



The Living Whole: A Critical Study of D. H. Lawrence's "*Why the Novel Matters*"

Dr. Shahin Parween

Assistant Professor

Department of English,

Marwari College, Ranchi, India

Abstract

This paper critically examines D. H. Lawrence's essay "Why the Novel Matters," with particular attention to his conception of the novel as a form capable of representing the wholeness and vitality of human life. Lawrence values the novel because it presents the human being not as an abstract soul, mind, body, or moral type, but as a living and changing whole. His argument therefore challenges the partial perspectives of science, philosophy, religious preaching, and rigid moral judgement. The paper also evaluates Lawrence's provocative claim that the novelist is superior to the scientist, philosopher, preacher, and poet. Although this claim effectively emphasises the novel's comprehensive vision, it is rhetorically excessive, since poetry and other disciplines can also illuminate important dimensions of human existence. Lawrence's suspicion of metaphysical and doctrinal absolutes may similarly restrict the breadth of his position. Nevertheless, his insistence on the complexity, mutability, and moral ambiguity of living individuals provides a powerful defence of the novel as an inclusive representation of life.

Article History:

Received 20 Nov. 2017

Accepted 23 Dec. 2017

Available online 31 Dec.

Keywords:

D. H. Lawrence,
Living wholeness,
Vitality,
Moral complexity,
Literary form

Introduction

The novel matters because its flexible form can do more than entertain or narrate events: it can engage emotion, represent social worlds, and accommodate varied forms of human experience (MacKay 1–15). In "Why the Novel Matters," D. H. Lawrence grounds this value in one fundamental fact: the human being is alive. He rejects accounts that identify the person solely with the soul, body, mind, consciousness, or another isolated faculty, insisting instead that "the whole is greater than the part" (Lawrence 193–95). For



Lawrence, life itself is the primary reality, and the novel is valuable because it can render the energy, movement, contradiction, and immediacy of living existence. Hugh Stevens accordingly describes Lawrence's theory as organicist: the novel should resist the fragmenting abstractions of modernity and represent the world in its complexity (137–50). Lawrence's defence of the novel is therefore not merely a claim about one literary genre; it is also a challenge to systems that reduce the human person to a fixed idea, an isolated faculty, or an abstract category.

The Novel as the “Bright Book of Life”

Lawrence famously calls the novel “the one bright book of life” and argues that it can make “the whole man alive tremble” (195). The brightness of the novel does not depend on its presenting only pleasant or optimistic experiences. A novel may depict suffering, conflict, failure, and the darker aspects of human conduct without becoming lifeless or spiritually barren. Its brightness arises from the vitality with which it represents life in its fullness. The novelist's task is therefore to communicate the energy, joy, pain, uncertainty, and vivacity of human existence rather than to impose a rigid theory upon it (Lawrence 195–96).

This emphasis on life enables the novel to present the human being as an integrated whole. A person cannot be adequately understood through the body alone, through the intellect alone, or through a single moral label. Human beings are shaped by changing desires, relationships, impulses, memories, and circumstances. The novel can hold these elements together and reveal how they interact. In this sense, its truth is dynamic rather than fixed: it shows individuals in the process of living and changing (Lawrence 193–97). Joan Douglas Peters observes that Lawrence's genre theory repeatedly connects literary value with the relation between parts and wholes, a pattern that clarifies why he privileges the novel's capacity to hold apparently incongruous elements together (36–51).

The Novelist and Other Forms of Knowledge

Lawrence strengthens his defence of the novel by claiming that the novelist is superior to the saint, scientist, philosopher, and poet, each of whom, in his view, masters only a particular “bit” of the living person (195). The force of this claim lies in his belief that these figures often approach human life partially. Scientific inquiry may isolate particular structures and processes; philosophy may organise experience into abstract concepts; and religious preaching may direct attention towards the soul, salvation, reward, punishment, or the afterlife. By contrast, the novelist can represent the living person before such divisions are imposed. Stevens relates this opposition to Lawrence's resistance to rational and scientific dualisms that separate the self from the body, nature, and the surrounding world (137–50).

This contrast helps Lawrence demonstrate the novel's holistic power, but his hierarchy is too absolute. Science, philosophy, and religion have their own purposes and



methods, and each can reveal dimensions of existence that the novel may not explain systematically. Their perspectives are partial, but partiality does not necessarily make them false or inferior. Lawrence's polemical language is most convincing when it warns against treating any single discipline as a complete account of human life. It is less convincing when it appears to dismiss those disciplines altogether.

The Novel and Poetry

Lawrence's attempt to place the novelist above the poet is particularly problematic (195). Poetry, like fiction, can express emotional depth, psychological conflict, sensuous experience, and the complexity of human relationships. A rich poem may possess concentration, depth, and imaginative intensity comparable to those of a novel. The two forms differ in their methods and scale, but they are not diametrically opposed. Both can render life, although they do so through different structures of language and experience.

Accordingly, Lawrence's judgement should be understood as a provocative defence of the novel rather than as a balanced theory of literary genres. Peters reads Lawrence's genre theory as rhetorically paradoxical: its categorical declarations frequently work to unsettle fixed categories rather than to establish a stable hierarchy (36–51). His claim succeeds in drawing attention to the novel's capacity for breadth, multiplicity, and sustained character development, but it does not establish the inferiority of poetry.

Life, Metaphysics, and the Limits of Lawrence's View

Lawrence gives overwhelming importance to present, embodied life and distrusts religious or philosophical systems when they elevate the soul, salvation, heaven, hell, or any fixed absolute above the whole living person (193–97). This position protects the novel from becoming a vehicle for abstract doctrine and insists that literature must remain attentive to actual human experience. Yet Lawrence does not simply exclude sacred or metaphysical writing: he calls the Bible a great novel because, in his interpretation, it is ultimately concerned with "man alive" (195). His primary objection is therefore not to spiritual questions themselves, but to systems that sacrifice the changing individual to an unchanging formula.

At the same time, Lawrence's polemical rejection of absolutes can narrow his vision. Questions about mortality, spiritual meaning, salvation, and existence beyond death have formed a significant part of human experience. A comprehensive novel may legitimately explore such questions, provided that it does not reduce its characters to mere illustrations of doctrine. The problem, therefore, is not the presence of metaphysical thought in fiction, but the loss of living complexity when an abstract belief controls the representation of character.

Moral Complexity and the Representation of Character

One of Lawrence's most persuasive insights is his rejection of absolute moral classification. He declares that there is "no absolute good" and argues that what is right in one case may be wrong in another (196–98). A human being is therefore rarely entirely



good or entirely evil, entirely right or entirely wrong. People act under changing pressures and may display generosity, selfishness, courage, weakness, love, and cruelty at different moments. Lawrence consequently warns that characters who remain good or bad merely “according to pattern” cease to live as convincing fictional beings (197).

This principle is central to the novel’s realism and moral seriousness. By presenting characters in their contradictions, the novel encourages understanding without demanding uncritical approval. It also resists the simplification of human identity into a single judgement. This attention to particular persons and circumstances resembles Martha C. Nussbaum’s account of literary form as a mode of moral perception that cannot be replaced by abstract rules alone (54–105). Lawrence’s emphasis on the living person thus leads to a flexible and humane theory of characterisation.

Conclusion

D. H. Lawrence’s “Why the Novel Matters” offers a passionate defence of the novel as the literary form most capable of presenting the living wholeness of human beings. Its greatest strength lies in the insistence that life cannot be adequately represented through fixed abstractions, isolated faculties, or absolute moral categories. The novel matters because it preserves movement, contradiction, relationship, and change, allowing characters to appear as complex individuals rather than as examples of a theory. Lawrence’s claims become less persuasive when he declares the novelist categorically superior to poets, scientists, philosophers, and preachers, or when his resistance to metaphysical absolutes becomes a broad dismissal of spiritual inquiry. Such arguments narrow a vision that otherwise seeks comprehensiveness. Even so, the central insight of the essay remains compelling: the novel is “the one bright book of life” because it can embrace the fullness of human experience, including its darkness, without reducing the living person to a fixed formula (Lawrence 195).

Works Cited

- Lawrence, D. H. “Why the Novel Matters.” *Study of Thomas Hardy and Other Essays*, edited by Bruce Steele, Cambridge UP, 1985, pp. 193–98.
- MacKay, Marina. *The Cambridge Introduction to the Novel*. Cambridge UP, 2010.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511781544>.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Love’s Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford UP, 1990.
- Peters, Joan Douglas. “Rhetoric as Idea: D. H. Lawrence’s Genre Theory.” *Style*, vol. 34, no. 1, Spring 2000, pp. 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.5325/style.34.1.36>.
- Stevens, Hugh. “D. H. Lawrence: Organicism and the Modernist Novel.” *The Cambridge Companion to the Modernist Novel*, edited by Morag Shiach, Cambridge UP, 2007, pp. 137–50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL052185444X.010>.