

STUDY OF THOMAS HARDY
AND OTHER ESSAYS

D. H. LAWRENCE

EDITED BY
BRUCE STEELE



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011-4211, USA

10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia

Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

This, the Cambridge Edition of the text of *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays* now correctly established from the original sources and first published in 1985, © the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli 1985. Introduction and notes © Cambridge University Press 1985. Permission to reproduce this text entire or in part, or to quote from it, can be granted only by the Literary Executor of the Estate, Laurence Pollinger Ltd, 18 Maddox Street, Mayfair, London W1R 0EU. Permission to reproduce the introduction and notes entire or in part should be requested from Cambridge University Press. Acknowledgement is made to William Heinemann Ltd in the UK and the Viking Press in the USA, who hold the exclusive book publication rights for the work as published (copyright 1923, 1925, 1928, 1932, 1936, 1958) in their respective territories, for the authorisation granted to Cambridge University Press through the Frieda Lawrence Ravagli Estate for use of the work as published in preparing the new scholarly text.

Library of Congress catalogue card number: 84-19872

British Library cataloguing in publication data

Lawrence, D. H.

Study of Thomas Hardy and other essays. –

(The Cambridge edition of the letters and works of D. H. Lawrence)

1. English literature – 19th century – History and criticism.
2. English literature – 20th century – History and criticism.

I. Title II. Steele, Bruce

820.9'008 PR451

ISBN 0 521 25252 0 hardback

ISBN 0 521 27248 3 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2001

CONTENTS

General editors' preface	<i>page</i> vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chronology	xi
Cue-titles	xv
Introduction	xvii
'Study of Thomas Hardy'	xix
Literary Essays, 1908–27	xli
<i>STUDY OF THOMAS HARDY AND OTHER ESSAYS</i>	i
Study of Thomas Hardy	3
Art and the Individual	133
Rachel Annand Taylor	143
The Future of the Novel	149
A Britisher Has a Word With an Editor	157
Art and Morality	161
Morality and the Novel	169
The Novel	177
Why the Novel Matters	191
The Novel and the Feelings	199
John Galsworthy	207
•Appendixes	
I 'Art and The Individual', First version	221
II 'Art and Morality', First version	231
III 'Morality and the Novel', First version	239
IV 'John Galsworthy', Fragment of an early draft	247
Explanatory notes	253
Textual apparatus	293

INTRODUCTION

‘Study of Thomas Hardy’

On 24 June 1914, D. H. Lawrence returned to England with Frieda Weekley after almost nine months at Fiascherino near Lerici on the Golfo della Spezia in Italy.¹ They stayed for a time with Gordon Campbell, an Irish barrister practising in London, whom they had met the previous summer on holiday in Kent. Campbell’s wife, Beatrice, was spending the summer of 1914 in Ireland, where he and the Lawrences planned to visit her in August.

Lawrence had returned to London with, as he thought, *The Rainbow* completed.² His immediate task was to provide his previous publisher, Duckworth, with a collection of short stories to replace *The Rainbow* which he had promised to Methuen. Within a fortnight, and while still at work on the stories, Lawrence was personally approached by another publisher with an invitation to write a short book on Thomas Hardy. On 8 July he explained the position to his agent, J. B. Pinker:

The man in Nisbet’s, Bertram Christian, has been asking me would I do a little book for him – a sort of interpretative essay on Thomas Hardy, of about 15,000 words. It will be published at 1/- net. My payment is to be 1½d. per copy, £15 advance on royalties, half profits in America. It isn’t very much, but then the work won’t be very much. I think it is all right don’t you? When the agreement comes I will send it on to you, and we need not make any trouble over it.³

The publishing firm of James Nisbet and Co. had recently launched a series entitled ‘Writers of the Day’ edited by Bertram Christian, one of the directors, and it is most likely that he envisaged Lawrence’s book on Hardy as

¹ Frieda left her husband, Ernest Weekley, and children in May 1912 to elope with DHL; they lived in Europe, mostly in Italy. The divorce became absolute in May 1914; DHL and Frieda’s return to England in June was in part prompted by the wish to be married as soon as possible and in England.

² This was the penultimate version of the novel, known until May 1914 as ‘The Wedding Ring’. See *Letters*, ii. 173, and *The Rainbow*, ed. by Mark Kinkead-Weekes (to be published by Cambridge University Press).

³ *Letters*, ii. 193.

one of that series. Nothing further is known for certain of Lawrence's dealings with Christian.⁴

At first he seemed keen to write the book. An extended literary study of a living established writer, and one for whom he had some affinity as well as admiration, was an agreeable challenge and would mark a quite new direction in his writing. 'I am going to do a little book of about 15000 words on Thomas Hardy', he wrote to his old friend and former teaching colleague at Croydon, Arthur McLeod. 'What do you think of that. Later on I shall ask you to lend me some Hardy books.'⁵ But his personal circumstances and political events in Europe combined to change both his plans for writing the book and, to some extent, the nature of it.

On 13 July 1914 Lawrence married Frieda at the Kensington Registry Office. Three days before, he had written to Edward Marsh, another friend he had made the previous summer, and a generous patron of writers, inviting him to be a witness at the ceremony. Business at the Admiralty, where he was Private Secretary to Winston Churchill, made it impossible for Marsh to attend. Both he and Lawrence were disappointed; but only two days after the wedding, Lawrence, perhaps unwittingly, allowed Marsh to make tangible expression of his regret. He wrote not to McLeod but to Marsh asking for the loan of Hardy books for his new work:

Have you got Lascelles Abercrombie's book on Thomas Hardy; and if so, could you lend it me for the space of, say, six weeks; and if so, do you mind if I scribble notes in it? And if you've got any of those little pocket edition Hardy's, will you lend me those too . . . I am going to write a little book on Hardy's people. I think it will interest me. We are going to Ireland at the end of this month. I shall do it there . . . We had Campbell and Murry as witnesses at the marriage. I wish you'd been there.⁶

Marsh responded with characteristic generosity: as a belated wedding gift he sent Lawrence the complete works of Hardy and also Abercrombie's *Thomas Hardy: A Critical Study* (1912). Lawrence wrote to Marsh straight away expressing his embarrassed jubilation, adding: 'If my book – a tiny book – on Hardy comes off and pleases me, and you would like it, I dedicate it to you with a fanfare of trumpets. Thank you a million times.'⁷ The materials he needed for his 'tiny book' were thus easily assembled and in accordance with his plan Lawrence must have begun his reading at once.

⁴ Information from A. A. C. Bierrum, a director of James Nisbet & Co. Nisbet's records were destroyed during the Second World War.

⁵ *Letters*, ii. 194. McLeod constantly lent and gave books to DHL.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ii. 198.

⁷ *Ibid.*, ii. 199–200. DHL's copy of Abercrombie, with autograph annotations, is at UT. The edition of Hardy's works is not known, but would probably be a set of the 1912 Wessex edition. See Christopher Hassall, *Edward Marsh* (1959), p. 288.

His request for Abercrombie's critical study suggests that he held that book in particular regard. It is the only book about Hardy that he is known to have read in preparing his own. He had read it first more than a year before, and later had met Abercrombie when he visited Fiascherino. '[He] is sharp', Lawrence wrote of him, 'he is much more *intellectual* than I had imagined: keener, more sharp-minded. I shall enjoy talking to him.'⁸ Lawrence, while often in disagreement, nevertheless found a stimulus in Abercrombie's 'intellectual' reading of Hardy, and the book seems to have acted as a spring-board for his own intuitive interpretation. Meanwhile, (apart from a good deal of work on the proofs in October) Lawrence had for the moment completed his collection of stories which was to appear in November as *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*. He sent the last story to Edward Garnett, his old friend and mentor at Duckworth's on 17 July, and in his letter he mentioned the Hardy commission: 'I *wonder* what sort of a mess I shall make of it. However it doesn't very much matter.'⁹ In this apparently light-hearted spirit Lawrence embarked on his re-reading of Hardy and Abercrombie.

In less than three weeks, however, Britain was at war. On 8 August Lawrence returned to London to find that his visit to Ireland could not take place, and, more seriously, his return to Italy before the winter was now totally out of the question. A further blow came when Methuen returned the manuscript of *The Rainbow*, refusing to publish it at present: they were postponing new publications, but may also have expressed concern to Pinker about some scenes in Lawrence's novel (which Pinker would later have passed on).¹⁰ To his agent, Pinker, on 10 August, Lawrence lamented his impecunious state: 'I am wondering how I am going to get on. We can't go back to Italy as things stand, and I must look for somewhere to live.'¹¹

The Lawrences left the Campbells' house in South Kensington, and by 16 August were installed in a farm-labourer's cottage, 'The Triangle', near Chesham in Buckinghamshire. With bleak financial prospects before them they settled in.¹² In these changed circumstances Lawrence continued his reading of Hardy. The little book for Nisbet and the forthcoming volume of short stories for Duckworth now seemed his only literary and financial hopes;¹³

⁸ *Letters*, ii. 120.

⁹ *Ibid.*, ii. 199.

¹⁰ Methuen later stated that their objection was on grounds of indecency, but most publishers returned unedited manuscripts at the start of the war.

¹¹ *Letters*, ii. 206-7.

¹² See *ibid.*, ii. 208-10.

¹³ He had an article 'With the Guns' published in the *Manchester Guardian*, 18 August 1914 (reprinted *Encounter*, August 1969, 5-6) and received gifts from friends like Marsh (see *Letters*, ii. 211). In October he received a grant for £50 from the Royal Literary Fund (see *ibid.*, ii. 223-4).

he does not appear to have contemplated immediate revision of *The Rainbow*.

On 5 September, after a further complaint to Pinker about money – ‘I can last out here only another month – then I don’t know where to raise a penny, for nobody will pay me’ – in a sudden outburst, he wrote: ‘What a miserable world. What colossal idiocy, this war. Out of sheer rage I’ve begun my book about Thomas Hardy. It will be about anything but Thomas Hardy I am afraid – queer stuff – but not bad.’¹⁴ Throughout September Lawrence seems to have devoted himself exclusively to writing the first draft. He makes no reference to any other creative work. On 15 September he asked Pinker: ‘If I am very badly off will you type it for me?’¹⁵ In the event Lawrence’s new friend S. S. Kotliansky offered to do it himself free.

On a walking tour of the Lake district at the end of July, Lawrence had met Samuel Solomonovich Kotliansky (‘Kot’), a Russian-Jewish emigré about three years his senior. Kot had come to England as a student of economics, and, because of Russian secret police interest in him, had decided to stay on in London, where he now worked as a secretary and translator in the Russian Law Bureau in High Holborn. He took to Lawrence immediately and became a devoted and life-long friend.¹⁶

It was at the beginning of October 1914 that Kotliansky made his offer to type Lawrence’s manuscript. Lawrence took up the offer enthusiastically, writing on 5 October:

Will you really type-write me my book – which is supposed to be about Thomas Hardy, but which seems to be about anything else in the world but that. I have done about 50 pages – re-written them. I must get it typed somehow or other. Don’t do it if it is any trouble – or if it is much trouble, for it is sure to be some. I should like a duplicate copy also.¹⁷

Kot must have agreed at once. He visited the Lawrences on the following Sunday, 11 October, and probably took the first batch of manuscript back to London with him the same day.¹⁸

Thus Lawrence had written a first draft and then rewritten some fifty pages of it in the space of little more than a month. Despite his assessment of its contents as ‘queer’ or ‘rum stuff’ and not very much about Hardy, he still appeared optimistic about submitting it to Nisbet for he wrote to Garnett in mid-October: ‘I have been writing my book more or less – very much

¹⁴ *Letters*, ii. 212.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, ii. 216.

¹⁶ Kotliansky was to make a modest literary reputation as a translator of Russian writers – among them, Chekhov, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. He worked always with collaborators, including DHL himself and Katherine Mansfield.

¹⁷ *Letters*, ii. 220.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, ii. 221.

less – about Thomas Hardy. I have done a third of it. When this much is typed I shall send it to Bertram Christian.’¹⁹ But in fact he had already signalled to himself the altered nature of the book by entitling his manuscript not ‘Thomas Hardy’ but ‘Le Gai Savaire’.²⁰ On 31 October he sent a further parcel of manuscript to Kot for typing, but whether he sent the first part of the typescript either to Pinker, as he had at first promised, or to Christian as he later intended, is not known but both seem unlikely.²¹ During November, as the work was nearing completion, Lawrence confided in Amy Lowell, the American poet and writer whom he had met in London on the eve of the war: ‘I am just finishing a book, supposed to be on Thomas Hardy, but in reality a sort of Confessions of my Heart. I wonder if ever it will come out – and what you’d say to it.’²² From this it might be inferred that Christian or Pinker had seen part of the work and been discouraging. On the other hand, on 3 December he urged Koteliansky: ‘Do please get my typing done. If I can send it in, I may get a little money for it.’²³ It remains uncertain at what point the Nisbet proposal was abandoned, and whether Pinker was inclined to try other publishers. Catherine Carswell, one of Lawrence’s early biographers, states clearly that the book represented a commission that failed to please, and adds, but without supporting evidence, that the book was ‘everywhere rejected at the time’.²⁴

On 5 December, Lawrence despatched ‘the last of the MS’ for typing.²⁵ By this time he had already advanced ‘the first hundred or so pages’ into a rewriting of *The Rainbow* and sent them to Pinker.²⁶ This was no mere revision to meet Methuen’s scruples, but a reconsideration and a thorough rewriting of the novel. With the experience of extensive revisions to the stories for *The Prussian Officer* volume²⁷ and of the ‘Hardy’ book, he approached the task with new insight and an extraordinary release of creative energy. ‘It is a beautiful piece of work, really. It will be, when I have finished it: the body of it is so now’, he told Pinker. He was working ‘*frightfully hard*’ at it, and it would occupy him almost exclusively until March 1915.²⁸

It was the working out of his philosophy, nourished by, and also stimulating his imaginative reading of Hardy, which gave Lawrence not only the impetus he needed to rework *The Rainbow*, but a clearer metaphysical structure which would ‘subserve the artistic purpose’. In the conclusion of ‘Hardy’ Lawrence

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, ii. 212, 216, 222.

²⁰ DHL’s French: ‘The Gay Science’. See below ‘The Title’ and Explanatory note on 7:2.

²¹ *Letters*, ii. 228, 216, 222.

²² *Ibid.*, ii. 235. See note 30 below.

²³ *Ibid.*, ii. 239.

²⁴ In the *Spectator* (27 November 1936), 960 and Carswell 27.

²⁵ *Letters*, ii. 239.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, ii. 240.

²⁷ See *The Prussian Officer and Other Stories*, ed. John Worthen (Cambridge, 1983), pp. xxx–xxxii.

²⁸ *Letters*, ii. 240, 239.

is virtually challenging himself to produce a novel in which the spirit of his knowledge and the body of his artistic purpose are reconciled: 'equal, two-in-one, complete. This is the supreme art, which yet remains to be done. Some men have attempted it . . . But it remains to be fully done.'²⁹

But in giving his principal attention to *The Rainbow* in December 1914 he neither abandoned nor forgot his 'Hardy'. Even while Kot was typing the final pages, and although possible publication seemed more and more remote, Lawrence wrote again to Amy Lowell on 18 December: 'My wife and I we type away at my book on Thomas Hardy, which has turned out as a sort of *Story of My Heart*: or a *Confessio Fidei*: which I must write again, still another time'.³⁰ But this effort, like his attempt to type his revision of *The Rainbow*, was probably short-lived.³¹ In any case it was over three months before he was free enough to concentrate on the rewriting, and by then he had abandoned altogether the idea of it as a book on Hardy. If he called the existing state of the book a 'confessio fidei', and referred to it as 'mostly philosophicalish, slightly about Hardy',³² the new version was to be unambiguously 'my "philosophy"'.³³ Lawrence's attempts to rewrite this philosophy into a definitive form were to occupy him from time to time for more than three years.

Lawrence's Philosophy

Lawrence's first attempt to set down his distinctive philosophy had been made nearly two years before 'Hardy'. In January 1913, on completion of *Sons and Lovers*, he wrote a 'Foreword' for the novel, insisting that it was a personal exercise – like 'Hardy' a 'confessio fidei' – and not for publication.³⁴ In it he set down his intuitive philosophy of the relation between Male and Female, man and woman in the act of creation. As its original sub-title – 'Of the Trinity, the Three-in-One' – suggests, the philosophy is worked out through Lawrence's heterodox versions of the Christian theology of Creation, Incarnation and Trinity. These, familiar to the reader of 'Hardy', offer

²⁹ See 91:37–8, 128:12–15.

³⁰ *Letters*, ii. 243. DHL's reference to Richard Jefferies' *Story of My Heart* (1883) is probably more general than specific. Cf. Explanatory note on 114:19. For DHL's view of Jefferies' book see *Letters*, i. 337, 353. The reference to typing may have been to indicate to Amy Lowell that her gift of a typewriter was being put to use. Whatever he and Frieda typed of this rewritten version no longer survives.

³¹ *Letters*, ii. 240. (DHL typed only the first seven pages of his revised *Rainbow*.)

³² *Ibid.*, ii. 292.

³³ *Ibid.*, ii. 309; see also p. 307.

³⁴ See *ibid.*, i. 507. The 'Foreword' is inaccurately printed in *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Aldous Huxley (1932), pp. 95–102. The quotations which follow are from DHL's MS (Roberts E373.1; UT).

probably the most strikingly idiosyncratic feature of his philosophy in this period, 1913–15.

The 'Foreword' opens, for instance, with a text from St John 'the beloved disciple': 'The Word was made Flesh', but the orthodoxy is immediately reversed: 'The Flesh was made Word'. God the Father, Lawrence asserts, is the Flesh, and we know the flesh as Woman; Woman, the Flesh, gives birth to Man, who in due time utters the Word. Woman or Flesh is the source of our instinctive or blood-knowledge. The Son, Man, constantly moves out, like a bee, from the Queen, Woman, to his work of conscious or intellectual endeavour, and back to her again for renewal.

God expels forth to waste himself in utterance, in work, which is only God the Father realising himself in a moment of forgetfulness . . . For every petalled flower, which alone is a Flower, is a waste of productiveness. It is a moment of joy, of saying 'I am I.' And every table or chair a man makes is a self same waste of his life, a fixing into stiffness and deadness of a moment of himself, for the sake of the glad cry 'This is I – I am I!' And this glad cry when we know, is the Holy Ghost the Comforter.

This central perception is extensively developed in 'Hardy', twenty months later. Its fundamental tenet that human life is properly seen as of the same order as nature, imaged in the flower, governs the parable of the poppy from which the philosophy of 'Hardy' emerges. It is related to that 'inhuman' quality in human life – the quality of being, rather than knowing – which Lawrence emphasized in letters to Edward Garnett and to Ernest Collings in 1913 and 1914.

To Collings, an artist and illustrator, he wrote of his conception of the body as a flame, the intellect being the light shed on surrounding things:

I am not so much concerned with the things around . . . but with the mystery of the flame forever flowing . . . and being *itself*. . . We have got so ridiculously mindful, that we never know that we ourselves are anything . . . We cannot *be*. 'To be or not to be' – it is the question with us now, by Jove. And nearly every Englishman says 'Not to be.' So he goes in for Humanitarianism and such like forms of not-being. The real way of living is to answer to one's wants . . . Instead of that, all these wants . . . are utterly ignored, and we talk about some sort of ideas.³⁵

His 'theology', especially when transposed into these secular terms, gave Lawrence a basis for social and literary criticism which he developed far in 'Hardy'. At the same time to see human life in terms of non-human 'life' was what Lawrence was attempting in his own art: 'that which is physic – non-human, in humanity, is more interesting to me than the old-fashioned human

³⁵ *Letters*, i. 503–4.

element – which causes one to conceive a character in a certain moral scheme and make him consistent'.³⁶ In this famous letter of June 1914 to Edward Garnett in which he defended *The Rainbow*, Lawrence shows the immediate influence of his recent critical reading of the Italian Futurists – Marinetti, Buzzi and Soffici.³⁷ For Lawrence the Futurists were instinctively right in breaking with stultifying traditions and an outworn civilisation in order to make 'modern life' the stuff of their art. But they went too far. The art of the Futurists, he said, betrays their over-insistence on intellect (the Word, the Son, the male line); it is scientific, dehumanised. Indeed, their works are diagrams and mechanisms, not art. Only when the intellect, the male, is properly balanced with the flesh, the female, is there truly living and incorporated art, he asserted.

This conception of marriage between Flesh and Word, Woman and Man, was to Lawrence both symbol and fact. It gave him a doctrine with which to interpret and criticise art – his own and others' – and on which to base his own writing. At the same time it was inseparable from the central fact in his life. Thus he records, sometimes to the mystification of his readers, two aspects of his experience: the struggle to 'get right' his art and his relationship, finally his marriage, with Frieda. To McLeod he confessed:

I think the only re-sourcing of art, re-vivifying it, is to make it more the joint work of man and woman. I think *the* one thing to do, is for men to have courage to draw nearer to women, expose themselves to them, and be altered by them: and for women to accept and admit men. That is the only way for art and civilisation to get a new life, a new start – by bringing themselves together, men and women – revealing themselves each to the other, gaining great blind knowledge and suffering and joy, which it will take a big further lapse of civilisation to exploit and work out. Because the source of all

³⁶ Ibid., ii. 182; see pp. 182–3.

³⁷ Filippo Tommaso Marinetti (1876–1944), Italian writer and critic, launched Futurism in his 'Manifeste du futurisme' in *Le Figaro* (Paris, February 1909). Paolo Buzzi (1874–1956), Italian poet and editor of *I Poeti Futuristi* (Milan, 1912) which DHL read. It contained essays by Marinetti and Buzzi as well as poems in Italian and French. Ardengo Soffici (1879–1964), an Italian painter, author of *Cubismo e Futurismo* (Florence, 1914) which DHL read also. See *Letters*, ii. 180–3, and Paul Eggert, 'Identification of Lawrence's Futurist Reading', *Notes and Queries* (August 1982), 342–4.

Futurism announced a revolutionary break with the past and with artistic tradition. It asserted that 'modern life is the only source of inspiration for a modern artist', especially its characteristics of energy, speed and mechanical power. Art must therefore be dynamic. It must be free from tradition and from the dead weight of academicism; artistic emotion must be taken 'back to its physical and spontaneous source – *Nature* – from which anything philosophical or intellectual would tend to alienate it.' A work of art cannot be static, its subject isolated; it must be dynamic and reach outwards in widening circles or spheres towards an expression of the 'universal dynamism'. See *Futurist Manifestos*, ed. Umbro Apollonio (1973), pp. 110, 122.

life and knowledge is in man and woman, and the source of all living is in the interchange and the meeting and mingling of these two: man-life and woman-life, man knowledge and woman-knowledge, man-being and woman-being.³⁸

The letters to Garnett and McLeod were written just as he finished the version of *The Rainbow* which Methuen was to reject, and just before he began work on the final form of his *Prussian Officer* stories. Despite his spirited defence of his novel against Garnett's criticism that 'the psychology is wrong', there is a suggestion that the criticism and his own developing philosophy together confirmed a barely recognised sense that the 'hitherto unachieved' utterance in the novel was not yet achieved. Instead, he became involved, apparently tangentially, with his 'little book' on Hardy, which in the outcome necessarily contained more of his own philosophy than criticism of Hardy. The rejection of the novel and the challenge of the Futurists and others, seem to have confirmed his instinctive sense that his philosophy must be clear before his novel could be got right.

His typically personal readings of the novels of Thomas Hardy helped greatly. The interpretations of the characters and relationships particularly in the great novels, *The Return of the Native*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*, recorded in the Hardy book, while always either exciting or infuriating for the reader of Hardy, are most remarkable in the end as demonstrations of Lawrence's own approach to characterisation and the relationships between men and women. This appears to have been his aim: to lay down a philosophy of character and relationships in terms of the fundamental, opposed and opposing forces which, he asserted, underlie all life; a philosophy which had been growing steadily from his 'Foreword to *Sons and Lovers*'.

But Lawrence was also concerned with a more specific problem: the proper relation between an artist's metaphysic or philosophy and its embodiment in the work of art itself, a problem exemplified by the imbalance which, he asserted, marred both Tolstoy's and Hardy's novels. One immediate spur to his thought in this direction must have been Abercrombie's *Thomas Hardy* where the argument centred on that very question. He wrote:

The highest art must have a metaphysic; the final satisfaction of man's creative desire is only to be found in aesthetic formation of some credible correspondence between perceived existence and a conceived absoluteness of reality. Only in such art will the desire be employed to the uttermost; only in such art, therefore, will conscious mastery seem complete. And Thomas Hardy, by deliberately putting the art of his fiction under the control of a metaphysic, has thereby made the novel capable of the highest service to man's consciousness . . .

³⁸ *Letters*, ii. 181.

For if the metaphysic be there at all, it must be altogether in control . . . The metaphysic will be something (as it is in Hardy's work) which can only be expressed by the *whole* of the art which contains it . . . There are no novels like Thomas Hardy's for perfection of form; and this is the sign of the inward perfection . . . Mr. Hardy's metaphysic is . . . tragical . . . for who knows better than he how the senseless process of the world for ever contradicts the human will?³⁹

When Lawrence first read this in 1913, he considered Abercrombie's claim that Hardy put his art 'under the control of a metaphysic', 'beautifully said'.⁴⁰ On re-reading he had found much to disagree with: he found Hardy deficient as a metaphysician. Hardy's conscious metaphysic, he said, 'is almost silly', and when he allows it to assume control, when he forces events into line with it, 'his form is execrable in the extreme'.⁴¹ Abercrombie had found the highest statement of Hardy's tragic metaphysic in *The Dynasts*, and made large claims for that work as 'one of the most momentous achievements of modern literature'.⁴² Lawrence read his chapter on *The Dynasts* with attention, as his notes on the end papers of his copy testify;⁴³ but he vigorously rejected Hardy's 'sense of the purposelessness in the scheme of things', the 'habit of the immanent Will', just as he rejected 'a good deal of the *Dynasts* conception' itself as 'sheer rubbish, fatuity'.⁴⁴

Lawrence even called in question the tragic status of Hardy's work, if by tragedy was meant the vision of an Aeschylus or Euripides. Hardy's characters, he asserted, do not struggle against the great ordinances of life and fate: they are merely at odds with the laws and opinions of a society to which, in the end, they submit.

In his reaction, Lawrence stressed in his own way an element which Abercrombie had considered secondary: Hardy showed a greater and deeper feeling, instinct, and sensuous understanding than 'that perhaps of any other English novelist'. What Lawrence concluded from his reading of Hardy and his study of Abercrombie was that Hardy's tragic metaphysic was pessimistic, perverse and untrue because it was at odds with the affirmation of his

³⁹ Abercrombie 19–20, 22, 20–1.

⁴⁰ *Letters*, i. 544.

⁴¹ See 93:4–13.

⁴² Abercrombie 225.

⁴³ The most connected notes are the last four which refer to passages in the chapter on *The Dynasts* concerned with Hardy's metaphysic. DHL wrote:

p. 200 the sense of purposelessness in the scheme of things

p. 202 – man's enjoyment of that which goes counter to his idea of rightness.

p. 209 The habit of the immanent Will is all that remains – so the habit in the human soul – break the habit and the Will is free 'rapt aesthetic rote'

That feeling is something apart from the Will

213 The human intelligence sees itself separate from the Will, raptly magnipotent – it would have a separate will

⁴⁴ See 93:6–7.

'sensuous understanding'.⁴⁵ Consequently the art which that metaphysic controlled was deeply flawed. Abercrombie nevertheless had thrown him back to the problem which he knew only too well from his own recent experience he must solve if his own art was to succeed. He ruefully reflected:

It is the novelists and dramatists who have the hardest task in reconciling their metaphysic, their theory of being and knowing, with their living sense of being. Because a novel is a microcosm, and because man in viewing the universe must view it in the light of a theory, therefore every novel must have the background or the structural skeleton of some theory of being, some metaphysic. But the metaphysic must always subserve the artistic purpose beyond the artist's conscious aim. Otherwise the novel becomes a treatise.⁴⁶

And, he might have added, the resulting form of the novel will appear imposed or contrived, rather than a natural flowering.

This disagreement with Abercrombie and Hardy may well have been the starting point for Lawrence's 'Hardy', even though it is expressed overtly only in chapter IX. But the overriding consideration was to set down his 'confessio fidei': his rejected novel, a world at war and bleak prospects even for subsistence made this only more pressing if his art and therefore his life as a writer were to progress. He must ascertain his own 'theory of being and knowing' and reconcile it with his 'living sense of being'.⁴⁷ Hardy had been important in this process, but could be pushed almost to the periphery of the work, certainly away from the centre. Lawrence soon signified this change of intention by his new title 'Le Gai Savaire' – at the head of the copy Kot was to type.

Hardy had therefore been the catalyst for Lawrence's philosophy. His diagnosis of Hardy gave him confidence in the power and the truth of his doctrine of the Law and Love, of Flesh and Word, of Being and Knowing. In his reading of Hardy it was as if he allowed Hardy to read him in turn, and he emerged from the experience with his earlier insights strengthened and clarified to the point where he could see how *The Rainbow* 'missed being itself' and what that true self must be. His joyful philosophy provided the 'structural skeleton' he needed; and in December 1914 he could say with joy of *The Rainbow*: 'It is a beautiful piece of work'. But to the extent that it was still 'slightly about Hardy', the philosophy needed to be written over again.⁴⁸

The final rewriting of *The Rainbow* was not completed until the beginning of March 1915; but Lawrence already was planning the new version of his philosophy. He had begun rethinking it even in December 1914. Early in

⁴⁵ See 93:14–16.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ See 91:31–9.

⁴⁸ *Letters*, ii. 146, 240, 292; see 91:35–7.

1915 he set down a new proposal which shows the influence of his 'pet scheme' for an ideal community to be called Rananim:⁴⁹

The book I wrote – mostly philosophicalish, slightly about Hardy – I want to re-write and publish in pamphlets. We must create an idea of a new, freer life, where men and women can really meet on natural terms, instead of being barred within so many barriers. And if the money spirit is killed, and eating and sleeping is free, then most of the barriers will collapse. Something must be done, and we must begin soon.⁵⁰

Nothing of this proposed new version of his philosophy survives, so that it is impossible to do more than guess at its content. What is fundamentally different is the purpose of the work. No longer a criticism of Hardy, an artist's metaphysic or a personal 'story of my heart', nor even some amalgam of these, it is conceived as a fervent public call to 'new life', born out of a sense that 'something must be done', that a revolution must take place.

Throughout 1915 Lawrence made several frustrated attempts to rewrite 'Le Gai Savaire'. Nothing substantial of these attempts survives, but it is clear that towards mid-1915 he abandoned for the time being his 'Christian' theology: 'I shall write all my philosophy again. Last time I came out of the Christian Camp.'⁵¹ One reason for this change was the influence of Bertrand Russell whom he had first met in February and with whom later he proposed to give public lectures – 'he on Ethics, I on Immortality'.⁵² By October 1915 he had written the six essays of 'The Crown'. Three of them were published in a little magazine *The Signature* devised and produced by himself and Middleton Murry, with Koteliensky as business manager,⁵³ but this public call to a new life in the midst of the horror of the First World War itself foundered for lack of support. Wise after the event, Lawrence reflected on this failure when he revised 'The Crown' for publication in a later work in 1925:

I knew then, and I know now, it is no use trying to do anything – I speak only for myself – publicly. It is no use trying merely to modify present forms. The whole great form of

⁴⁹ See *Letters*, ii. 259. For the name see *ibid.*, ii. 252 and n. 3.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, ii. 292–3.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, ii. 367. Some of this rewriting may have found its way into *Twilight in Italy*. See P. R. Eggert, 'The Subjective Art of D. H. Lawrence: *Twilight in Italy*' (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Kent at Canterbury, 1981).

⁵² *Letters*, ii. 359. DHL's lectures were never given and probably not written as such. Russell's revised lectures were given in January–March 1916 (published as *Principles of Social Reconstruction*). Russell suggested that DHL read John Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy* (Edinburgh, 1892) and this changed the direction of his philosophy.

⁵³ Three issues of *Signature* appeared (4 and 18 October and 1 November 1915) with an essay from 'The Crown' in each. The public (only about fifty subscribers) was baffled by DHL's philosophy, Murry and Mansfield withdrew their support and DHL's attempt at 'action' was at an end.

our era will have to go. And nothing will really send it down but the new shoots of life springing up and slowly bursting the foundations.⁵⁴

As the last sentence, so close to the heart of Lawrence's philosophy, suggests, public failure was not the end of his personal endeavour. In January 1916, he began his philosophy for the fifth time: 'It's come at last. I am satisfied, and as sure as a lark in the sky.'⁵⁵ But this version entitled 'Goats and Compasses' was abandoned during 1916, and the manuscript destroyed.⁵⁶ By September 1917 yet another version was complete entitled 'At the Gates', and this time the manuscript was sent to Pinker in whose hands it remained until 1920.⁵⁷ It has since disappeared, so that the final definitive version of a work which began with the book on Hardy is unknown. It would be a book of about 140 pages, he told Pinker, 'based upon the more superficial "Reality of Peace"'.⁵⁸ Four of the essays from the 'Reality of Peace' series were written, published by the *English Review*, in 1917, and are the last surviving testimony to this phase of Lawrence's philosophy.⁵⁹ At what was for the moment the end of his long struggle with his metaphysics, he recalled Koteliensky's help and advice at the beginning in 1914:

I have written into its final form that philosophy which you once painfully and laboriously typed out, when we were in Bucks, and you were in the Bureau. I always remember you said 'Yes, but you will write it again'. – I have written it four times since then. Now it is done: even it is in the hands of my friend Pinker. But I have no fear that anybody will publish it.⁶⁰

The text and its transmission

Neither Lawrence's first draft nor his rewritten manuscript, from which Koteliensky typed 'Hardy', has survived. Of the three typescript versions extant, two – designated TS (Roberts E384a) and TCC (Roberts E384b) – are relevant to this edition. The third is an agent's copy in duplicate of TCC.⁶¹

⁵⁴ Note to revised version of 'The Crown' in *Reflections on the Death of a Porcupine* (Philadelphia, 1925); reprinted in *Phoenix II* 364.

⁵⁵ *Letters*, ii. 504.

⁵⁶ For accounts of this phase of the philosophy see Emile Delavenay, *D. H. Lawrence: The Man and His Work: The Formative Years, 1885–1919* (1972), pp. 388, 450ff., and Paul Delany, *D. H. Lawrence's Nightmare* (Hassocks, Sussex: 1979), chaps. v and vii.

⁵⁷ *Letters*, iii. 163, 453 and 472 n. 2.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, iii. 152, 155.

⁵⁹ May, June, July and August 1917 (reprinted in *Phoenix* 669–694).

⁶⁰ *Letters*, iii. 163.

⁶¹ This typescript appears to have been made hastily by two typists. Corrections and page references confirm that it is a copy of TCC, not an independent version of TS. English watermarks on the paper show that it was made in London. When copies were needed for London and New York publishers, Curtis Brown presumably had these additional copies made. The carbon copy is uncorrected. Both copies are at UT (Roberts E384c and d).

TS is Kot's typing of Lawrence's manuscript. Since it is the only source for the work, some account of its nature and history is appropriate. It is entitled simply 'Le Gai Savaire' with no reference to Hardy. It contains 186 pages, of which the first 88 are on cartridge paper, the remainder on lightweight paper watermarked Silver Linen; there are no corrections in Lawrence's hand. Pages 1–86 are carbon copy, 87–186 are ribbon copy. Lawrence required Kot to type his manuscript in duplicate, and some months later, when asking him to type a later version of his philosophy (now lost), he specifically requested Silver Linen paper.⁶² This, together with the amateur quality of the typing, is the primary evidence for TS being Kot's work: it is clearly not Lawrence's or Frieda's typing (see footnote 30). What became of the second composite copy of TS is not known: Lawrence probably destroyed it.

TS has survived, despite Lawrence's failure to find a publisher and his several attempts to rewrite the book in different form, because he gave it to John Middleton Murry 'for safe keeping' at some time during the war years.⁶³ On Lawrence's death in March 1930 Murry handed the typescript along with others in his possession to Laurence Pollinger of Curtis Brown, Lawrence's agent in London.⁶⁴ Pollinger had it copied in duplicate and then deposited TS in a bank. After Frieda's legal entitlement to Lawrence's manuscripts was established, TS passed to her.⁶⁵

There is further evidence to support the authenticity of TS. Lawrence's letters to Kot indicate that he sent the manuscript for typing in three batches. The despatch dates and the estimated size of the batches of manuscript can be related to significant breaks in the typescript: pages 1–50 (manuscript sent 11 October); '50 *bis*'–86 (sent 31 October); 87–186 (sent 5 December).⁶⁶ Page 50 breaks off after 20 lines, page 86 after only 4 lines of type.

Kot was not a trained typist: 'I cannot type, and never could,' he told a correspondent in 1948.⁶⁷ The typescript contains a large number of errors; there are omissions, gaps and obvious misreadings of Lawrence's manuscript. On the other hand, since the manuscript itself may have contained heavy

⁶² *Letters*, ii, 317. The letter, in BL, is on Silver Linen.

⁶³ See 'Publication' below.

⁶⁴ Letters from Laurence Pollinger to Frieda Lawrence and Field, Roscoe, 6 April 1933 in Curtis Brown archives; UT.

⁶⁵ After Frieda's death it was sold to UCB in 1957; documents relating to the sale are also in UCB. TS was exhibited in the Los Angeles Public Library in 1937: see Lawrence Clark Powell, *The Manuscripts of D. H. Lawrence: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Los Angeles, 1937), item 86. (It was not, however, included in Tedlock, *Lawrence MSS*, when Tedlock catalogued the manuscripts in Frieda's possession 1944–8.)

⁶⁶ There are two pages numbered 50; on the second, the pencilled word *bis* follows the numeral. Pages 87–186 have the typed numbers 95–194 but are renumbered in pencil. Mispagination and pencilled emendations are discussed below.

⁶⁷ Letter to Lucy O'Brien, 11 February 1948; BL.

revisions and corrections, it is not surprising that Kot occasionally became confused; in seven places a space is left either because of a lacuna in the manuscript or because a word was illegible. Two larger breaks in the typescript more seriously affect the transmission of Lawrence's text. Page 57 is missing which means that a passage of more than 300 words is lacking in chapter v. On page 181, in chapter x, there is a gap of five lines between "Thou shalt love thy enemy" and "Therefore, since by the law . . ." (see 124:39-40), and the latter is not indented. The considerable sense break in the text and the lack of indentation together suggest some missing manuscript, possibly a whole page.

Some light is shed on the evolution of the work from the chapter divisions and numberings in TS. While the chapters are in the same order as in the printed text, TS numbers them as follows: I (in two sections, only the second of which is numbered), II, III, III, V, V, IV, VIII, IX (in two sections, only the second of which is numbered), XII. In the seventh chapter (numbered IV), a misnumbering of pages begins: 87, the beginning of the third batch of typing, is numbered 95, and this misnumbering continues to the end. Since it can be assumed that Kot copied Lawrence's manuscript accurately, something of the original plan for the book can be inferred.

Lawrence said in October 1914 that he had already rewritten the first quarter of the book, and it was 'less - very much less' about Thomas Hardy. The chapter numbering of TS suggests that this early part of the first draft may have been even less about Hardy than the revised manuscript. Since the final chapter bore the number XII when Kot typed it, it is possible that the first draft contained twelve chapters, or, at least, that twelve were planned.⁶⁸ It seems that the sequence of chapters was different in the draft, and that the revision involved rearrangement (as well as rewriting and new material). Lawrence records no details of his rewriting, so the following account is based on evidence in TS.

He probably began with four chapters - here called 1-4 - where 1 and 2 represented something like the present chapters 1 and II, and 3 was the present IV (which, with whatever revisions Lawrence had made, reached Kot with its number unchanged, hence the second 'III' in TS) together with most of the present very brief chapter VI. The close connections in the argument between chapters II and IV, and IV and VI, are evident. The principal alteration in revision would then have been the inclusion of the present chapter III (the first 'III' in TS) between the existing 2 and 3. This chapter, 'Containing Six Novels and the Real Tragedy', can be read as an interpolation in the

⁶⁸ If the two sections of chaps. 1 and IX are counted, there are twelve.