CHAPTER 5

THE HERETICAL WRITERS:
THOMAS HARDY AND D H LAWRENCE

I

Thomas Hardy and D H Lawrence are chief among the writers whom T S Eliot classifies as heretics. Eliot's definition of the term, 'heretics', makes interesting reading. He holds the view that heretics are people who have 'an exceptionally acute perception, or profound insight into some part of the truth.' They are those who, he believes, insist upon 'half of the truth'. Also, he holds that these are people who 'attempt to simplify the truth, by reducing it to the limits of our ordinary understanding instead of enlarging our reason to the apprehension of truth.' We find Eliot conceding in After Strange Gods that 'most of us are heretical in one way or another.' He believes that the 'exceptionally acute' perception or 'profound' insight is developed through a higher degree of education.

Let us take a brief look at what Eliot has to say about 'heresy'. Noting that it is a synonym, or 'another' word for 'heterodoxy' (which is the antonym of 'orthodoxy'),
he states that 'it is not simply that it is wrong; it is that it is partly right.' Eliot goes on to explain that an heresy is apt to have a seductive simplicity to make a direct and persuasive appeal to intellect and emotions, and to be altogether more plausible than the truth.

Furthermore, Eliot makes an equally clear-cut statement about the beginning, or what is in Eliot's own words, 'the first suspicion of heresy'. He finds the suspicion to be creeping in with a writer who at... best, had much pro-founder moral insight and passion... but who unfortunately combined it with the dreary rationalism of the epoch...

Having said that about Eliot's wording of what a heresy is and what it is not, let us take a good look at Eliot's statements quoted above.

To begin with, it would be useful to consider for a while the implications of Eliot's remark that 'heresy' is another word for 'heterodoxy' which, in turn, is the opposite of 'orthodoxy'. The prefix 'heter-' means different in composition, for the word is derived from the Greek counterpart:
'heterodoxos' wherein we have 'doxa' which means 'opinion' and 'dokein' which means 'to think'. Thus, 'heterodox' means 'holding an opinion other than or different from the one generally received', especially in theology. The adjective for it is 'heretical'. Since Eliot considers heresy to be the same as heterodoxy which is the antonym of orthodoxy, the question of ascertaining the meaning of heresy begs the consideration of what Eliot means by orthodoxy.

Orthodoxy, according to Eliot, 'represents a consensus between the living and the dead.' One would not be wrong to think heterodoxy represents no such consensus and that seems to explain Eliot's assertion that orthodoxy may be upheld by one man against the world. A second explanation follows the first one. Orthodoxy is attained when 'past and present' get together to 'give us a reconciliation of thought and feeling'. Here is a fine tie-up between orthodoxy and tradition. However, one cannot help overlooking the suggested linking of the past with thought and the present with feeling. For, the reconciliation of the past and present give us a reconciliation of thought and feeling. It is perhaps only in this sense that Eliot remarks that orthodoxy 'is realised in one's thought'. Turning to the prerequisites of orthodoxy, Eliot asserts that 'the maintenance of orthodoxy is a matter which calls for the exercise of all our conscious intelligence.' This certainly requires some explanation.
It is apparent that Eliot distinguishes between what are likely to be types of intelligence: conscious and, maybe, unconscious. We might see in this suggested distinction the kind of difference that Saussure makes between 'langue' and 'parole' and Chomsky between 'competence' and 'performance'. Conscious intelligence may be one that can be measured, or seen as being applied and one might like to see this as being akin to 'performance'. If there is anything called 'unconscious' intelligence, then it could only be related to what is called 'intuition' and one might like to see this on par with 'competence'.

On getting back to the main argument, we discover that if, on the one hand, we have a statement like 'orthodoxy' is 'realised in one's thought', then, on the other hand, we also have the fact that its maintenance is 'a matter' calling for 'the exercise of all our conscious intelligence'. What this might mean at the level of ground realities, with the philosophical frills removed, is that because orthodoxy is realised in one's thought, one needs to exercise all of one's conscious intelligence for its maintenance. Juxtaposing the two statements, we are bound to find that 'thought' and 'conscious intelligence' are the key terms in them. To say that thought is the same as conscious intelligence is to deny to thought its intuitive content. Also, the thought in question may be the result of an intuition. How far would it be right then
to insist on this ridiculous proposition? Questions like this need clear answers.

Two other statements of Eliot's also draw our attention. Noting that orthodoxy, as a concept, implies 'Christian' orthodoxy, Eliot hurries on to add that he does not take orthodoxy 'to mean that there is a narrow path laid down for every writer to follow'. This is so because it would be improper to expect 'every theologian to succeed in being orthodox in every particular'. He asserts that orthodoxy resides in the Church itself and thus he finds 'Perfect orthodoxy in the individual artist' not to be 'always necessary, or even desirable'. That is one assurance which compels attention. But Eliot adds a rider to it by taking a view to the contrary in commenting about the literary artists of his time. He remarks, 'It is too much to expect any literary artist at the present time to be a model of orthodoxy'. The reason seems to him to be that the modern world is disparaging. It is quite clear that the word 'model' is stressed. One should like to think that when Eliot surveyed the scene, he found that no model of orthodoxy was to be seen around. And yet it is a fact that he thought G M Hopkins and James Joyce among some others to be so, for he discovered in their works the reaffirmation of belief. It is quite baffling to any reader to note such quick changes in his opinions.
His stress upon the word **model** does cause some anxiety, if not irritation, in that it sets one wondering about the real intention. Was he searching for an Absolute when he ought to have known that such a search was futile? There are no such Absolutes really. At the best, we might only need to think in terms of who came closer to reaching this state of perfection. This makes sense if we return to those two very valuable statements of Eliot's, viz, (i) orthodoxy resides only in the Church, and (ii) Perfect orthodoxy is **not always** necessary, or even desirable in the individual artist. The logic of the second statement would tend to make perfect orthodoxy necessary and even desirable in the individual sometimes. One would not fail to note a criterion emerging out of this, which one would like to put down as being 'selectional' in its structure and content. And it is quite striking how he looks at the individual talent tempered, as it were, in passing through the furnace of tradition. In other words, although 'perfect orthodoxy' is viewed as being selectional, it is seen as an essential attribute which marked the growth of the individual artist within the broad framework of a literary tradition. That is apparently the strongest point in Eliot's new 'poetics.'

This chapter is devoted to discussing the heretical writers and we intend to apply the criteria set up by Eliot (as we see them unfolding) to those of the works of the two
representatives of heretical writers referred to by him with a view to finding out whether Eliot's opinions are indeed based on those criteria. The next two sections will address themselves to this issue. We shall take Thomas Hardy first and then move on to D H Lawrence. In Section IV, we will apply the criteria and discuss the results.

II

To Eliot, Thomas Hardy was every inch a heretic. Four of Hardy's works are used for extensive comment. Two of these are novels: The Mayor of Casterbridge and Far From the Madding Crowd. Of the remaining two works, A Group of Noble Dames is the collection containing the short story, "Barbara of the House of Grebe". But before we continue with our discussion of these works, let us turn to Eliot for his opinion about Thomas Hardy. To quote Eliot,

Thomas Hardy represents an interesting example of a powerful personality uncurbed by any institutional attachment or by submission to any objective beliefs; unhampered by any ideas, or even by what sometimes acts as a partial restraint upon inferior writers, the desire to please a large public. (Added emphases)
Obviously, the institutional attachment that Eliot talks of is the commitment to the cause that the Church stands for as an institution. In other words, Eliot seems to suggest that Hardy's lack of institutional attachment is the cause of the growth of the unregenerate. 'Self' and, therefore, also the cause of his heresy. The secret lies in the phrase 'submission to any objective beliefs'. One finds in this a categorical assertion that Hardy's problems had their roots in the fact that his belief was partial. Belief proper is neither subjective nor objective in nature, for its appeal is to the heart. How could one submit oneself to any belief if one's belief is partial or imperfect? Moreover, Hardy was not selective because he was not hampered by 'any ideas' or a partial restraint'. And because he did not allow himself to be blinded by anything, he was supposed to be unrestrained in his pronouncements. His desire, says Eliot, was 'to please a large public'. An artist is expected to mirror the society for his or her readers but, in doing that, he or she is expected to act responsibly and ensure that he or she helps the readership to develop literary taste.

Eliot makes the following points about Hardy:

(1) He seems to have written for the sake of 'self-expression' and the 'self' reflected in the works is neither wholesome nor edifying.

(2) He is quite indifferent even to the prescripts of good writing and thus wrote very carelessly and overpoweringly well on occasions.
(3) He makes a great deal of landscape which lends itself to his moods.

(4) He is not interested in men's minds but their emotions so much so that this extreme emotionalism appears to become a symptom of decadence.

(5) He implies that Hardy has no moral resistance. Surely, 'moral resistance and conflict are essential' for they make life meaningful. It is not as if passion were the surest evidence of vitality.

(6) His insistence on not leaving anything to nature introduces 'a note of falsity' into his novels.19

These observations are in themselves quite damning and one does get a very uneasy feeling that Eliot was not being fair to Hardy. It is true that when a writer's only purpose behind writing something is to give vent to his need for 'self-expression', his vision is likely to be blurred. It is this that makes the 'self' reflected in the work quite unwholesome and unedifying.

A writer ought to follow the prescripts of good writing, taking proper care to follow the conventions expected of him. The result would not be a product of a mind that would balance everything or has equipoise. Here it is supposed to be written overpoweringly well at times. Another charge is excessive use of the landscape which lends itself
to Hardy's moods. A far more damning charge is that Hardy's interest in men's emotions rather than their minds makes it a sure symptom of decadence. The question here is one of the primacy of emotion over intellect, not vice-versa. Again, if emotion were to be given importance then it would lead to the reaffirmation of the ill-conceived notion that passion is a sign of vitality. A conflict taking shape in an intellectual's mind ought to be resolved through moral resistance which is possible in an individual only when his life has been spent not in the service of the 'self' but in giving expression to conventions which are a part of a tradition. Morality is an essential attribute in a writer whose upbringing, education and life have been devoted to the cause of the maintenance of a tradition. It is an accepted fact of life that nature plays an important role in our lives. It is both the material and the product resulting out of an artistic exercise. If the subject of art is life, then nature is an important element. Any art that denies it a role is likely to lack vitality.

Now, these are not the only observations he has had to make.

Talking about The Mayor of Casterbridge, Eliot notes how this has always seemed to be Hardy's finest novel as a whole. The reasons he offers are:

(a) 'he comes the nearest to producing an air of inevitability'

(b) 'making the crises seem the consequences of the character of Henchard'
(c) 'the arrangement by which the hero, leaning over a bridge, finds himself staring at his effigy in the stream below is a masterly tour de force' (Eliot's emphasis)

(d) 'the scene is however as much by arrangement as less successful ones in which the motive intrudes itself more visibly.'

It should be quite apparent to any student of literature that Eliot's arguments have to do more with the structure and technique rather than anything else. Where is the 'air of inevitability' in this novel? It is the inevitable tension between past and present which applies to the reader, the author, and the characters within the novel, especially Henchard. And this inevitable tension leads us to the awareness of the sense of a public and a private history and helps us in coming to terms with change.

Eliot emphasizes on the scene where Henchard is startled by what Ivan Gregor (1974: 113) calls 'a mute self-recognition taking place within an individual consciousness fatally divided against itself.' Here it is in the full:

While his eyes were bent on the water beneath there slowly became visible a something floating in the circular pool formed by the wash of centuries; the pool he was intending to make his death-bed. At first it was indistinct by reason
of the shadow from the bank; but it emerged thence and took shape, which was that of a human body lying stiff and stark upon the surface of the stream.

In the circular current imparted by the central flow the form was brought forward, till it passed under his eyes; and then he perceived with a sense of horror that it was himself. Not a man somewhat resembling him, but one in all respects his counter-part, his actual double, was floating as if dead in Ten Hatches Hole.\textsuperscript{21} (Added emphasis on the phrase).

The phrase 'wash of centuries' symbolises the past. But why 'wash'? That is a difficult question. The word is used as a noun here and could not mean anything but the pattern of disturbed water made by a moving boat. This 'wash of centuries' formed the circular pool which Henchard wanted to make his bed. He wanted to end his life in it. In other words, the pattern of disturbed waters which had been like that for centuries seems to symbolize the 'past' into which Henchard intended to drown himself now. As a result of these contrasting features of temporal and spatial distances, a certain tension is generated.
Gregor finds in this the tension between the public circumstances and the individual response which accounts for the dynamic of the novel. He notes how it is difficult to think of each of the elements of the novel (maybe, even each of the elements of the thought) apart from each other and the whole thing becomes a part of the age. He goes on to argue that 'One man's deeds' in this novel 'can contain the exploration of a community, not in the sense of its detail, but in the contrast between the solidity of its present and the haunting power of its past.' This is the scene whose very substance is found by Eliot to be culled out by arrangement. In other words, one might look at it as being contrived — something that is deliberately and consciously done. And so powerful is the effect it produces that it appears to have the air of inevitability of the action being contemplated by Henchard. Or, to put it in his own words, it 'seems to me deliberately faked' much in the same way as the scene in *Far From the Madding Crowd* in which Bathsheba unscrews Fanny Robin's coffin.

Explaining what he means by calling it 'deliberately faked', Eliot notes that the author seems to be deliberately relieving some emotion of his own at the expense of the reader. It is a refined form of torture on the part of the writer, and a refined form of self-torture on the part of the reader.
This is, to Eliot, 'the intrusion of the diabolic into modern literature'. What this obviously seems to suggest is that the deliberate relieving of some emotion on the part of the author is an example of the diabolic tendency finding its way into the work. If we turn to "Tradition and the Individual Talent", we get the key to this pronouncement. Eliot does not approve of this 'turning loose of emotion' which is conscious and, therefore, deliberate, much in the same way as is 'the expression of personality'. What a good artist is expected to do is to seek 'an escape from emotion' as well as 'an escape from personality'. For, it is not the business of an artist 'to find new emotions, but to use the ordinary ones' in order to 'express feelings which are not in actual emotions at all'. This is the process that leads to the 'continual self-sacrifice' by an artist, or what he also fondly calls, 'a continual extinction of personality'.

Jagdish Chandra Dave (1985: 6) seems to answer the question about Eliot's evaluation of Hardy as a heretic, although he does not do so by mentioning Eliot even once. Dave notes that Hardy appears to be a heretic because

(1) some of his characters have an anthropomorphic conception of a Godhead qualitatively different from that of Christianity and substitute revolt against prayer for him; (2) he himself of his
authorial comments satirically lashes out
at the God of traditional faith with a view
to vexing pious believers in Him; (3) he
asserted his unbelief emphatically but
often in interrogative form, and (4) he
frequently exercised a 'willing suspension
of disbelief' and imagined a Diety somewhat
after the Hellenic notion, for the purposes
of tragedy in his fiction. 27

There is also another reason. Hardy was trying 'to reconcile
the average uncommonness which alone makes it natural that a
tale or experience would dwelve in memory and induce repeti-
tion.' 28 Hardy is quoted as saying this about the novel in a
work on him by Florence Emily Hardy.

Moving on to Far From the Madding Crowd, we find that
Eliot uses one particular scene from the novel wherein Bathsheba
unscrews Fanny Robin's Coffin. Bathsheba discovers her husband
Sergeant Troy's double perfidy. Fanny Robin had been a servant
at Farmer James Everdene's and Bathsheba was a niece to him.
She continues to stay with Bathsheba after his death.

Fanny Robin falls in love with Sergeant Troy whose
regiment is at the Casterbridge barracks. Her search for Troy
ends fruitlessly and the promised marriage does not take place.
When she reaches Melchester to which place Troy's regiment had
shifted, she realises that she had been done for. She takes up
a job as a seamstress there and when it is time for her to deliver her child through Troy, she walks all the way to Casterbridge Union where she dies in childbirth. As the coffin bearing her body is being taken by Joseph Poorgrass from Casterbridge to Weatherbury where Bathsheba has her farm, he leaves it outside Buck's Head Inn long enough near the Woodland Swamp by which Bathsheba finds herself after Troy's perfidy is revealed. Bathsheba is by then married to Troy. Bathsheba's unscrewing of the coffin, and her realisation that she has been double-crossed by a man who had destroyed Fanny Robin, take place simultaneously. How this could happen the way it does is a curiosity. And, hence, Eliot finds this scene to be 'deliberately faked'. In other words, he might be seen questioning its validity as an experience.

This leads us to the collection of short stories titled *A Group of Noble Dames*. Eliot picks upon one short story out of this collection, that is, "Barbara of the House of Grebe". And in this short story, he notes, 'we are introduced into a world of pure Evil. The tale would seem to have been written solely to provide a satisfaction for some morbid emotion.' The work is founded on the life of Barbara Webb, wife of the fifth Earl of Shaftesbury. Barbara Grebe has a riotous life. She elopes with Edmond Willowes even as she has been receiving the attentions of a young earl named Lord Uplandtowers who wanted to marry her. Her parents send Edmond abroad with a tutor to complete his education. It is at a Venetian theatre that his face is disfigured so shockingly while rescuing people out of the fire that had broken out that
he could not think of staying on with her. He goes abroad once again to test her feelings and upon his death, she marries Lord Uplandtowers. But her love for Edmond is revived when a beautiful statue of his, which he had commissioned while he was alive, arrives from Pisa. She becomes indifferent to her second husband. Lord Uplandtowers discovers the real nature of Edmond's disfigurement and gets the statue hacked in such a way as would help simulate the effect. He goes about the task of torturing Barbara with the disfigured statue very heartlessly and without relent, so much so that out of revulsion and sheer terror, she breaks down and submits to his will. But although she bears him eleven children, her wasted frame gives in to the continued assaults of time and she dies shortly thereafter.

On making a comparison of these three scenes, viz, (i) Henchard's self-recognition in the scene over the bridge in The Mayor of Casterbridge, (ii) Bathsheba's heart-breaking realisation that her husband, Troy, had doublecrossed her in the scene involving Fanny Robin's coffin in Far From the Madding Crowd, and (iii) Barbara Grebe's surrender to Lord Uplandtower's relentless torture of her to make her forget Edmond in "Barbara of the House of Grebe" in the short story collection, A Group of Noble Dames, one feels utterly shocked at the sheer brutality involved in the plots of these three works. For Eliot, these are examples of the diabolic, or what in layman terms means wicked or devilish and, therefore, Evil.
This he finds to be pure blasphemy which is reflected in 'the notion of a positive power for evil working through human agency', the entertaining of which notion is the sign of 'a very inaccurate notion of what Evil is'. And it was Hardy's genius which produced these works. Hence, Eliot regards Hardy as a heretic.

III

If, on the one hand, Eliot suspects "Barbara of the House of Grebe" to have been written solely to provide a satisfaction for some morbid emotion, then, on the other hand, he finds 'this same strain in the work of a man'—morbidly notwithstanding—is 'a very much greater genius, if not a greater artist' and that man is D H Lawrence. Noting how Lawrence is for him 'an almost perfect example of the heretic', he goes on to list the reasons.

According to Eliot, Lawrence's men and women demonstrate the absence of any moral or social sense and betray a certain lack of conscience. And this seems to come clearly through examples of the decay of sexual morals as well as those of the other types. He notes how Lawrence's attitude towards Christianity seems to him to be that of 'a man who had had no emotional acquaintance with any but some debased and uncultured form'. (Eliot's emphasis). Lawrence, he thought, had no living tradition and that he finds to be the reason why Lawrence compensated for this lack of living tradition by
'a purely intellectual and individual effort'. Let us take a look at some of Eliot's important observations about Lawrence. Lawrence, he believes

(a) lacked a sense of humour and there is a certain snobbery to be noted.

(b) lacked critical faculties and had a certain incapacity for thinking but not information.

(c) had a keen sensibility and capacity for profound intuitions which led him to wrong conclusions.

(d) had a deplorable religious upbringing and a lust for intellectual independence.

(e) was insensible to ordinary social morality and had a sexual morbidity but was not gifted with the faculty of self-criticism.

(f) believed that evil resided only in the absence of spirituality.

(g) has a vision which is spiritual, but spiritually sick.

Where Eliot is so ruthless in his evaluation of D H Lawrence's works, he also tries to understand the so-called aberrations of Lawrence's. In *The Idea of a Christian Society* published five years later (that is in 1939), he notes:

The struggle to recover the sense of relation to nature and to God, the recognition that even the most primitive feelings should be part of heritage, seems to me to be the explanation and justification of the life of
One would not miss the deliberate use of the word *excuse*. In ordinary usage, the word means a reason given to explain or defend a fault/faults. Eliot, however, goes a step forward and replaces the word 'faults' with 'aberrations' which mean deviations from the normal course. 'Fault' simply means the responsibility or cause of blame for wrongdoing. An aberration would seem to imply a deliberately deviant behaviour, whereas a fault would limit itself to the cause of blame. That does appear to offer a dependable clue to Eliot's semantic jugglery.

Having said that, it would be natural to go straight to those works of Lawrence's on the basis of which Eliot came to such conclusions. These works are: *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, "The Prussian Officer" and "The Shadow in the Rose Garden". The first of these is a novel which is known for its curious handling of a very sensitive subject. The other two are short stories. We shall keep the travel sketch, *Mornings in Mexico*, out of our discussion because that has hardly anything worthwhile to offer us, especially in terms of Eliot's comments.

To begin with this part of the section, we shall take a close look at select portions of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Eliot does not see much development in the novel despite the fact that it has undergone changes and has three versions.
What seems to strike Eliot is
the social obsession which makes his
well-born — or almost well-born — ladies
offer themselves to — or make use of —
palaeians springs from the same morbidity
which makes other of his female characters
bestow their favours upon savages.36

Eliot's reference to the gamekeeper, Parkin, later called
Mellors, is particularly striking because a lady like Connie
Chatterley is shown having a roaring affair with him although
he is her paralysed baronet husband's employee. What he seems
to find very unedifying is the discussion Lawrence has strai­
ned quite unwittingly or otherwise by providing layers of
sexual explicitness that are added to the original in the
third version of the novel.

We shall take only two instances and we have used
the second version for the purpose. The first of the two
instances is from chapter VI when Connie Chatterley goes to
the woods where she meets Parkin. She wants to rest for a
while before returning to Wragby. Parkin's instincts tell
him she had come to be near him; nearer and nearer she would
want to come. He realises that he had reached the point
where he had decided not to think about women any more, nor
to lust steadily after them. He had met the vulgar sexuality
of his wife quite different from the true, silent stream of
sex which, he felt, flowed towards him now. His bowels
stirred and the knees hotly fused in desire. The paragraph is here:

The strange, soothing flood of peace, the sense that all is well which goes with the true sex, flooded him now. But the damaged human being in him dreaded more than ever exposing itself to the false thing, the false sexuality, which is of a rasping egoism, and the false social virtue, which is utter humiliation. The man in him, the natural male man inherent in life, wanted her to open her eyes and look at him in the softness of desire, so that they could enter that soothing flame of peace which is true sex. But the maimed human being which had only suffered from human contracts, wanted her to go away, to go away and leave him insulted. 37

On the surface of it this might be a part of the musings of a man who would later fall for her. It is the psychological process which sets in motion as Connie walks into his life that is more important. His natural drives as a man are suddenly stirred and he begins to weigh the pros and cons of his likely relationship with Connie. Although he rejects the thoughts of her temporarily, this musing paves the way for their ultimate union.
Another instance is from Chapter VIII. When Parkin and Connie come to know each other well enough to have sex, Connie discovers the woman in her but she is quite resentful that she wants this to happen. She avoids meeting Parkin and goes to the wood by herself. But she has a chance meeting with him. Parkin does not like the way she treats him, lifts her in his arms, carries her to a place where he is a heap of dead boughs, feverishly breaks her underclothing once she is laid down, and makes his entry into the woman of his desire. The scene of their love-making, as described by Lawrence, changes Connie's life for her. Her feelings are described in a telling passage for us. Here is how she felt after Parkin had made his entry:

And then, something awoke in her.
Strange, thrilling sensation, that she had never known before woke up where he was within her, in wild thrills like wild, wild bells. It was wonderful, wonderful, and she clung to him uttering in complete unconsciousness strange, wild, inarticulate little cries, that he heard within himself with curious satisfaction.

But it was over too soon, too soon!
She clung to him in a sort of fear, lest he should draw away from her.
The masterly way in which Lawrence analyses that supreme moment of a union of bodies in coitus is something that is praise-worthy. Although this might appear to be pornographic and obscene, Lawrence had rejected the charge of pornography and obscenity in an essay of the same title. The questions that one would like to pose to oneself are: Are plebeians (a name given to commoners in ridicule) lesser human beings? Don't they feel the bodily hungers? Is it justified to talk in terms of class relationships insofar as sex partners are concerned? Answers to these questions would suggest that the kind of morality Eliot talks about is a sham. It is the society that shapes its own morality. If that be the case, why must a standard not applicable to a given society be used to understand its morals? And what about the freedom of a literary artist to write the way he or she wants?

Moving on to Lawrence's work Fantasia of the Unconscious, we get many insights into Lawrence's philosophy. Reviewing the work, Philip Hobsbaum (1981: 93) notes that this represents a reaction against the psychology of Freud emphasising sex and the incest-motive. Countering Freud, Lawrence propounded a psychology of his own stressing upon an equally individual view of physiology. He saw instinct as the one that was the basis of any classification. What spoilt the beauty of his fine argument is that he saw the nerve centres as the sole agents responsible for activities
connected with creativity ignoring or, maybe, even deliberately underestimating the role played by the brain. The personal cosmography it creates is insufficiently mythopoetic. Eliot's approval of it is quite notable and his commendation of it a happy change. This leaves us with the short stories. "The Shadow in the Rose Garden" has many points in common with Thomas Hardy's short story "Barbara of the House of Grebe." This is also a story which involves a couple and a man in the life of the wife prior to her marriage. If it is Edmond in "Barbara of the House of Grebe", it is Archie in "The Shadow in the Rose Garden".

Simply put, the plot in "The Shadow in the Rose Garden" is weaved around the affair of the heroine in the past with a man called Archie, who was believed to be dead in military action in Africa. It is against this backdrop that the story begins although one is made aware of it quite a few pages after the story has begun. The heroine arrives in a town, the name of which is not made known except the mention of a place called Torill Hall, with her husband who is 'a labouring electrician in the mine'. Her past association with the town where she had spent two years, brings her back. The place is somewhere in Yorkshire county. We learn that she had been a companion to one 'Miss Birch of Torill Hall' through whom she came in contact with the rector and his son Archie, who was then a sub-lieutenant in the army.
She had fallen in love with Archie and, as she puts it in a candid confession to her husband, 'We were as good as engaged for nearly a year, though nobody knew — at least — they talked — but — it wasn't open.' She reveals that 'he suddenly went out to fight in Africa, and almost the very day I first met you, I heard from Miss Birch he'd got sun-stroke — and two months after, that he was dead —.' It appears to her husband as if she had been going around looking at their old courting places. Indeed, she had been doing just that. Her visit to the rose garden brought her face-to-face with her former lover, who was not dead but had turned a lunatic.

Lawrence explores the inner workings of the woman's mind as she is confronted by 'the shadow' of her former lover in the rose garden. The 'shadow' is an aphorism really, a metaphoric coinage, referring to what appeared to her to be unreal. It would be useful to take into account what Lawrence has to say about this woman. She was 'in a state of self-suppression' as she walked into the garden of the house where they were staying. She was 'gazing away to the sea' but 'glanced at him (her husband) with a wild smile' as her husband, Frank, tried to attract her attention. She makes it clear to her husband that she does not want it known in the village who she was or that she used to live there in the past for the simple reason that there was nobody she wanted to meet. Her intention in coming to the place was simply to
see it, 'not the people'. She also makes it clear that she does not want her 'past brought up against' her.

Once she reaches the rose garden, 'her face became strained, her movements eager'. The familiar sights cause her face to shine, transfigured as it was with 'pain and joy'. Moving to the little corner where there was the seat beneath the yew tree, she throws searching glances. Then goes down one path, 'lingering, like one who has gone back into the past'. Flushed with excitement, as she sits down on a seat, 'a shadow' crosses her and she sees a figure— that of her former lover's. She is curious to find out whether he could recognise her but soon discovers that though the features were the same 'Yet it was not he'. The discovery shocks her into a state of motionlessness, 'horror and silence'. But her search for some sign of recognition from him continues. At long last, she asks him if he knew her. The lunatic turns to her in affirmation and she is horrified. The meeting ends as the gardener approaches them to tell her that the garden was not open then and she hurries back home.

Her reactions after her return make for a good study in human psychology. She wants to be alone but her jealous husband would not leave her in peace. He, on his part, is angry with her because of her indifference to him and what he believes to be a certain feeling of superiority in her. He feels that she does not love him. Nor had she
ever loved him. When he learns of the affair, he feels cheated. The discovery that her former lover was now mad sobers him down and his jealousy gives way to compassion. The hate dissolves itself.

The point that one would like to focus on is this: What makes Lawrence a heretic especially insofar as this story is concerned? There is a certain deviance in the behaviour of the lady, for she could be accused very easily of deception. She had, in fact, deceived her husband by hiding her past from him. Apart from that, one does not find any other clue which would suggest that this was indeed a heretical work. Would the other story be any different from this?

"The Prussian Officer" unfolds the saga of love-hate relationship between a perverted Captain, who is a sadomasochist, and his orderly. The middle-aged Captain is handsome and has a good figure. He is a bachelor. His indifference to his twenty-two year old orderly gradually gives way to a kind of involvement in his personal life so much so that he starts detesting him for many things. He puts him through a grave ordeal which finally leads the orderly to kill him as the spur of the officer is caught in a tree-root and he falls against a sharp-edged tree-base. His affair with the Vicar's daughter notwithstanding, the orderly dies of exhaustion, and beating he had got from the Captain before his death.
The Prussian Captain's behaviour is very difficult to understand, especially his behaviour towards the orderly. One would like to agree with Philip Hobsbaum's (1981: 32) assessment that 'Clearly, there is an unstated homosexual relationship; on both sides.' Maybe, that is the reason why Eliot observes in his inimitable style:

The daemonic powers found an instrument of far greater range, delicacy and power in the author of The Prussian Officer than in the author of A Group of Noble Dames; and the tale which I used as an example (The Shadow in the Rose Garden) can be matched by several others. (Eliot's parenthesis).

That is how a believer looks at deviant behaviour as the work of the 'daemonic powers'. We have said that the Captain is a 'sadomasochist' and since it is apparent that the assaults on the orderly were not simply 'sadistic', as Hobsbaum puts it, we propose its replacement by the word 'sadomasochistic'. The Prussian officer, were he only a sadist, would take (pleasure, especially) sexual pleasure in causing suffering, pain or humiliation to another person. He is also a masochist — a person seeking (pleasure, especially) sexual pleasure, in one's own suffering, pain or humiliation. That is how he
is a sadomasochist — a person who combines in himself both sadism and masochism.

Hobsbaum uses two clues in order to drive home the point about implied homosexuality in the story:

(1) "The Captain's heart gave a pang, as if of pleasure, seeing the young fellow bewildered and uncertain on his feet, with pain."^{49}

(2) "The Captain's hand had trembled at taking his coffee at dawn: his orderly saw it again. And he saw the fine figure of the Captain wheeling on horseback...."^{50}

There are other pieces of evidence also. Some of these are listed below:

(a) "And the officer was always aware of the tramp of his company behind, the march of his orderly among the men."^{51} (Added emphases)

(b) Sometimes he took a mistress. "But after such an event, he returned to duty with his brow still more tense his eyes more hostile and irritable."^{52} (sexual incompatibility?)

(c) "He could not get away from the sense of the youth's person, while he was in attendance. It was like a warm flame upon the older man's tense, rigid body ...."^{53}

(d) "But the influence of the young soldier's being had penetrated through the officer's stiffened discipline, and perturbed the man in him."^{54} (Added emphasis)
(e) 'In spite of himself, the Captain could not regain his neutrality of feeling towards his orderly.\textsuperscript{55}

(f) 'He could not rest when the soldier was away, and when he was present, he glared at him with tormented eyes.'\textsuperscript{56}

(g) 'He would not know that his feeling for his orderly was anything but that of a man incensed by his stupid, perverse servant.'\textsuperscript{57}

(h) 'He went away for some days with a woman. It was a mockery of pleasure. He simply did not want the woman.... At the end of it, he came back in an agony of irritation, torment and misery.'\textsuperscript{58} (Added emphasis)

(i) When he comes to know on his return after a weeks that the orderly has plans to go out for the evening, he is clearly incensed, and insists, 'I want you this evening... I want you tomorrow evening also....'\textsuperscript{59} (Added emphases)

(j) After he has had the opportunity of punishing his orderly for no real reason, this is the state of his mind: 'Deep inside him was the intense gratification of passion, still working powerfully. Then there was a counteraction, a horrible breaking down of something inside him, a whole agony of reaction... a chaos of sensations.'\textsuperscript{60} (Added emphases).

(k) 'He needed to see his orderly. His helmet threw a dark shadow over his light, fierce eyes, but his moustache and mouth and chin were distinct in the sunshine. The orderly must move under the presence of the figure of
And there are many more such descriptions and exchanges — pieces of discourse that suggest the Prussian officer's secret longings for his orderly. The list is by no means exhaustive.

The officer's sexual incompatibility in his relationship with his women is reflected in his dissatisfied behaviour: he became more tense, hostile and irritable after such encounters. He simply does not want the woman. He wants his orderly all the time. Within the overall context of his desire for sex, the verb 'want' assumes an ominous connotation, a certain secret notoriety. The Prussian officer does not want women, he wants his orderly. 'Want' seems to suggest that he feels the need for or craves for his orderly's attention. In terms of Freudian psychology, this unusual craving, attention to the masculinity of the orderly, seems to turn him on sexually and he seeks gratification of his primitive need. One should like to think that when this gratification is not available in a concrete physical contact, his passion seeks its gratification in a physical assault on the orderly. This sets off 'a whole agony of reaction' in 'a chaos of sensations'; especially after such an assault when he learns that his orderly has been writing a poem for, as he puts it, 'my girl'. The Captain does not want to think and he makes himself 'rigid' in order to prevent himself from thinking.
The orderly's initial reaction to the Captain's emotional state is one of admiration. But when he realises that he is being forced into 'a personal interchange' with him, he feels he must get away from it all. Maybe, he feels threatened. Let us take a brief look at two clues in the thought processes of the orderly. He serves his master as 'a matter of course' which does not in any way 'implicate him personally',

But now if he were going to be forced into a personal interchange with his master he would be like a wild thing caught, he felt he must get away.62

(Added emphases).

And when, on finding that the orderly had 'a deep seam going across the knuckle', the Captain wants 'to do something to it' and asks where he got that, the young man winces and explains briefly that it was a wood axe which had caused it. No further explanation is given and the orderly begins to avoid him. The officer is not satisfied and feels restless. He seizes opportunities to sneer at him. The orderly, on his part, continues with his duties, but

All his instinct was to avoid personal contact, even definite hate. But in spite of himself the hate grew, responsive to the officer's passion.63 (Added emphases)
The orderly puts his growing hate in the background, determined in his mind that 'he could dare acknowledge it' only after he had left the Army.

The crucial words and phrases here are 'implicate', 'be forced', 'a personal interchange', 'a wild thing', 'personal contact', 'definite hate', and 'responsive to the officer's passion'. The orderly does not want to do anything which would 'implicate him personally'. On the face of it, the verb 'implicate' might seem innocent but it means 'to cause to be involved in or associated with a crime, fault etc'. Moreover, it is the thought of action which would 'implicate him personally', which means that he does not want any personal involvement or association with a 'fault' because 'crime' is not on his mind really. Fault could mean 'a flaw' or 'a misdeed'. Taking his growing 'hate' for the Captain in response to 'the officer's passion', and reading it with the ideas of the likely use of force for ensuring 'personal interchange' and 'personal contact' which would make him 'a wild thing', we believe, one could arrive at the real implication. In other words, the orderly develops hate for the Captain because he does not want to be involved in any sinful act that might take place through personal interchange and contact, for it would make him 'a wild thing'. 'Interchange' connotes exchange of ideas and 'contact' means the act of touching or meeting. But in the developing scenario here, 'interchange' would tend to mean a mutual give and
take and, if this were to involve the act of 'touching', it looses its original meaning. And more so when it is read in the context of a response to a passion. The uneasy feeling that he would be like a wild thing if this were to happen adds an ominous note to the developing etymology. For, 'wild', as an adjective, means: (1) not controlled; untruly, rough, lawless etc., as in case of the usage 'wild children', and (2) lacking social or moral restraint; dissolute, orgiastic etc., as in 'a wild rake/party'. The orderly apparently seems to be unsure of how he would react if the Captain were to take him by force. He seems to suggest that his behaviour would in that case be uncontrolled, rough (implying a passionate response pattern) but since he sees that as a situation in which he is caught — something which was bound to be lacking insofar as social or moral restraint is concerned (implying thereby a value system that affords no such action), he panicks and feels that he must get away to ensure that it does not happen.

The discussion about the implications of this short story, in particular, is responsible for its close analysis. One would hurry to add that the intention was not to get drawn into a debate about what Lawrence should or should not have done and it ought not to suggest one's stand on the question of this morally deviant behaviour. Our only intention was to ascertain the logical strings in Eliot's censure of Lawrence.
We would like to devote this section to a discussion of Eliot's censure of Thomas Hardy and D H Lawrence as heretics. We would like to do this by applying the criteria set up towards the end of Chapter 1. We do not want this discussion to become a full-length evaluative essay on Hardy and Lawrence. What we want to do is to ascertain whether or not Eliot used this criteria justly.

We had argued in Chapter 1 that the impress of a central tradition demonstrated by a work of art was the main element in the critical output of Eliot's. Originality was to be permitted only within the parameters of an established tradition. There was the need for the stressing of conscious intelligence. The work under evaluation, if it was to conform to this criterion, was expected to show positive signs of the conservation and maintenance of tradition. Both Hardy and Lawrence were Christian by belief and were, therefore, expected to conform to the Christian tradition. Christianity does not approve of any deviance in social or moral behaviour. Marriage is a sacrament essential to the maintenance of tradition. The other essential Christian attributes are compassion for the suffering and good neighbourliness. The central characters, both in the works of Hardy and Lawrence, demonstrate a definite deviance. Connie, Lord Uplandtowers,
Sergeant Troy, the Captain and others, all demonstrate a certain deviance from the norms. Tradition is not maintained. Their actions are too liberal for the Church to approve of. The originality factor is clouded. Although both of the artists are original, they have not been able to handle problems within the parameters of an established tradition. Connie flouts her marriage vows, Troy is not faithful to Bathsheba, Lord Uplandtowers and the Captain are sadists. Deviant sexual behaviour does not have approval of the Church and, hence, like other deviations, it is a strange god. Eliot is justified in holding such a view especially in the light of our discussion of the strange gods in Chapter 2.

The second criterion is concern with the orthodoxy of sensibility and the sense of tradition. Since this has to do with criterion 1, it might be argued that both Hardy and Lawrence violate the orthodoxy of sensibility and the sense of tradition. Authenticity and wholeness both in terms of experience and its expression is the third criterion. Authenticity and wholeness are signs of universality rather than individuality. Only what is true in case of everyone or a majority would make the experience and its expression universal in nature and negate individuality. Fostering of positive values and control of intellectual and moral aberrations is what is sought in this authentic and wholesome experience and its expression. Eliot is justified in dubbing
both Hardy and Lawrence as heretics because their subject and its treatment lacks wholsomeness and is inauthentic. Intellectual and moral aberrations are, by their very nature, limited to a section of people and may, therefore, be seen as exceptions rather than the rules or norms.

The fourth criterion involves acute perception of truth as a whole. When we apply this to the works of Hardy and Lawrence discussed by Eliot, we are not sure if the perception of truth as a whole lacks acuteness because the very question involved in the critical formulation is abstract. However, it might be said to the credit of Eliot that the perception of truth here is partial, as he suggests. Both the artists are selective and appear to use a surgeon's scalpel to dig into the inner layers of the minds of their characters. What emerges is neither complete in perception nor edifying as it were.

The fifth criterion is wholesome perception of Good and Evil. In case of the two artists here, the perception is that of Evil alone. Nowhere does it involve the Good. A certain 'spiritual sickness', notes Eliot, is to be found in Hardy and Lawrence. Within the framework of Christian ethos, this makes sense. But in the context of changes that have come about in all forms of art in the Twentieth Century, that might not be so. Vitality may be reflected in resistance to excitement and abject surrender to passion. An ostrich-like
attitude, however, may not be a sign of either vitality or a healthy attitude. So there are some doubtful features in this case.

As a criterion, interest in men's minds rather than their emotions is difficult to apply. One is not sure whether Lawrence was interested in the psychology of human behaviour, especially in terms of our most primitive needs. Hardy's concern was more with emotions as it happens to be in case of some of the works of Lawrence's like "The Prussian Officer".

It may be said in conclusion that the application of the criteria set up for the purpose yields good results and helps us in understanding Eliot's censure of Hardy and Lawrence because they did not adhere to a tradition but concentrated on the growth of unregenerate 'self' in their works. Had they adhered to the Christian tradition, their works would have been tempered by faith.
References and Notes

3. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. 25.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
14. Ibid., p. 32.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., p. 34.
17. Please refer to Eliot's *After Strange Gods*, p. 23. One is puzzled at the way he does this soon after stating his intention of applying the standard of orthodoxy by emphasizing its 'collective' rather than its 'static' meaning.
19. The problems raised by Eliot in the discussion are listed here. For more details, see pp. 55-56 of Eliot's *After Strange Gods*.
20. All quotes appearing here are from *ASG* and they appear on p. 56 of the work.
22. Ibid., pp. 114-115.
24. Ibid.
31. Ibid., p. 58.
33. Ibid., p. 40.
34. See Eliot's After Strange Gods, pp. 58-61. F.R. Leavis (1955: 307), in a well-argued rebuttal to Eliot's criticism of Lawrence, makes the following points which compel attention:

(a) 'It must be enough here to say that the religion of Lawrence's mother does not deserve the contempt with which Mr Eliot dismisses it. 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. That the Lawrences were Congregationalists is a relevant point — their Nonconformity was very far from being the debased tin-chapel salvationism that Mr Eliot appears to think it. Congregationalism had a peculiarly strong intellectual tradition — in what ways does Mr Eliot think Unitarianism superior? As for the part played by Nonconformity in English civilization, I suggest that he reads Helévy, though books alone will not cure that kind of ignorance.

(b) 'Lawrence's 'insights' were a matter of being able to see what was there, as only genius can, and they went with an extraordinary power of relating insights, and not only of understanding situations comprising elements difficult to get at and recognize but of understanding whole comprehensive and complete fields of experience. His thinking, in fact, is so much superior to what is ordinarily called thinking that it tends not to be recognized for thinking at all. If 'ratioinative powers' means anything worth having, then Lawrence's seem to me superlative; in logical stamina, the power to pursue an organizing process of thought through a wide and difficult tract, with a sustained consistency that is at the same time a delicate fidelity to the complexities of the full concrete experience, Lawrence seems to me to be superior to Mr Eliot (yes, to the author of Four Quartets). (see p. 309).
(c) On challenges regarding Lawrence's genius, Leavis has this say: (i) 'it manifests in an infallible centrality of judgement', (ii) 'he has an unfailingly sure sense of the difference between that which makes for life and that which makes against it', and (iii) (he has an unfailingly sure sense of) 'the difference between health and that which tends away from health'. (See p. 311).


One must admit that Leavis' candid confession about his reaction to Eliot's comment pertaining to the crippling effect upon men of letters, who have not been brought up in an environment of living and central tradition, leaves one with a nagging doubt about the fairness of such an evaluation. (The reaction being 'I am a fellow-countryman of D.H. Lawrence. Mr Eliot is not'...)
(See p. 306).

35. T S Eliot, ICS, p. 35.
36. T S Eliot, ASG, pp. 60-61. The word 'plebeians' refers to the common or even vulgar people.

It is to be noted that Parkin's/Mellor's initial reaction to Connie Chatterley's first visit to the woods, where she meets him, is one of deep suspicion about her real intention. And this suspicion is triggered off due to his doubts about whether women had any genuine, deep sex of womanhood left in them. His earlier sexual experiences seemed to confirm that the sexuality of women was a false one. He hated the feeling of 'endless humiliation' which went with 'false
sexuality', or what he also calls, 'self-sexuality', just in order to get 'a moment's bad gratification!' The question here appeared to be one of 'sexual appetite' being distinct from 'real desire'. Connie's visit touches a deep cord in his heart and he is stirred. For the first time in his life, he sees it as a forerunner to 'true sex'. This psychological aspect of male sexuality, in reaction to narrower 'sexual' encounters with women, as it were, is interesting. But its exploration seems to suggest what Eliot, quoting a contemporary liberal practitioner, says, 'Aided by psycho-analysis, which gave them new weapons, many of the poets and dramatists of our day have dug into the most perverse of human complexes, exposing them with the scalpel of a surgeon rather than that of a philosopher.' (ASG, pp. 22-23).

There is no perversity here but Lawrence's exploration of all forms of male and female sexualities could give the feeling of perversion at times, however misplaced it might be.

38. Ibid., p. 133. Also see R E Pritchard, D.H. Lawrence's Body of Darkness (London: Hutchinson & Co. 1971), p. 186. Pritchard makes a very important observation about Connie's attitude to the change in her by bringing in the function of sex and what it does to her: 'sex is an escape from consciousness, and then there is a release from sexuality into peaceful chastity.'


41. Ibid., p. 231.

42. Ibid.


44. Ibid., p. 225.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid., p. 227.

47. Philip Hobsbaum, *RGDHL*. A detailed analysis of this theme appears on pp. 32-33 of the book.


49. See D H Lawrence's CSS1, p. 102.


51. Ibid., p. 96.

52. Ibid., p. 97.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid., p. 98.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid., p. 99.

57. Ibid., p. 100.

58. Ibid.


60. Ibid., p. 103.
61. Ibid., p. 105.
63. Ibid., p. 99.
64. David Guralnik (ed), WNWD, p. 375.
65. Ibid., p. 859.
66. There is support for such a view in Pritchard besides in Philip Hobsbaum. Attention is drawn in particular to the following analysis in RE Pritchard, D.H. Lawrence: Body of Darkness (London: Hutchinson & Co. 1971), p. 64:

"'The Prussian Officer' is about more than militarism and homosexuality though the officer displays a perversity that includes the homosexual. His hostility is directed against the unselfconsciousness and 'natural completeness' in his young orderly, who as a result is thrown into 'a chaos of sensation', feeling that he and the officer are the 'only two people in the world'. The officer's physical assault (a displaced sexual assault) is less important than the psychological one, when he attempts to force the young man to expose and articulate his feelings (for his girl), in an attempt to 'possess' the young man."