

Creativity and originality with special reference to D.H. Lawrence- A Glimpse

Dr. Babina Bohra¹ , Jyoti Gupta²

¹Research Guide, Department of English, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology & Medical Sciences, Sehore, M.P.

²Research Scholar , Department of English, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology & Medical Sciences, Sehore, M.P.

Abstract:

D.H. Lawrence has been the “most controversial” in English literature in the twentieth century. F.R. Leavis recognized him as one of the greatest novelist of our time and included Lawrence in the “greatest tradition” of English novelists, because like Jane Austen, Conrad, George Eliot and Henry James, D.H. Lawrence has a profound moral concern for life. Contrary to this, a favorable view lauding Lawrence is expressed by Henry Miller and Keith Brown who affirm that the work of D.H. Lawrence has won a permanent place, and a significant one, in the history of English Literature. In view of this, the task of assessing Lawrence’s position in the hierarchy of eminent writers becomes rather difficult. In this article, creativity and originality with special reference to D.H. Lawrence has been evaluated.

Keywords: Creativity, Originality, D.H. Lawrence

INTRODUCTION:

It is true that Lawrence never enjoyed good reputation during his life time. Even after his death, he has been a subject of mixed opinion. His name was associated with offensively erotic literature. Middleton Murry wrote in 1921 that Lawrence is “deliberately, incessantly and passionately obscene in the exact sense of the word.”(Andrews, Critics on Lawrence 21) Hugh Kings Mill launched his better attack on Lawrence in 1938, describing him as a “sexual incompetent with homosexual tendencies.”(Quoted Anthony West 7) Rhy Davies who knew Lawrence called him “a frustrated sexual maniac, pornographic and indecent.”(Quoted by Tony Slade 20) However, despite bitter criticism from all sides, Lawrence did succeed in making a living as a writer, but it was no easy going. Although there was an intelligent minority of

readers who responded to Lawrence in a favorable way, the fact remains that only a few people in the literary world had the courage to speak well of him.

When Lawrence died in 1930, some of the obituaries were seethed with hatred as he was called “morose, frustrated, tortured even a sinister failure.”(Draper, Critical Heritage 22) But a few friend strongly defended him .Contradicting the bitter statements of Lawrence’s detractors E.M. Forster called Lawrence “the greatest imaginative novelist of our generation.”(Athenaeum, quoted in Critical Anthology 219) Foresters comment was a challenge to the world in which Lawrence enjoyed only notoriety. Nevertheless, for a few years after his death, Lawrence’s reputations continued to suffer under adverse criticism. The reminiscences even by those who had known him intimately like Catherine Carswell’s *The Savage Pilgrimage*, published in 1932 and Jessie Chambers *D.H. Lawrence : A Personal Record* were far from charitable. His admirers also did not find it easy to formulate their approval in coherent critical terms. Middleton Murry attributed Lawrence’s greatness to the fact that “art was not Lawrence’s aim.”(Son of Woman 173) T.S. Eliot charged Lawrence with lack of intellectual and social training. He emphasized Lawrence’s incapacity for what we ordinarily call thinking. According to him, Lawrence was given to distinct sexual morbidity and extreme individualism. This was because Lawrence trusted “inner guide” and rejected adherence to tradition. (Eliot, *Strange God* 58-59) Leavis, on the other hand, argued that far from being “uneducated and untrained,” Lawrence had led “an extraordinarily active intellectual life.” (Novelist 371) He charged Eliot with ignorance of English culture. According to Leavis Lawrence’s two essays “The Crown,” “Study of Thomas Hardy” and specially *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* expose the “absurdity of Eliot’s privative judgment on Lawrence that denies him all capacity for developed thought.”(Thoughts, Words and Creativity 18-20) Iris Murdoch disputed Eliot’s remark about Lawrence’s intellect “an astonishing judgment” and wonders “whatever is thinking if Lawrence couldn’t think.”(Meyers, *Lawrence and Tradition* 2)

Since the Second World War the “critical renaissance” (Spilka, *Essays* 1) initiated by F.R. Leavis gave impetus to the revival of interest in Lawrence. Criticism of Lawrence’s works has been a history of contradictions and conflicts. New Criticism which advocated close textual analysis as opposed to biographical and ideological studies proved beneficial for the consideration of his works. But New Critics favored tradition which Lawrence did not accept. For this reason, he was called a heretic. Blackmur attacked Lawrence for favoring inspiration at the expense of craft in the poetry and he calls it “the fallacy of the faith in expressive form.”

It means that “if a thing is only intensely enough felt its mere expression in words will give it satisfactory form.”(Blackmur, Expressive Form 281) Defending Lawrence against Blackmur’s attack, Sola Pinto said the Lawrence’s poetry was not “a mere outburst of personal feeling.”(Critical Quarterly 18) The fact, however, is that Lawrence believed that in writing the writer’s feeling must be set down spontaneously and that depending entirely upon inspiration, the form will emerge naturally from the force of the emotion struggling to be expressed. Lawrence wrote in the “Forward” to *Fantasia of the Unconscious* that “the novels and poems come unwatched out of one’s pen,” and that the novels and poems are “pure passionate experience.” The emotional coherence of a work was Lawrence’s principal standard of evaluation, and “he saw the art of writing as a continuous experiment with the formal possibilities of uncovering new emotional substance.” (Cavitch, *New World* 8) He rejected the old form of the novel which compels one to “conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and make him consistent.”(CL 281) He did not want to impose form on his novels. What counted most in the Lawrence’s aesthetics is that the form of a work must correspond to the emotional pattern of the experience of the artist.

EVALUATION OF CREATIVITY AND ORIGINALITY:

The whole critical perspective of Lawrence’s works changed in the fifties. Richard Aldington’s book *The Portrait of a Genius, But ...* thickly underlined the unique qualities of Lawrence’s poetic vision without being blind to his faults. H.T Moore’s two books: *The life and works of D.H .Lawrence* and *The Intelligent Heart* which was later called *The Priest of Love* also helped to promote the revival of interest in the work of D.H .Lawrence. After the publication of *The Life and works of D.H .Lawrence* , Lawrence emerged as a “many-sided genius, growing, changing, lapsing and reviving.”(Spilka, *Essays* 5) Father William Tiverton in his study *D.H .Lawrence and Human Existence* draw our attention to the Lawrence’s influence upon English fiction in the twentieth century that has been undeniably as great as any of his contemporaries. This influence was not direct on technique, rather it has been an influence of negation, that is to say, “he has not compelled his successors to write like him, but he has made it impossible for them to write like his own predecessors.”(Tiverton, *Human Existence* 19) In fact since mid-fifties a large number of books have been written to assess Lawrence’s greatness as a writer. Even Murry, who had remarked that art was not Lawrence’s aim modified his stand and regarded Lawrence as “the most significant writer of his time” and that “as a poet and novelist has no imitators; as prophet no successors. And that also is significant.” (*Creative Iconoclast* 1)

Many people like E.M. Forester believed that D.H. Lawrence was a prophetic writer. Sola P into argues that Lawrence was not the kind of prophet “who foretells that will happen in the future, though he may do that incidentally, but one who tells forth (the literal meaning of the Greek word) great living truths which come from the depths of his being.” (Quoted by Moore, Miscellany XIV) It cannot be denied that Lawrence was a prophetic writer but the fact should not be overlooked that he was an artist first. This is too often neglected by those who concentrate exclusively on his ideas or his personality. They ignore his deep and compelling vision and the originality that lay in his powerful utterance. Leavis called Lawrence “a great artist, a creative writer.” (Novelist 17) The title of Leavis’ book D.H.Lawrence: Novelist proves that in this most exciting of critiques of Lawrence written up to that time and in a special sense until now, Leavis was dealing first of all with Lawrence as an artist, although he did not neglect the prophetic aspect, Leavis’ Thought, Words and Creativity is concerned with Lawrence’s thought, art and language. Many critics after Leavis looked carefully at Lawrence as an artist. Mark Spilka, Graham Hough, Eliseo Vivas, H.M.Daleski, Keith Sagar, Julian Moynahan, Alastair Niven, Yudhistar and others read Lawrence’s novels and short stories critically and acclaim them as great works of art.

F.B.Pinion and Emile Delavenay study Lawrence’s life and work and try to examine how the experiences formed Lawrence’s personality and art. Delavenay’s study concentrates on the early formative years. Emile Delavenay’s D.H.Lawrence and Edward Carpenter is a study of very different kind. Delavenay attempts to define the mental climate in which Lawrence was writing and relates the “ideas and conceptions” in his works with that of his surroundings. He also draws resemblances between Lawrence and Edward carpenter, Kingsley Widmer gave a new dimension to Lawrence’s criticism. Widmer believed that Lawrence’s real strength lay in “perversity which played a positive role in his vision.”(Art of Perversity 4) Following the same line, Colin Clarke finds the moralistic interpretation of Lawrence’s fiction that has prevailed at least for two decades showing “signs of cracking.” He believed that Lawrence in the discursive writing of the period 1915-19 found in “corruption or disintegration an essential life-energy.” Clarke tries to show how the strange logic of “The Crown.” “The Reality of Peace” and the essay on Poe have an important bearing upon the major fiction. (River of Dissolution IX-XIII). A large number of eminent critics have read Lawrence from different angles and thus opened up new vistas to Lawrence’s criticism. The feminist case was first put against Lawrence by Murry who construed Lawrence’s attitude towards women as the assertion of his “hypersensitive masculinity” which is highlighted by creating the sexual mystery wherein “he

is the lord.”(Son of Woman 118) About Lawrence’s treatment of female characters Helen Corke says that although “these women are fully drawn,” Lawrence was not interested in them as “individuals” and saw them “only in relation to their men.”(Croydon Years 95) Kate Millett sounded a new note which created a stir in the literary world. She saw Lawrence as a sexual politician leading a counter revolution against all forms of female emancipation. Faith Pullin calls Lawrence a “ruthless user of women” and believes that despite his “brilliant insights,” Lawrence was “unable to present women as they are.” (Quoted by Anne Smith 50, 73)

At the other end of the spectrum, feminist appreciations of Lawrence have not been lacking. Defending Lawrence against Murry’s criticism, Anais Nin affirmed that Lawrence had “a complete realization of feeling of women.

In fact, very often he wrote as a woman. It is “the first time that a man has so wholly and completely repressed women accurately.” (Unprofessional Study 57-59) The tradition set up by Anais Nin was carried on by Barbara Hardy and Lydia Blanchard Carol Dix admires Lawrence for “exploring with great boldness the female mode of being.”(Lawrence and Women 54) Norman Mailer, too, defends Lawrence against Millett’s attack. Comparing Lawrence’s treatment of women with the spirit of Modern Women’s Movement, T.E. Apter writes that Lawrence’s approach involves a “sanity and depth” which women’s movements often lack. Apter believes that Lawrence’s success rests upon his study of “a woman’s need.” (Lawrence and Women 156-157) Lawrence Lerner and Hilary Simpson discuss Lawrence’s concern with women’s cause in the light of the feminist movements and bring out factors repressible in the change of his attitude to women after the First World War.

Margaret Beede Howe interprets Lawrence from the psychoanalytical angle. Her study is concerned with Lawrence’s developing self. Phillip Hobsbaum studies the relation of the developing self to society and nature in it wider perspective in Lawrence’s works Raymond Williams traces Lawrence’s influence in social thinking. Roger Ebbatson traces how “evolutionary theory acted as a stimulus” and fired Lawrence’s imagination. He studies Lawrence’s art as an “evolution of the self” (Quoted by Heywood, New Studies) John Carey and Christopher Heywood discuss Lawrence’s blood doctrine although from the different perspective. Heywood studies the “sources” of Lawrence’s theory of blood -consciousness. Daleski’s study examines the dualist aspect of Lawrence’s vision. He believes that male and female duality is central to Lawrence’s dualism. Daleski is the first critic to draw our attention to Lawrence’s “Study of Thomas Hardy” which contains Lawrence’s major pronouncements

on this subject. Marshal W. Alcorn studies “spontaneity” that Lawrence considered a cure for such negative qualities as “mind,” “will” and “idea” which are responsible for the autoimmunization of life. (Review 1982, 147) Chaman Nahal evaluates Lawrence’s art by bringing out affinities between Lawrence’s approaches to life with what is projected in the Vedas.

Lawrence’s language and technique has been the subject of many critical studies. BlackMur and Mark Schorer have critically discussed Lawrence’s technique. Allan Ingram studies Lawrence’s language by way of the linguistic resources available to him. His study contains some imported discussion of the contexts of his writings. Frank Kermode’s study of Lawrence’s works and the apocalyptic types in his novels has contributed to a large extent towards a deeper understanding of Lawrence’s works. A large number of critical studies have appeared on Lawrence’s use of symbols, myth, primitive modes, metaphor and expression. It is not possible to mention all names here. No less is the contribution of John Worthen and James T. Boulton. Worthen presents the changing way in which Lawrence saw his novels. He works through the history of the composition of each book to establish its identity as Lawrence discovered, and modified it. Boulton has edited the Cambridge Edition of the letters and complete works of D.H.Lawrence. In addition to this, the quarterly *The D.H.Lawrence Review* keeps us in touch with the latest critical approaches and studies on D.H.Lawrence. The purpose of presenting this brief survey of Lawrence criticism was not to give its history but to offer the changing and developing perspective on Lawrence’s multifarious genius, both maligned and eulogized. What these studies have not touched upon, except marginally, is Lawrence’s morality. Indeed he wrote to his friend Edward Garnett that he was disinterested in the subject of morality, to one broad moral scheme as he put it, but which he objected was the morality of Russian novelists, which he called dull, old, and dead. He searched for a new moral vision, not customary Christian morality, but essential of Christ, the ethics of human love following the renunciation of the will to assert, that Lawrence explored in his novel and which is also the subject of the present research.

Lawrence was a versatile writer who tried his hand in many genres. As far conformity to tradition is concerned Lawrence did not belong to any one tradition. In this connection Wright Morris’ remark is questionable: “There is no need to let Lawrence speak for himself, since Mr. Eliot’s attack has the merit of doing that for him. It is Lawrence’s defects indeed that make him important to us.” Besides, “Mr. Eliot speaks for the past — that region where that vast host and the dead dwell; Lawrence speaks for the present — that region where the rest of us

dwelling.”(Immediate Present, Miscellany 8-10) Virginia Woolf equally wrong in saying that “Lawrence was not part of any tradition and that he has an alien in literature.”(Quoted by Suzanne, Review 1969, 269) Therefore too much need not be made of Lawrence’s non-adherence to any one tradition, but in ethics, his tradition as that of Eliot himself is of wider significance, as it is both of the west and the east.

Different critics have placed Lawrence in different tradition and tried to trace influences on him. Leavis challenged Eliot’s view and convincingly maintained that “in our time when the gap in continuity is almost complete, Lawrence may be said to represent, concretely in his living person, the essential human tradition.”(For Continuity 158) Leavis insisted that “Lawrence was brought up in a living and central tradition.”(Novelist 373) Keith Sagar saw Lawrence as “uncompromisingly unconventional, and taking his place in a much larger, two-thousand— rather than two -hundred-year-old tradition.”(The Art of Lawrence 5) Herbert Landenberg traces Lawrence’s relation to a double tradition “social tradition” in dealing with man’s relation to men around, and the Romantic tradition which is concerned less with man’s relation with men than with “his relation to larger forces” and “to himself.”(Romantic Tradition, Miscellany 326) Colin Clarke also believed that Lawrence took over the “anti - thesis of mechanical and organic” (River of Dissolution 137) from his romantic predecessors and therefore, belongs to that tradition. John Alcorn has placed Lawrence in the “Nature Tradition.” Raymond William believed that “Lawrence takes over the major criticism of industrialism from the nineteenth century tradition, but in tone he remains more like Carlyle.”(Culture and Society 200) Keith Aldritt argues that Lawrence’s concern with industrialism is “a continuation of the great English romantic vision which we can follow in the works of Blake, Turner, Ruskin and William Morris.”(Visual Imagination 237) Jeffery Meyers believes that Lawrence has his place in the “European intellectual tradition.”(Lawrence and Tradition 3) He, therefore, refutes the charge that D.H. Lawrence had “incapacity for what we ordinarily call thinking.” Thus, we see that various approaches to Lawrence as the great denier of influence or belonging to different tradition show the richness and intensity of his art.

Lawrence neither wrote like his nearest contemporary writers —Virginia Woolf and E.M Forster, nor like his immediate seniors — Bennett, Galsworthy and Wells whom Virginia Woolf called “materialists.” She believed that these writers were too much concerned with the “solidity” of “fabric,” whereas the essential thing “whether we call it life or spirit goes a miss.”(Common Reader 186-188) Lawrence broke away from the mainly sociological tradition of the English novel. The eighteenth and nineteenth century novel was concerned with man’s external

behaviour and the change which affected his social and economic status. It was what has been called a “public instrument.”(Daiches, *Modern World* 1) Lawrence believed that novel could be used for any purpose: “You can put anything you like in a novel.” And he wondered “why people go on putting the same thing?” (PII 416) He struck a note of modernity by declaring that whereas “the ordinary novel would trace the history of the diamond.. ..my diamond might be coal or soot, and my theme is carbon.” (CL282) Lawrence was interested in the very core of the being of man. He did not care about the “physiology of matter,” but was concerned with that which is “physic-non-human, in humanity.”(CL 281) Novel writing for Lawrence meant the “close and penetratingly honest exploration of human experience to reveal what makes for, and against the enhancement of life and personal fulfillment.”(Draper, *D.H.Lawrence* 1) He saw and used it as a “passionate struggle into conscious being.” (PII 275).

For Lawrence, art and life were inseparable. He believed that art is “the medium through which men express their deep and real feelings.”(PII 224) That is perhaps why he declared: “My motto is ‘art for my sake.’”(CL 171) In a way art is utterly dependent on the artist’s vision of life, even if the artist is at first not conscious of it. Lawrence believed in art which was guided by “instinct and intuition.”(SE 302) Even a critic who is to judge a work of art “must be able to feel the impact of a work in all its complexity and its force.”(SE 217) Lawrence’s stress on the emotional response of a critic to the works of art should not be construed as supporting a criticism of the subjective - impressionistic kind. He also stresses the intellectual, moral and emotional capabilities of the critic. He wrote: “A critic must be emotionally alive in every fiber, intellectually capable and skillful in essential logic, and then morally very honest.”(SE 217) Lawrence’s objection was only to the cerebral approach which he considered partial, because “the deeper responses down in the intuitive and instinctive body are not touched.” For Lawrence “both criticism and creation requires the same faculties as in due proportion make for the wholeness of a man.”(T. Singh, *Literary Critics* 20) True criticism and appreciation require what Lawrence calls the “imaginative awareness” which includes “physical, intuitional perception.”(P 556-57) Similarly art for Lawrence was something “spontaneous and flexible as flame,” not restricted by artificial form, (P 221) because form is “impersonal like logic” which is the outcome not of “artistic conscience, but of certain attitude to life.”(SLC 260) F.R. Leavis writes that Lawrence’s genius was of a special kind. “To Lawrence, as to Shakespeare and Keats his writings did come ‘as naturally as the leaves to a tree.’ And it is as distinctive as theirs.”(Leavis, *Uncontemporary Studies* 121) There is no doubt that Lawrence’s art has the “rhythm of a living thing.”(SLC 265).

Lawrence found novel the appropriate medium for “exploring the largest questions of man and his relation to the created universe” and he realized that “any such exploration must begin with a voyage inward,” as a “search for self.” (Cushman, Lawrence at Work 13) Only the novel can explore the hidden areas of life which lie “underground, like roots in the dark.” (P 418) Lawrence regarded novel the best guide to living, because it “can help us to live, as nothing else can.” (P 532) He used the novel to capture the inward vision of life. He dealt with characters at a level which the conscious mind could not comprehend. This attitude brought in a new conception of character. Lawrence was not concerned with what a character “feels,” but what a character “is.” (CL 281 -282) He viewed man as part of larger non -human mystery, capable of changing and developing in all sort s of ways. Lawrence believed that “all great novels,” the real hero is not any of the characters, but “some unnamed and nameless flame behind them all” (PII 419) which impact life to their works, Characters in the works of the writers who ignore this flame, and tend to the personal or are concerned with the “old stable ego” (CL 281) are stereotyped, wooden and lifeless. That is why Lawrence wished to deal with “another ego” according to whose action the “individual was unrecognizable, and passes through as it were, allotropic states for which it needs a deeper sense than any we have been used to exercise.” (CL 282) Thus characterization with Lawrence was a “process” like life “ever present and flowing off, and never in any sense at rest, static, finished.” (P 219) He was not interested in the “infinite” and the “eternal.” He wanted the “still, white seething, the incandescence and coldness of the incarnate moment” Which is “the quick of all change.” (P 219)

To present the ever-changing flux of life, Lawrence’s genius needed a new form of characterization which created distinct human beings constantly changing and developing. If the characters have some fixed ideas in their heads and live according to those fixed “patterns,” they “cease to live,” and “the novel falls dead.” (PhS 187) If a novel is to survive it must handle “new propositions without using abstractions.” (PhS 193) To present “the whole man alive,” the novelist has to deal with the experience in its totality. He can do so if he has the awareness or what Lawrence tells “an instinct of the whole consciousness of man, bodily mental, spiritual all at once.” (PhS 188) Lawrence was interested in “the mystery of the inexhaustible, forever unfolding creative spark,” (P 219) which could not be understood b y the mind. When we realize life in its fullness, and good, bad, right, wrong — “all things are given full play in the novel, then emerges the wholeness of a man,” (PhS 188) in its “real, vital potential self.” (P 410)

In his works, Lawrence is concerned with certain concepts and values. But they should not be regarded as a part of a fixed or absolute doctrine which is valid for all people at all times. His own views are not presented as absolute truths because for Lawrence there were no absolute truths. As he put it: "Away with eternal truth. Truth lives from day to day." (SCAL 8) It is no part of the novelist's business to offer solution or cures for the ills mankind suffers from.

A work of art reveals and leaves it to the individual reader to solve for himself the questions and problems of life or civilization. Besides we should not forget that the concepts and values with which Lawrence is dealing in his fiction emerges from the artistic experience of the writer. They are not grafted on artistic experience. In the "Foreword" to *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, Lawrence has written that these "pollyanalytics" are "deduced from the novels and poems, not the reverse. The novels and poems come unwatched out of one's pen...These 'pollyanalytics' are inferences made afterwards, out from the experience." (FU 15) What Lawrence means is that novels are not written simply in order to convey certain ideas about life, but to see whether the ideas are valid as experiences of the characters. Thus, for Lawrence "writing was part of unified effort to expand and perfect the entire arena of human experience." (Cavitch 3)

D.H. Lawrence belonged to the period of transition (1885-1930) — the period of chaos and frightening change in the modern world, more particularly the Western world. With the development of modern mechanical civilization, old values were withering away. To this the First World War added frustration, decay of faith and loss of human values. Lawrence wrote: "The war finished me: it was a spear through the side of all sorrows and hopes." (CL 309) After the war he was "sick" in his "soul." (CL 371) He was caught and remained in this state for some time. Gradually he recovered his balance and wanted people to maintain it. He looked at the war as "the European soul's revolt against a false set of values," (Cavitch 33) a fight for psychic freedom. Lawrence wrote in the "Study of Thomas Hardy": "It is a war for freedom of the bonds of our own cowardice and sluggish greed of security and well-being; it is a fight to regain ourselves out of the grip of our own caution." (P 407).

CONCLUSION:

With civilization apparently breaking down, Lawrence felt that it was more urgent than ever to proclaim the naturally good part of man and strengthen it against the moral disintegration of the times. For although civilization has solved problem of “bread and butter,” (FU 245) man has physically starved. The modern mechanical civilization is either the product of these starved men and women, or this civilization has produced these starved folk. Perhaps both have a symbiotic relationship. Throughout his life, Lawrence tried to show how this materialistic civilization has been affected by science and industry degraded human life in numerous ways causing irreparable loss of human instinct. Lawrence strongly believed that science was anti-life and living by it was taking the wonder or mystery out of human life rendering it unbearably monotonous, dull and boring. Huxley also pointed to Lawrence’s attitude to science and says that Lawrence disapproved of “too much knowledge, on the score that it diminished men’s sense of wonder and blunted their sensitiveness to the great mystery.” (HL XIV) For this, Lawrence hated science and called scientist “liars.” (P 190) Lawrence believed that wonder is the most precious universal element which is fundamental to life, “we can call wonder the religious element inherent in all life.” And he maintained that the sense of wonder which is our “sixth sense,” is the “natural religious sense.” (SLC 8)

Scientific knowledge and skill were doing man irremediable harm by explaining the natural phenomenon. This process ended by taking wonder out of things. That is why people “experience nothing.” Lawrence held that “our science is a science of dead world. Even biology never considers life, but only mechanistic functioning and apparatus of life.” (FU 12) The great fatal fruit of our civilization based on mental knowledge is “boredom.”(SLC 7) The universe is dead for us. Knowledge has killed the “sun” and reduced it to “a ball of blazing gas” (P 299) and the moon to “pock -marked,” “cold and snow.” Machine has killed the earth for us making it a surface, more or less “lump” that we travel over. (P 300) In fact, we know everything in terms of our own deadness. To overcome this feeling of deadness and emptiness we need “the living sun and the living moon.”(P 299) To achieve that end, we have to strip ourselves of the petty personal feelings and ideas. Only then could the “vital correspondence” between our blood and the sun be brought about. Lawrence believed that the sense of mystery still persisted on the instinctual plane and could be experienced through intuitive faculties; the latter however, were in a “diseased, atrophied condition” in modern times. (PII 528) That is why Lawrence chose to deal with these areas of human experience where the sense of mystery still flourished, and insisted on the removal of the “dead crust” (SL 189) which was keeping it

suppressed. Though not saying, Lawrence in his novels directly, at timely obliquely points out, that it is in human will.

Apart from taking away wonder from human life, science and industry were gradually cutting man off from the heading impact of the natural world. In this process of alienation, other factors which joined hands with science and industry were the cult of individualism, egoism and rationalism. They are out to thwart man's "societal instinct" (CL 989) depriving him of his vital relationship with the living universe. To Lawrence, it was "obvious that from the time a child is born, or conceived, it has a permanent relation with the outer universe." (F 46) On the other hand he felt that men and women in the modern times have become automatic idealized units instead of their genuine selves. With the aid of explosive and mechanistic ideas, man has perverted his whole psyche. The mind of man is responsible for causing the split in the monolithic structure of which man and the universe in which he lives are an integral part. Despite his best efforts man fails to solve the problems of his own making with the help of the mind alone. In the extremely complex business of living, mind has come to assume a position which actually subverts the whole process of integration. As a result the vital centre where life should find spontaneous expression dry up for the mind does not give them a chance to operate in a manner they should. It is because of living too much in terms of "mental life" that we are cut off from the great sources of our renewal which flow eternally in the universe. In "a propos of Lawrence Chatterley's Lover" Lawrence said: "virtually, the human race is dying. It is like a great uprooted tree which it roots in the air." To be able to live, therefore, we must "plant ourselves again in the universe" (PhS 355) which is by no means an easy task to perform. This is the main purpose of the present study and it is hoped that the present work will add a new dimension to the study of Lawrence's fiction.

REFERENCES:

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Lawrence, D.H. *The White Peacock*, 1911; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981.
- .*The Trespasser*, 1912; United States: Myna Classic Books, 2008.
- .*Sons and Lovers*, 1913; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2010.
- .*The Prussian Officer and Other Stories* , Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- .*The Rainbow*, 1915; Harmondsworth: Penguin English Library, 1995.

—. *The Lost Girl*, 1920; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987.

—. *Women in Love*, 1920; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1995.

—. *England, My England*, 1922; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books:

Aldington, Richard. *Portrait of a Genius But...: The Life of D.H. Lawrence*. London: Heinemann, 1950.

Becket, Fiona. *A Complete Critical Guide to D.H. Lawrence*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Catherine Carswell. *D.H. Lawrence Ware*, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd., 2008.

Delany Paul. *D.H. Lawrence's Nightmare: The Writer and His Circle in the Years of Great War*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Ebbaston, Roger. *Lawrence and Nature Tradition: A Theme in English Fiction: 1885-1914*. Sussex: Atlantic Press, 1980.

Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.

Gregory, Horace. *D.H. Lawrence: The Pilgrim of Apocalypse*. New York: Groove Press, 1957.

Hamalian, Leo. *D. H. Lawrence and Nine Woman Writers*. New Jersey: Associate University Press, Inc., 1996.

Ingram, Allen. *The Language of D.H. Lawrence*. London: The Macmillan Press, 1990.

Kalnins, Mara ed. *D.H. Lawrence: Centenary Essays*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. 1986.

Lerner, Laurence. *Love and Marriage: Literature and its Social Contents*. London: Edward Arnold, 1979.

Mailer, Norman. *The Prisoner of Sex*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.

Nahal, Chaman. *D.H. Lawrence: An Eastern View*. London: Barends and Co., 1970.

Peter Preston, Peter Hoare. *D. H. Lawrence in the Modern World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Ralph, C.H. *The Trail of Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961.

- Sagar, Keith. *The Art of D.H.Lawrence*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . *D.H.Lawrence: A Calendar of his Works*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.
- . *D.H.Lawrence: Life into Art*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 2008.
- Tiverton, Father William. *D.H.Lawrence and Human Existence*. London: Rockliff, 1951.
- Van Ghent, Dorothy. *The English Novel: Form and Function*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.
- Weekes, Mark Kinkead. ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretation of The Rainbow: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Young, Kenneth. *D.H.Lawrence*. London: Longman, Green & Co., 1963.