence. Art is the enjoyment of aesthetic conditions; the aesthetic condition is a means of interpreting phenomena in such a way as to make them endurable and in essence self-justified. Art is therefore necessarily a celebration of the rightness of things, an affirmation, a praise. In art anything can be made enjoyable and anything justified by aesthetic interpretation. That is the inescapable purpose of art, especially of that form of art which is the aesthetic interpretation of worst things. The spectacle of death, catastrophe and unmerited useless suffering becomes a source of the highest gratification and satisfaction. Even the blackest pessimism is employed as a stimulant of life. This is the art of tragedy. Nietzsche rejected the tragedy which is a demonstration of the badness of existence and a stimulant to resignation (Schopenhauer) and the tragedy which is the arousal and the catharsis of emotions and especially the emotions of pity and fear (Aristotle). He rejected
both conceptions as inconsistent with what he believed to be the origin and customary effect of the tragedy and the general character of art as life affirmative. That art is a means of affirming life, that artists ought to glorify life and then there is no such thing as pessimistic art explain Lawrence's objection to pessimism in Hardy. Nietzsche thus helped form Lawrence's concept of tragedy which is one of the themes of the Hardy Study.

Conceived and completed in a span of one year, 1914, and not published until 1936 the Study of Thomas Hardy was written in the midst of the First World War. Lawrence wrote in a letter "What colossal idiocy this war. Out of sheer rage I've begun my book about Thomas Hardy. It will be about anything but Thomas Hardy. ..." If his experiences of Italy gave him a focus for his awareness of the drifts and drives of the 19th century England, the Hardy Study, Davies suggests, "was the necessary outburst of creative assimilation of the past, of affirmation, of faith in life, that enabled him to go on despite his apprehension of the war and of the quite other world of alienating superficiality it was to bring in its train."
If *The Rainbow* is about the changing, complex relations between the human beings, the *Study of Hardy* could be described as an attempt to study the relationships between art and philosophy. Lawrence's misleading suggestion that the *Study* is "about anything but Thomas Hardy" and "a sort of story of My Heart" has been taken for granted by most critics. While it is true that only three chapters (III, V, IX) deal with Hardy exclusively, seven (I, II, IV, VI, VII, VIII, X) with Lawrence's philosophy, it cannot be said that the *Study* is divided into unrelated water tight compartments. On a closer study one realises how relevant the philosophy is for an understanding of Lawrence's discussion of Hardy's characters. Themes such as war, women's suffrage, religion and aesthetics have much to do in the discussion of Hardy as a novelist. What Lawrence had done in *Studies in Classic American Literature* he has repeated in the *Study of Hardy*. He locates his subject in a very vast setting and discusses it against that setting. That is Lawrence places Hardy in a greater context so that the questions that he discusses are shown to be larger than life. Lawrence is less interested in the critical twiddle twaddle about style and form than the vision of life in Hardy's novels. When, for example, Lawrence
touches upon man's unappeased rage for self-preservation or the paleolithic man deriving lessons from nature, the feeling raising over planes he is not wasting his effort in irrelevance. He is recommending the aristocratic manifestations of life as models for everybody. He focuses on numerous characters in Hardy's novels who failed for want of these aristocratic manifestations. In his essay on Galsworthy Lawrence says that a good critic should give his reader a few standards to go by. The Hardy Study is the product of Lawrence's attempt to define his standards. Swigg rightly observes, "Much in the Study leads one away from Hardy in order to be able to return to him with enlarged understanding. But even when Lawrence is not discussing Hardy explicitly, Hardy is there as a consistent implicit presence, providing points of suggestivity which Lawrence thinks through as though a natural symbolic language."¹⁵

There is the view that the Study is Lawrence's autobiographical account. It was Middleton Murry who initiated the kind of criticism which tended to treat Lawrence's work as an imperfectly veiled autobiography. Delavene in her work on Lawrence treats the Study as a highly personal philosophy aimed at resolving personal problems. This critic goes to
the extent of relating the fictional characters in the Study with persons whom Lawrence had known in real life. "If Sue is Jessie chambers, who then is Arabella in Lawrence's personal mythology? She cannot be either Alice Oak Helen or Jessie; is she perhaps a composite portrait of Louie and of the Frieda of his blackest moods ..."16 Claudia C. Morrison says that the "Study is concerned less with Hardy's thought than ... with Lawrence's own."17 But Lawrence defends his work saying that literary criticism, unlike science, is much too personal although he does not imply that the critic can use the subject of his criticism as a peg to hang his own personality upon it. It's true the Study wanders too much in the world of ideas which only reveals Lawrence's fascination for ideas. Nevertheless, he discusses Hardy in relation to himself not vice-versa. His imaginative encounter with Hardy is indeed much too personal but it does not degenerate into criticism of the subjective, impressionistic kind. As Lawrence himself remarks in the Study, a young painter goes to the work of old master to study "the State of Soul of the great old artist, so that he the young artist, may understand his own soul." From this
it can be inferred that Lawrence the young artist studies Hardy, the state of the Soul of the great old artist. So the Study illuminates the state of Soul of both Hardy and Lawrence.

The layout of the Study of Thomas Hardy is so designed that the focus is on Hardy's characters in Chapters III, V preceded by Lawrence's ideas on man and society, individual Law and social Law, adventurism and conventionalism contained in Chapters I, II and IV. Although Lawrence refers to six novels of Hardy as falling within his discussion, he singles out *The Return of the Native* for an elaborate treatment. The central thesis on which Lawrence bases his discussion is that Hardy's characters become victims of social laws. Rather Hardy makes his characters transgress a social law which causes their destruction. It is interesting that from a discussion of modern tragedy, the Hardyesque tragedy, Lawrence leads on to a discussion of Greek tragedy and of Shakespearian tragedy. What follows is Lawrence's discussion of Hardy's *The Return of the Native* and his conclusion about Hardy's philosophy and art.
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