

D.H. Lawrence's "Tenderness"

中山本文

Probably it is at the writing of *The Rainbow* that Lawrence began to have more critical conception of mechanism, materialism, and idealism. Here exists the reason why he split *The Wedding Ring* into the two works: *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*. The tragedies of Skrebensky, Gerald, and Clifford mirror the author's irritation against those living unconcernedly in society imbued with established mechanism. That is why we the reader sometimes have a stronger impression in existence from Gerald and Clifford rather than from Birkin and Mellors. Such restiveness of his led him to the creation of the so-called leadership novels: *Aaron's Rod*, *Kangaroo*, and *The Plumed Serpent*. Although his sense of helplessness was intensified against the serious situation under which our life is put, the visit to the Etruscan places inspired him to have a vision of life inherent in us human beings. The life portrayed on pots, urns, vases, or walls of the tombs were filled with vividness and life warmth.

The research efforts here are directed to scrutinizing anew how pessimistically Lawrence looked upon the reality of society and tracing how "tenderness" is described through the characterization of Birkin, Mellors, and Connie.

キーワード : mechanism, materialism, idealism, will, warmth, tenderness

I Introduction

Lawrence published "*A Propos to Lady Chatterley's Lover*" designed to let them know the real intent of the novel because it had too poor popularity among British people. It is a record of his philosophical contemplation, which can be regarded as kind of cosmology, and is beyond just justification of the notorious story. Here is shown the idea underlying all his works, such as novels, poems, paintings, and simultaneously, can be seen the evidence of how much influence *The Sketches of the Etruscan Places* exercised on the creation of *Lady Chatterley*.

The various scenes of their daily life painted on jars or vases or walls of the tombs convinced Lawrence that the Etruscans were possessed of "a religion of life" (56) based on their deep understanding of life. He saw that their naked bodies or dancing, described on the surfaces of the urns, had tenderness of life, thought that "they were always kept *in touch*, physically, with the mysteries" (59), and discerned that their contact was "physical," never intellectual. Here

is something peculiar to him. For Lawrence, the universe was one, consisted of numerous things, and lived as if it was “a single aliveness” (57). He severely criticized the reality that among them, human beings were the only creature who lived, idealizing, abstracting, and spiritualizing life. He imagined the reason was that humans destroyed the circumstances surrounding themselves. All the conflicts of the characters proved how the author struggled to acquire the intrinsic way of life, which is depicted in the various relationships between men and women or men and men, such as Paul and Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*, Ursula and Skrebensky in *The Rainbow*, Birkin and Ursula, Gerald and Gudrun in *Women in Love*, Lilly and Aaron in *Aaron's Rod*, Ramon and Cirpiano, Cipriano and Kate in *The Plumed Serpent*, and the priestess of Isis and the dead man in *The Man Who Died*. He never abandoned the desire for true life all his life. The following is part of “A Propos,” conveying his intention hidden behind the description of repeated sexual contacts:

But relation is threefold. First, there is the relation to the living universe. Then comes the relation of man to woman. Then comes the relation of man to man. And each is a blood-relationship, not mere spirit or mind. We have abstracted the universe into Matter and Force, we have abstracted men and women into separate personalities—personalities being isolated units, incapable of togetherness—so that all three great relationships are bodiless, dead. (331)

This is the way of speech particular to Lawrence, but clearly expresses his view of universe and human life. The statement that our life has lost “togetherness” in relationships, been reduced into “separate personalities,” and become “bodiless” explicates his own view of world the unusually sensitive intellect only possesses which can freely go into and come back from the realm beyond the real world. No other artist is distressed with “separatedness” of personalities than Lawrence. He saw that materialization and mechanization of human life made people idealistic and deprived primordial life of warmth and tenderness. In “Personality” and “Individualism” contained in the essay “Democracy,” Lawrence deplores that life has deteriorated into ideal or abstract one, pointing out that the vivid flow of life has altered into “a fixed, static entity” (711) by repeated use of “the ideal self.” The very impressive and implicit sentence below expounds the implication of the starting sentence “Ours is essentially a tragic age” (5) of *Lady Chatterley*:

... once you generalize and postulate Universals, you have departed from the

creative reality, and entered the realm of static fixity, mechanism, materialism.
(712)

"Tenderness" is the principle he established at the end of his life, which does not mean just soft consideration of being "gentle" or "kind," but something beyond personal feelings. R.W. Emerson often referred to this "tenderness" (594) in his writings, including "Historic Notes of Life and Letters in New England." He is quite close to Lawrence in recognizing it as part of essential quality inherent in human beings. However, Emerson stays at the level of emotion; Lawrence goes into the depth of human existence. There are other critics, such as Eugene Goodheart or Kathryn A. Walterscheid or David Holbrook, who regard "tenderness" as beyond sentimentalism, but their discussion is not deep enough to catch the reality of "tenderness."

The purpose here is to disclose what quality is intended in "tenderness," paying deliberate attention to the realities of present life dramatized in *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

II Gerald Obsessed with Consciousness and Will

Lawrence had increased feelings of crisis that industrialized society of today demanded us individuals to live in the "social" way, not allowing us to live in the "impulsive" or "individual" way. Gerald, representative of those promoting further industrialization, cannot leave the others to exist as personal, independent beings; he cannot regard them as his equivalents. The other personalities exist only to function as his belongings or tools or ornaments. He never pays attention to the fact that they have the same feelings, desires, and passion just as he does; they feel pleasure and sadness. But he, dressed in the clothing of a ruler, judges other people from the outer of them. What matters to him is how faithful they are to themselves, not how they are feeling.

Self-bigoted Gerald is unveiled in the scene where he scuffles with his Arabian mare. He puts a spur on her and mercilessly struggles to make her take into place as he wishes to when she tries to evade the squeaking noise from the locomotive approaching:

The mare opened her mouth and rose slowly, as if lifted up on a wind of terror.

Then suddenly her fore feet struck out, as she convulsed herself utterly away from the horror. Back she went, and the two girls clung to each other, feeling she must fall backwards on top of him. But he leaned forward, his face shining with

fixed amusement, and at last he brought her down, sank her down, was bearing her back to the mark. (111)

His cruel behavior of keeping on kicking the mare bleeding from the wounds on her side tells well his arrogant and obstinate will to stick to his own posture as her owner. As he demands his miners to function as part of the machine, so he enforces the mare to obediently serve him as a subject. Her vindication lies in the function as mare. Her superiority is decided depending on how she could fulfill her function and satisfy her owner. There lies the reason he stubbornly oppresses her to turn straight toward the track when she makes desperate efforts to wriggle away from the terrible noise.

The same is true of Gudrun. She sees Gerald close to for the first time at the wedding. He is perfect in his bearing and dressing, having good-looking appearance; in that sense, he is wearing wonderful clothes. She is attracted with his excellence, but sensitive enough not to fail to notice some danger hidden behind. Gerald is fascinated by her beauty and vivid character, and gradually there is less distance between them. However, what he wants is her function to fully satisfy his need, not the whole Gudrun as an individual woman. It is a woman wearing clothes matching his. The particularity of his biased character is gradually divulged with the progress of their relationship. The chapter “Death and Love” gives us a good evidence. Gerald is an incarnation of consciousness and will, and yet at the same time, aware and terrified of some serious deficiency or drawback in himself. When he has something to tackle with, he is confident in himself. On the other hand, nothing left to do, he is totally lost, completely covered with terrible void, scared of his being “a purely meaningless babble” (233). Very impressive is the scene where he sneaked into Gudrun’s room late at night, when he was unbearably tortured with futility of life after he had succeeded in rationalization of his coal mine, followed by his father’s death.

Gudrun was surprised at the unexpected visit from Gerald, but could not turn him away from the door because it was not that always-willful Gerald, but just a stray, wounded, pitiable sheep, desperately asking for help from Gudrun, that stands before her. She cannot help taking off the clothing of strong self because he has thrown away his stubbornness. Just like the dead man’s old wounds, in *The Man Who Died*, were healed by the touch of warm life of the priestess of Isis and recovered himself, he felt saturated with “enveloping soft warmth” (344), and became whole again:

He felt his limbs growing fuller and flexible with life, his body gained an

unknown strength. He was a man again, strong and rounded. And she was a child, so soothed and restored and full of gratitude. And she, she was the great bath of life, he worshipped her. (344)

He reveres her for having enabled him to rigorously come back to life. As shown here, a steel will cohabits with dependence in him. He cannot show consideration to any other person, but is rescued by its consideration he cannot give. Really he is a man-child, "a man" and "a child" coexisting in himself.

Apparently, it is selfishness deriving from Gerald's egocentricity that is indicated here, but part of "tenderness" is also bespoken. He was given a chance to regain himself by discarding the hard shell of self on the point of breakdown. Relinquishing his ruling clothes capacitated the other party to dismiss its egocentric clothes. Somehow Gudrun receives him. Here is no Gudrun who suddenly hit him on the face to be interfered with her dancing as if challenging cows. Her caution disappears as her tensed strain is eased, there arising a possibility for "tenderness" to be produced. He restored himself, bathed in the bath of "tenderness." It is the very effect of tenderness. Gerald's letting himself uncover his vulnerable entity facilitated Gudrun to dispose of her stubbornness.

However, it is just temporary for Gerald to cast away his clothes of consciousness. At the next moment, the usual Gerald comes back. He is asleep with his head on her breast, reassured by retrieving himself; while she is awake, eyes wide open as if gazing at something in the air. She is annoyed with incongruity between them, which takes a concrete shape when they travel to the Tyrol with the Birkins. The encounter with an artist called Leorke, a totally different type from Gerald, illuminates the essential substance of the man Gerald and leads her to the understanding of their marriage. Unlike Gerald, Leorke never imposes his will on her, leaving her alone. When she is with Gerald, she never feels freed from his will. What she realized clearly is that she is obliged to reinstate him as a man when he returns home from work, giving him a peaceful, delightful sleep. In reality, it is she who wants to have a restful sleep. While he is conscious, he is always giving instructions to someone. When he has others under control, he feels confident in himself. It is quite natural that Gudrun should be inclined to love Leorke who never thrusts his will on her. Gerald feels it unbearable that he is dispossessed of her by the mean thing like Leorke, much inferior in constitution, appearance, or status to Gerald. There is the only way left for him to keep his existence unspoiled; that is, to break down the obstacles just as Hermione tried to do with Birkin when she realized that he was the wall to confine her in horror. At last, when he, totally flustered, was driven into a

corner, he essayed to break them down:

He took the throat of Gudrun between his hand, that were hard and indomitably powerful. And her throat was beautifully, so beautifully soft. Save that, within, he could feel the slippery chords of her life. And this he crushed, this he could crush. What bliss! Oh what bliss, at last, what satisfaction, at last! The pure zest of satisfaction filled his soul. He was watching the unconsciousness come into her swollen face, watching her eyes roll back. How ugly she was! What a fulfillment, what a satisfaction! How good this was, oh how good it was, what a god-given gratification, at last! (471-2)

No doubt it is his horror of loss of self that drove Gerald to knock Leorke down and strangle her throat. It is a tragedy of the man who lived shouldering the social shell and felt relieved to find his presence only in keeping it unbroken. But it was also the tragedy that ought to have been avoided if he had entrusted tenderness with himself. It is definite that “tenderness” is juxtaposed with hardened self. Gerald and Gudrun, both holding an inflexible ego, never attempt to draw near to each other. Both are tightly clothed in unyielding will; especially, Gerald adheres to his will to the last as if he is lost when he meets anyone halfway. The only way left to him is to thrust his rigid will on the other party. It is impossible for Gudrun, having her own world as an artist, to easily yield to other’s will. In effect, there is no bridge between the two. “Tenderness” arises where they take off their clothes of stiff consciousness.

They are not the only existences who confined themselves in the steely shell of consciousness. Hermione is the first person who is pictured to the reader. She has enough vindictiveness to try to kill Birkin by striking him on the head with a paperweight. She is closely dressed in the clothes of consciousness; necessarily she is unrelated with any happiness. Gerald exposed his deficiency when he was put under difficult situations. He, convinced of no other way left, could not take another course in order to live along while hurt in the soul. Here lies the frailty of a person who has become a will incarnate. Gerald and Hermione manifest such danger and frailty.

III Clifford Obsessed with Consciousness and Will

Clifford has similarity to Gerald in anything but the fact that he is impracticable in the lower part of the body and cannot be helped to be abstract. They share the social status and

way of thinking and treating of others.

Quite like Gerald, Clifford thinks that everyone has his or her own function: aristocrat is a function; the general public a function, too. The worth of individuals is determined, depending on their performance. This idea takes a shape in a scene in chapter 13 where Clifford and Connie go for an outing in the woods when new life comes into being here and there. Clifford is seated on the wheel vehicle, while Connie is walking beside him. Enchanted by the animated vegetation, they go deep into the far part of the forest where they rarely advance. An unexpected thing happens when they return home, following the same route. The engine of the vehicle, which was first in good condition, often stops due to the weight of Clifford. The figure of Clifford, making desperate efforts to run the engine every time it halts, perfectly overlaps with that of Gerald desperately trying to turn the head of the mare back toward the railway. Mellors, who came answering the whistle Clifford blew unwillingly, demanded by Connie, puts forth his helping hand, but Clifford was obstinate in refusing his help:

It was steep and jolty climb. The chair pugged slowly, in a struggling, unwilling fashion. Still, she nosed her way up unevenly, till she came to where the hyacinths were all around her, then she balked, struggled, jerked a little way out of the flowers, then stopped. "We'd better sound the horn and see if the keeper will come," said Connie. "He could push her a bit. For that matter, I will push. It helps." "We'll let her breathe," said Clifford. ... "Let me push!" said Connie, coming up behind. "No! Don't push!" he said angrily. "What's the good of the damned thing, if it has to be pushed! Put the stone under!" (187)

His adherence to function makes Clifford tenaciously reject Mellors, which reminds us the reader of the battle between Gerald and the animal. Just like Gerald stuck to the function she ought to perform, Clifford demanded the wheel to fulfill its function. As Ursula and Gudrun screamed and criticized his merciless deeds, so Connie remonstrated him here.

They are quite similar to each other in the attitude toward their miners, too. Clifford reckon them as subordinates or objects or part of the mine rather than human beings:

The miners were, in a sense, his own men: but he saw them as objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than parts of life. (15)

There is a lack of warm consideration in his mechanical treatment of coal miners. He speaks

to them, but without any heart. Connie and Mrs. Bolton, who are the residents in the same house, are not exceptions. He is the successor of Gerald who finds his own evidence as human existence in the will like: “Man’s will was the absolute, the only absolute”(223). Clifford is not inferior in cold, heartless will to Gerald. Therefore, he is not in contact with anybody:

This lack of warmth, this lack of the simpler, warm physical contact—. He was never. Kind, thoughtful, considerate, in a well-bred, cold sort of way! But never warm as a man can be warm to a woman: (72)

Clifford lives the same mechanical life as Gerald. He also considers his workers as “his instruments,” believing in “the pure instrumentality of mankind”(223). There is “No warmth of feeling” (17) in the relationship maintained by “the mechanical order” (17).

Clifford also devotes himself to improvement of the mine. He, influenced by Mrs. Bolton, becomes a resident in the outer world in order to realize “his life-long secret yearning” (108). He finds delight in controlling the outer world and wielding his will over his workers. Inevitably, all the people around could not be helped to be sacrifices:

What a strange creature with the sharp, cold, inflexible will of some bird, and no warmth, no warmth at all! ..., but an extra-alert will, cold will. (138)

Having objects to work on with, he looks animated, but inside is a terrible void wide open:

..., becoming almost suddenly changed into a creature with a hard, efficient shell of an exterior and a pulpy interior, one of the amazing crabs and lobsters of the modern industrial and financial world, invertebrates of the crustacean order, with shells of steel, like machines,... (110)

In the daytime, when he is engaged in active movement over a new method of using coals in the material world, he appears to be full of energy. Once he enters into inner life again, his reality emerges. Here again is Gerald reminded of:

... he was afraid of death. A terrible hollow seemed to menace him somewhere, somehow, avoid, and into this void his energy would collapse. Energyless, he felt at times he was dead, really dead. (140)

Although he enjoys his "immortal self," he is always terrified of deficiency in the mind, asking Mrs. Bolton for help. Due to the wounds, he was deprived of function in the lower body. He can neither enjoy outing alone nor take care of himself. Such situation helps him to sharpen his nerves, enforcing him to be hedged in consciousness. Will and consciousness, these are the evidence of his presence. Besides, his status and personal circumstances make his character more inhuman, cold-hearted, and cruel. All his acquaintances, including the residents of his house, are aware of his inhumanity. Michaelis, one of his friends, has a hard opinion on him like:

"He'll hardly know you've gone, after six months. He doesn't know that anybody exists, except himself. Why the man has no use for you at all, as far as I can see: he's entirely wrapped up in himself." (52)

He gives us the impression that he has unyielding will, but in fact, he cannot survive for a minute without relying on others. Always is he longing for someone to cling to. Mrs. Bolton, who was employed as nurse because Connie often goes out into the woods in search of relaxation, takes care of him. Gradually she comes to type for him what he wrote, play chess or trump with him, and acquires trust from him. She submits to what he orders, while ironically, as a result of her strenuous efforts, she has had control over him. The following is what she says to Connie indifferently:

"All men are babies, when you come to the bottom of them. ... they're babies, just big babies. Oh, there's not much difference in them!"... she found he was like the rest, a baby grown to man's proportions. (99)

The word "a baby" brings to recollection Gerald who is delighted to find himself eased and unburdened of the willful mind by Gudrun. Likewise, Clifford is composed to be restored by the caressing of Mrs. Bolton. Both of them exist embraced with womanhood. He can no longer stay self-possessed without her; he has become a "child-man" (291).

It is quite certain that through Clifford, the author pictures a man who only finds self-assurance in implementing his will in the mechanical life, protected by the social system.

IV Protagonists in Opposition to Gerald and Clifford

Although Ursula and Birkin alike hold resolute self respectively, they have flexibility with which Gerald and Gudrun are not gifted. There is an interesting scene in chapter “Sisters” describing the Ursula figure who has “an intimation of something yet to come” (9), and is going to break “the last integuments” (9). Without doubt, the division of *The Wedding Ring* into *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love* was partly designed to create the character of Ursula. Birkin is also portrayed as quite a different type from Gerald and Clifford. In a scene in chapter “Excursion” illustrating that Ursula accepts the proposal of marriage from Birkin, she has a vision of his being one of the sons of God:

He stood there in his strange, whole body, that had its marvelous fountains, like the bodies of the Sons of God who were in the beginning. There were strange fountains of his body, more mysterious and potent than any she had imagined or known, more satisfying, ah, finally, mystically-physically satisfying. (314)

His disparateness is condensed into the “more mysterious and potent” body just like “the bodies of the Sons of God.” Another example of his uniqueness appears in chapter “Breadalby,” where he escapes into the woods as if driven by the impulse to free from the struggles of consciousness and will with Hermione after he received a blow on the head with a paperweight from her, takes off all the clothes, and rolls over the grass and flowers:

He was happy in the wet hill-side, that was overgrown and obscure with bushes and flowers. He wanted to touch them all, to saturate himself with the touch of them all. He took off his clothes, and sat down naked among the primroses, moving his feet softly among the primroses, his legs, his knees, his arms right up to the arm-pits, then lying down and letting them touch his belly, his breasts. (106-7)

This tells that he is endowed with an ability to sense the world beyond human while staying in the real world. This strange conduct of Birkin’s suggests the scene of the discussion about living without having any clothes on in chapter “Fetish,” where Halliday, one of his friend, emphasizes the importance of living naked. The gist of his statement “Life is all wrong because it’s become too much visual” (78) is in that life has become indirect and one is not enjoying one’s real life. Interestingly enough, this undressing is repeated in *Lady Chatterley*, where Mellors relates his more pessimistic view of the future world than usual when he was

informed that Connie had a plan to visit Venice for finding a means to deal with the difficult situation. However, whether it is because she is expecting or not, she looks blank-minded somehow and even happy, and does not try to connect the hopeless future with herself. While she is apathetically looking out of the window of the hut, she has a sudden desire to run around in the rain. Then she takes off all her clothes just like Birkin does, rushing into the rain. She enjoys bathing herself in the rain as if being a life incarnate. He is captivated by her innocent figure, gets undressed as well, and starts to run after her:

She opened the door and looked at the straight heavy rain, like a steel curtain, and had a sudden desire to rush out into it, to rush away. She got up, and began swiftly pulling off her stockings, then her dress and underclothing, and he held his breath.... She slipped on her rubber shoes again and ran out with a wild little laugh, holding up her breasts to the heavy rain and spreading her arms,... He laughed wryly, and threw off his clothes. It was too much. He jumped out, naked and white, with a little shiver, into the hard, slanting rain. (221)

The scene above is of significance in two ways. One is that his action is spontaneous. Birkin repeatedly states his critical ideas about lack of spontaneity in our present life in *Women*, but here they are spontaneous and impulsive enough. They embody his idea here. The descriptions "ran out with a wild little laugh" and "jumped out, naked and white" convey their spontaneity. That brings to mind the scene where the bridegroom abruptly runs after the bride the moment she begins to run to see him alight from the vehicle in *Women*. And the other is that they take off their clothes. The undressing here has the same effect as Birkin's action. Nakedness helps Birkin and Mellors to be liberated from consciousness seizing them. It is common in that both of them are driven to take their clothes off, which demonstrates that they are created to change the deplorable reality of life into some new form of life.

He had a vision of rebirth of individuals to rebuild the society imbued with mechanism, materialism, and idealism. Both of them keep distance from the material world. So Birkin does not have his own house and parents: he has no shell of society. He is now a school inspector, but leaves office when he gets married to Ursula. He tells Ursula his determination to be freed from anything. She agrees with him, thinking that she would like to separate from the past. She thinks that marriage is a way to part with the surrounding. But as shown in the statement that "Marriage is a way to accept the whole world," he differs from Ursula in the view of marriage. His remark reflects his idea that a true marriage helps one to liberate

one's self and gives a clue to reach an open space to enjoy oneness with the other party. To "accept the whole world" implies what world he seeks after. But strangely enough, he wants Gerald as a member of his world in order to make it richer. There lies the reason why he needed the pledge of "Blutbrüdershaht." Fighting, touching – this enables the consciousness-bound Gerald to be free from himself, and he is blissfully delighted. But while attracted by the physical touch, he hesitates to leave himself to the pledge of "blood"; in effect, the fear of casting away his clothes surpasses the delight of freedom. He cannot put his trust in warmth, or "tenderness" caused by physical touch, which might have been a possibility of evading the tragedy in the snowy mountains.

The creation of Gerald and Clifford figure is positively placed side by side with that of Birkin and Mellors. Hardened self keeps the other party away, and rational-analytic attitude makes them nervous. There is still too long a road for him to acquire the quality to "accept the whole world." It is obvious that they are created in order to grope about a possibility of establishing a new relationship.

V Intention Hidden in "Tenderness"

Mellors is contrastive to Clifford who is tortured with emptiness inside. He recalls Birkin, thin, medium-sized. Connie senses "a perfectly fearless, impersonal look" in his eyes when he looks into her eyes:

He might be a gentleman. Anyhow he was a curious, quick, separate fellow, alone but sure of himself. (47)

Totally different is he from Clifford in that Mellors has indomitable spirit. Somehow he lives satisfied with his solitary life; he is an individual, yet beyond individuality, a self-possessed man. He is in sharp contrast with Clifford always observing others with a network of sharpened nerves, always asking someone for help in the inner life. Connie observes that he has "a vividness" that regular visitors to her house do not have, "something very uncommon" (68), and besides, has not lost "warmth" (68) despite various hardships he was forced to experience. Especially, that "vividness" makes her consider that "there is something special about him" (69).

The secret of this effect is in his own flesh. She happens to glimpse Mellors bathing himself at the back of his hut when she comes to see him on an errand for Clifford. She, in a panic

with the shock of the naked body, leaves the place, but still has it stay on her eyes. What bewitched her was not the flesh itself, but the something beyond the body:

And beyond that(i.e. perfect, white solitary nudity), a certain beauty, but a certain lambency, the warm white flame of a single life revealing itself I contours that one might touch: a body! (66)

Here in his body Connie witnesses something like animation of life Lawrence observed in the relics of the Etruscans. Body is a manifestation of life flowing inside. Mellors seems to entertain his living life; then she intuits that he has "something special." Yet she receives this shock with her "womb," not with the sense, which gives her the impression of his being "uncommon." This impersonality of his desire leads her to too hasty an intercourse with Mellors, though she was utterly upset by the delicate vividness of the new life of freshly-born pheasants:

Yet he was kind. There was something, a sort of warm, naïve kindness, curious and sudden, that almost opened her womb to him. But *she felt he might be kind like that to any woman.... It wasn't really personal.* She was only really a female to him. (121, italics mine)

The warmth of his body is not caused by love, but life. The noticeable is that this kindness is impersonal beyond any humanity. Therefore she responded to it by the body; her body acted in response to the suddenly-burned flame of his body. The author characterized life-interchange, not reciprocity of love. However, she temporally gains liberated feelings from the spiritual life with Clifford, but she keeps hesitating to throw away herself just like Kate did in *The Plumed Serpent*. While repeating the physical intercourse with Mellors as if to extricate herself from "the burden of a self," she comes to realize the reason she feels disengaged: it is "a ponderous, primordial tenderness" (174). This "tenderness" capacitated her to loosen her strain and abandon her stiff self:

It was from herself she wanted to be saved, from her own inward anger and resistance. Yet how powerful was that inward resistance that possessed her!... she went all open to him. (173) ... She dared to let go everything, all herself, and be gone in the flood.... She was gone, she was not, and she was born. (174)

Connie touched something beyond himself in Mellors; it is “strangeness” that distinguishes Mellors from worldly men. This Connie is quite like Ursula who was released from herself, showing her wild anger against Birkin. The release facilitated Ursula to take out natural Ursula out of usual “personal” Ursula as seen in Gerald just after the wrestling with Birkin; she had natural Ursula come out of self-conscious, “personal” self:

New eyes were opened in her soul, she saw a strange creature from another world, in him. (312)

Ursula recognized in him the mystic current of life, or liveliness of life: some different being from human, “one of the Sons of God” (313). Just like Ursula Connie discovers in Mellors one of “the sons of God” (174) when Connie was discharged from the conscious herself by the touch with Mellors. The quality of “the unknown man” (174) prompted her to go over the usual Connie and get herself as “plasm.”

Despite the bitter experience with several women, including his wife Bertha, and soldiers in the army, Mellors keeps “warmth” particular to his character. He sometimes speaks dialects in order to keep distance from others; however, she is never blind to his own true nature hidden behind the outer mask as a member of the working classes. She is removed of the wall of class distinctions by his independent, unbridled spirit free from any systems forming the society.

Another original quality of the “warmth” should be noted which attracts Connie. The following is a scene in the ending part of the story. Mellors hesitates to agree to her suggestion that they should live apart from England:

“I’ve got nothing.”

“You’ve got more than most man. Come, you know it,” she said.

“In one way, I know it.” He was silent for a time, thinking. Then he resumed:

“They used to say I had too much of the woman in me—. But it’s not that. I’m not a woman because I don’t want shoot birds: neither because I don’t want to make money, or get on. I could get on in the army, easily—but I didn’t like the army.... I like men, and men like me. But I can’t stand the twaddling, bossy impudence of the people who run this world. That’s why I can’t get on. I hate the impudence of money, and I hate the impudence of class.... (276).

The statement that "I had too much of the woman in me" unveils his another attribute of the "strangeness." His characteristic exceeds biological difference of sex as well as the dimension of emotion and physical warmth, which is blood-warmth of life, or of human existence. She, captivated by this warmth motivating her to the union beyond class difference, paraphrases the "strangeness" as shown below. Connie says to Mellors who laments that he has no money or status:

"Shall I tell you what you have that other men don't have, and that will make the future? Shall I tell you?"

"Tell me then," he replied.

"It's the courage of your own tenderness, that's what it is:..."

The grin came flickering on his face.

"That!" he said. Then he sat thinking. "Ay!" he said. "You are right. It's that really. It's that all the way through. (277; italics mine)

This courage is the very thing that entralls Connie and makes her ignore the class difference. However, the notable is that Connie has sensitivity to sympathize with the mystery of his "strangeness." When he met her for the first time, he received the impression like: "She's nice: she's real! She's nicer than she knows." (68) In addition to the outstanding character intrinsic to her, more important is her delicate sensitivity, as seen in the scene where she sheds tears, deeply moved by touching the fragile life of little pheasants:

Connie crouched to watch in a sort of ecstasy. Life! Life! Pure, sparky, fearless new life! New life! (114)

Here is a woman who is simply, purely affected with life. This story has several women, including a woman like Miriam, but Connie differs from anyone of them. She belongs to a type of woman similar to Ursula in *Women in Love* and Kate in *The Plumed Serpent*, awakened to a new universe of life. Yet she has deeper recognition of life than both of them. Connie has reached the same stage as the priestess of Isis, who has no worldly name, did in *The Man Who Died*. Her property to sense life keeps herself from Clifford and makes herself closer to Mellors. The life "tenderness" she is possessed of reminds Mellors of hyacinths:

Poor thing, she too had some of the vulnerability of the wild hyacinths, she

wasn't all tough rubber-goods-platinum, like the modern girl. And they would do her in! As sure as life, they would do her in, as they do in all naturally tender life. Tender! Somewhere she was tender, tender with a tenderness of growing hyacinths, something that has gone out of the celluloid women of today. (110)

Connie, aroused to life warmth that “the celluloid women of today” have lost, is a clue to real life for Mellors who lives away from any personal will, inhuman class society, and industrialized world. Yet Connie’s consciousness with “completed myself” is sharpened through life-consuming married life with Clifford for 5 years, which makes her more conscious of true life. She is hedged in his consciousness while listening to his detailed analysis about various topics such as literature or society. She is almost destroyed with the conflicts with the will of Clifford:

And at last, she could bear the burden of herself no more. She was to be had for the taking. To be had for the taking. (117)

Connie cannot cast herself away, almost collapsed under the stress of self. But she is aware that she must part with “her own hard, bright female power” (136) in order to regain real, plain herself. Connie is afraid of losing herself just like Ursula and Kate were. Forsaking herself is to degrade herself to a slave. However, she, by nature having “some of the vulnerability of the wild hyacinths,” gradually changes and comes to experience “positive passivity” through repeated warm contacts with Mellors. The man returns to “positive activity,” and the woman to consciously-unclothed woman, devoid of conscious Connie with the completed self as the lady Chatterley. The following is the description of her alteration just before she leaves for Venice:

She felt, now, she had come to the real bed-rock of her nature, and was essentially shameless. She was her sensual self, naked and unashamed.... That was life! That was how oneself really was! There was nothing left to disguise or be ashamed of. She shared her ultimate nakedness with a man, another being. (247)

Here is an unknown sphere depicted that Ursula and Kate never treaded on. Connie finds here “her sensual self” and “her ultimate nakedness” at the very root of her presence. It is not the gamekeeper Mellors that facilitated her to alter, but “a man, another being” unknown

even to her. Just as in *The Man Who Died*, the priestess realized the meaning of true existence through the dead man with no name, Connie secured her way of being as it should be. The man does not have any name and Connie never calls him by name, though he has his own name, which betrays the secrets of their beings. It is obvious that both of them are created beyond worldliness. Besides, the following manifests the true nature of "tenderness" as well as sensuality:

It was a night of sensual passion, in which she was a little startled, and almost unwilling: yet pierced again with piercing thrills of sensuality, different, sharper, more terrible than the thrills of tenderness, but, at the moment, more desirable. Though a little frightened, she let him have his way, and reckless, shameless sensuality shook her to her foundations, stripped her to the very last, and made a different woman of her. (246; italics mine)

Interestingly enough, Connie feels "sensuality" to be "more terrible than the thrills of tenderness," and simultaneously, "more desirable." This illustrates the mystery of "tenderness" beyond the level of emotions, which implies that his "tenderness" has two aspects in quality. Just like nature itself is sometimes tender to human beings, but some other time unfriendly, the "tenderness" is "desirable," and also "terrible."

Lawrence evinced a vision of relationship as it should be by picturing a myth of alteration of the protagonist Connie motivated by the mystery of "tenderness."

VI Conclusion

Lawrence firmly believed that the then prevailed "mechanism" and "materialism" took away "warmth" and "tenderness" out of our present life. Therefore, he made Gerald and Clifford represent the evil aspects of "mechanism" and "materialism," while Mellors and the dead man; Connie and the priest "warmth" and soft "tenderness." The most significant is that Lawrence's "tenderness" is not just sentimental, but connotes the true nature of human existence, "desirable" and also "terrible."

The author's emphasis on being "naked" or "tender" in *The Sketches of Etruscan Places*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and *The Man Who Died* reflects his distressful supplication for our changing industrialism-oriented way of life into life-centred way of life.

Works Cited

1. D.H. Lawrence, *The Sketches of Etruscan Places and Other Italian Essays*, Ed. Simonetta De Filippis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
2. D.H. Lawrence, *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, Ed. Edward D. McDonald (New York: The Viking Press, 1972)
3. D.H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Ed. Michael Squires (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
4. R.L. Emerson, "Historic Notes of Life and Letters in New England" contained in *The Portable Emerson* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981)
5. D.H. Lawrence, *Women in Love*, Ed. David Farmer, Lindeth Vasey and John Worthen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Bibliography

1. Robert M. Polhemus, *Erotic Faith* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)
2. Keith Sagar, *The Art of D.H. Lawrence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966)
3. Eugene Goodheart, *The Utopian Vision of D.H. Lawrence* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964)
4. Peter Scheckner, *Class, Politics, and the Individual: A Study of the Major Works of D.H. Lawrence* (Cranbury: Associated University Press, 1985)
5. Peter New, *Fiction and Purpose in Utopia, Rasselas, The Millon the Floss and Women in Love* (London: Macmillan, 1985)
6. Gamini Salgado/G.K. Das, eds. *The Spirit of D.H. Lawrence: Centenary Studies* (Totowa: Barnes & Noble Books, 1988)
7. Sheila MacLeod, *D.H. Lawrence's Men and Women* (London: Heinemann, 1985)
8. Kathryn A. Walterscheid, *The Resurrection of the Body: Touch in D.H. Lawrence* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1993)
9. David Holbrook, *Where D.H. Lawrence Was Wrong about Women* (Cranbury: Associated University Press, 1992)