

J·D·H·L·S

Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies

Citation details

Article: 'Flowers as "Other", then "other", in *The White Peacock* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*'

Author: Terry Gifford

Source: *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (2014)

Pages: 71–85

Copyright: individual author and the D. H. Lawrence Society.
Quotations from Lawrence's works © The Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli. Extracts and poems from various publications by D. H. Lawrence reprinted by permission of Pollinger Limited (www.pollingerltd.com) on behalf of the Estate of Frieda Lawrence Ravagli.

**A Publication of the
D. H. Lawrence Society of Great Britain**

**FLOWERS AS “OTHER”, THEN “OTHER”,
IN *THE WHITE PEACOCK* AND
*LADY CHATTERLEY’S LOVER***

TERRY GIFFORD

When Constance Chatterley tries to describe to her sister the experience of her relationship with Oliver Mellors, she says that their love makes her feel that she is living “in the very middle of creation” (*LCL* 241). To an ecocritic this is a striking image of a fulfilled human life that is fully integrated into the wider life of nature as an organic part of a larger whole. Indeed, the implication is that a fulfilled human relationship can only be achieved through, and is a consequence of, a vital sense of relationship with the whole of creation. The next question for the ecocritic would be to ask to what extent “middle” means “centre” – that is, the extent to which this is an egocentric or ecocentric notion, one of taking from nature or of interacting with nature.¹ The answer will be found in the detailed expression of moments of engagement with nature, such as human responses to flowers, for example, and this essay will come to consider an evolution of Lawrence’s exploration of human engagements with flowers that might be found by comparing examples in his first and his last novels.

But an ecofeminist reader will want to ask about Lawrence’s representation of the gendered experience of living “in the very middle of creation” and how it is achieved through the love between a man and woman. This will need to be considered briefly in the context of Lawrence’s extended project to explore marriage and its alternatives. This, in turn, raises the question of the capacity of ecofeminism to discuss Lawrence’s representation of nature in the lives, and modes of loving, of *both* Oliver Mellors and Constance Chatterley. It is clear that ecofeminism has made no attempt to consider the kind of masculinity represented by Mellors

and that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928) stands as a challenge to its ability to discuss a man and nature in relation to a woman and nature, as the novel obviously requires. Constance Chatterley's reflections upon her engagements with flowers are designed, it will be argued through the detailed textual discussion in this essay, to bring her into a relationship with nature that parallels that of Mellors the gamekeeper whose life is already embedded in the woods.

It could be argued that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is Lawrence's last attempt, or more precisely his last three attempts, to explore in the relationship of Oliver Mellors and Constance Chatterley the possibility of "star-equilibrium" that he had first proposed through Birkin in *Women in Love* (1920) – a relationship that was "not meeting and mingling ... but an equilibrium, a pure balance of two single beings: – as the stars balance each other" (WL 148). For all its pre-eminence in Lawrence's *oeuvre*, *Women in Love* is ultimately inconclusive. It begins but also ends with questions. The outcome of the novel's ambitious project is finally undecided: can Ursula and Birkin actually live out Birkin's "star-equilibrium" in their relationship and by doing so achieve the potential of their species to be integrated with the rest of creation? Or is this really Birkin's "doomed attempt ... to have his cake and eat it" as Keith Sagar suggested of a novel in which "Lawrence rehearses all his mistaken abstract views up to the point of writing"?² Perhaps the positive appearance of the same idea twice in Lawrence's subsequent novel, *Aaron's Rod* (1922), confirms its importance for Lawrence: "then there we are, together and apart at the same time, and free of each other, and eternally inseparable" (AR 104);

Two eagles in mid-air, grappling, whirling, coming to their intensification of love-oneness there in mid-air. In mid-air the love consummation. But all the time each lifted on its own wings: each bearing itself up on its own wings at every moment of the mid-air love consummation. That is the splendid love-way. (AR 166–7)

To claim that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* could be read as a final attempt to imagine a relationship in "star-equilibrium", with its implication of connection to creation, would be to suggest that Mellors is what would now be called the "new man"; he is alive with a physical masculinity that includes generosity and tenderness and from which Birkin, by contrast, is precluded because he is too intellectually conflicted. It would also imply a rejection of Birkin's intellectualism towards nature – for example, his idea that "Man is a mistake, he must go" (WL 128), an idea satirised by Mellors in favour of a direct sensual relationship with nature (LCL 218).³ Embedded amongst woods, flowers, animals and birds, yet a servant of an estate, Mellors possesses a duality of language modes that betrays both a compromised position between classes and an empowered duality of modes of knowing. It is in his earthy dialect mode that Mellors gives us his sense of the rare human experience encoded in "cunt" that is different from, but on a continuum with, instinctive animal "fucking". For Mellors "cunt" is a physical expression of "tenderness", an earlier title for the novel. The tenderness of masculinity that Connie brings out in Mellors is reciprocated by the connection to the whole of creation that Connie gains from sex with him. So at the centre of our understanding of how the experience of their bodies comes to connect them to "the very middle of creation" (LCL 241) is Lawrence's offering us Mellors's distinction between animal lust and human tenderness. But how does Lawrence achieve a sense of the gendered distinctiveness of human nature in this relationship that also connects the lovers to the rest of creation?

As ever with Lawrence, there are clear connections and dialogues between nature, women and men who reject patriarchy, that go beyond the essentialism of woman=nature and man=culture, and might invite an ecofeminist reading such as I have offered for *Kangaroo* (2013), *The Boy in the Bush* (with Izabel Brandão, 2005) and *Birds, Beasts and Flowers* (1996).⁴ Yet it is not at all clear that ecofeminism is prepared to consider the problematic of a male writer offering what remains a challenging kind of masculine

heterosexual discourse. "Masculinity" does not appear in the index of landmark works of ecofeminism such as Catriona Sandilands's *The Good-Natured Feminist* (1999) or Stacy Alaimo's *Undomesticated Ground* (2000). The more recent *International Perspectives in Feminist Ecocriticism* (2013), edited by Greta Gaard, Simon Estok and Serpil Oppermann, has two entries for "masculinism" which both refer to essentialist rejections of patriarchal masculinity. For all its recent exploration of queer ecologies, ecofeminism seems unwilling to engage with masculine heterosexuality such as that exemplified by Mellors.⁵ Yet how would an ecocritical discussion of nature and gender in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* be framed if not by ecofeminism? Perhaps this novel exposes a neglect in ecofeminist discourse itself of versions of masculinity that are defined by a tenderness in a relationship with a woman in the context of a very real material nature in its smallest physical elements and its largest spiritual presence. In Mellors, my ecofeminist reading might suggest, a masculinity that carries a strong ancient element of Pan and of the Green Man becomes an embodiment of Lawrence's final vision of a new kind of man: distinctly masculine, alive to the ebbs and flows of seasons, organic growth and decay, giving as well as taking, in the physical, emotional and spiritual dimensions of relationships.⁶ Indeed, it is actually Constance Chatterley who needs to discover her inner nature as a continuum of outer nature. Her sense of "disconnection" at the beginning of the novel is expressed by her body's "getting thinner" and "going a little harsh. It was as if it had not had enough sun and warmth. It was a little greyish and sapless" (*LCL* 70–1).

But actually this rather grand theory of the last novel as the final exploration of the elusive utopian relationship of man, woman and nature is predicated upon a very small one that might be expressed by the merest change of a capital letter. This is the idea that in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Lawrence demonstrates a shift in his writing from nature as "Other" to that of "other". That is, in this novel Lawrence achieves a sense of Connie and Mellors being so at home in nature in their gendered modes that nature is not an alien "Other"

and they assume an instinctive at-one-ness with it: what ecocritics call “inhabitation” – not being *on* the ground, inhabiting it, but *of* the ground, the seasons, organic growth and decay, or “the cosmos” as Lawrence wants to call it in *A Propos of ‘Lady Chatterley’s Lover’* (1930), written as he was also working on *Apocalypse* (1931) in which the physical and spiritual dimensions of creation are combined in the term “cosmos”.

Sagar mentions an example of how nature helped Lawrence get through the worst of times and to keep his sanity during the “nightmare” period of the First World War in Cornwall, quoting from a letter that: “It isn’t my disordered imagination. There’s a wagtail sitting on the gatepost. I see how sweet and swift heaven is”.⁷ In Lawrence’s work it is through the quality of our relationships with the small things that we actually become aware of the larger nature of which we form a part. As he puts it in *A Propos of ‘Lady Chatterley’s Lover’*: “We *must* get back into relation, vivid and nourishing relation to the cosmos and the universe” (LCL 329, original emphasis). In the context of the “old religion” of New Mexico, Lawrence itemised it like this: “For the whole life-effort of man was to get his life into direct contact with the elemental life of the cosmos, mountain-life, cloud-life, thunder-life, air-life, earth-life, sun-life” (MM 180–1) – and, we might add, flower-life. But how does Lawrence actually achieve such a reconnection in the discourse of his final novel and can we observe its evolution from, say, his first novel, *The White Peacock* (1911), or, indeed, within the three attempts to resolve this last novel? It is time to turn to a consideration of gendered engagements with nature from the two versions of the first novel and then from the three versions of the last novel.

The earliest surviving version of *The White Peacock* comprises two fragments from ‘Laetitia’, in the first of which the male narrator, Cyril, expresses the following attitude towards woodland daffodils that were:

lifting their glorious heads and throwing back their wanton yellow curls to sport with the sun ... I felt inclined to hug them, I wanted to know their language perfectly so that I might talk my heart out to them. They had a rich perfume as of oranges; they laughed to me, and tried to reassure me. (WP 348)

Here, Lawrence appears to be suggesting what is now called "biosemiology", which refers to the way in which organic things read each other's sign systems in order to negotiate their symbiotic relationships.⁸ The idea that daffodils might have a "language" that we might be able not only to read but to respond to in an empathetic way, would be a radical idea here were it not that the narrator wants rather a one-way communication. The impulse is an egocentric rather than an ecocentric one; hugging is hardly appropriate, although unburdening talk from a human to these daffodils, which are carefully individualised in different stances and stages of exposure, might nevertheless be beneficial at least to the narrator. But there is a giving and taking in one direction here: an offering of laughter and a reassurance taken from nature that also includes a recognition of inadequacy in not being able to fully comprehend the language that enables a "happy", "healthy", "splendour" of a relationship with the sun.

In the final version of *The White Peacock* there is a similar moment of observing woodland snowdrops in "a holy communion of pure wild things, numberless, frail, and folded meekly in the evening light" (WP 129). Here the description is even more extended than that of the daffodils, but again emphasising colours, light and the plants' characteristic spirit. But now the spirit of snowdrops is defined by contrast with other flowers: "Other flower companies are glad; stately barbaric hordes of bluebells, merry-headed cowslip groups, even light, tossing wood-anemones; but snowdrops are sad and mysterious. We have lost their meaning. They do not belong to us, who ravish them" (WP 129). One is reminded of the poem 'Fish', one of Lawrence's most extreme expressions of mysterious Otherness, except that there is a hint that

the “meaning” of snowdrops might once have been understood, perhaps by “the Druid folk before us”, and is now lost (*WP* 129). So here is not only a more final sense of not knowing the flowers’ “language”, but an alienation expressed by the male narrator that results from culpability in “ravishing” them. This double failure to make a connection with nature through the cultural degradation of a loss of meaning and a mistaken destructive attitude of “ownership” is the outcome of Lawrence’s first novel’s attempt at a celebration of the earth’s “manna” that ought to be sustaining. The Otherness of nature could not be more complete and condemning, despite the male narrator’s awareness of his culpability in creating his sense of his own alienation.

In each of the three versions of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, Constance Chatterley has an engagement with wild daffodils on a slope at the back of Mellors’s cottage that defines her relationship with nature at that stage of the narrative. The editor of the Cambridge Edition of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (2002), Michael Squires, who had written a book on *The Creation of ‘Lady Chatterley’s Lover’* in 1983,⁹ comments that the three versions of this scene “follow Lawrence’s usual pattern: origination in version 1, expansion in version 2, then condensation *and* expansion in version 3” (*LCL* xxv, original emphasis). But thus far there has been no consideration of what the changes in these versions say about Lawrence’s representation of the potential human/nature relationship. In what the Cambridge Edition of *The First and Second Lady Chatterley Novels* calls “version 1”, published in the USA in 1944 and in the UK in 1972 as *The First Lady Chatterley*, Mrs Bolton, noticing that Constance Chatterley is “wasting away” in the company of her husband, suggests that she gets out of the house to see the daffodils at the back of the keeper’s cottage. Rather crudely Mrs Bolton says to herself, “She’s wasting away, simply eaten up! I wish there was some nice young man to make love to her” and, sure enough, at the mention of the gamekeeper “something stirred in Constance’s soul” (*FLC* 28).

The wildness of the March day in the wood provides an immediate contrast to the house, emphasised by a rather too obvious Lawrencean neologism: "The trees in the park were bare, there was a rushing of the wind in the wood, pale wind-flowers, in groups, bent and bobbed" (*FLC* 29). *The First Lady Chatterley* text had changed "wind-flowers" to "wild-flowers", although the third version confirms, now as one word, "windflowers" (*LCL* 85). Whilst wind and movement are important sensual effects here, the bareness of the trees gives full focus to the flowers, the primroses and violets that add scent to the effect upon Constance that is explicitly thematic: "Ah! to escape, to escape the level monotony of doom, to break through into magic once more! To pass into the life of the woods!" (*FLC* 29). If "doom", "magic" and "life" are loaded contrasts, the actual experience of the wild daffodils, in "the last place where they were left", recalls for Constance "Clifford's dictum: 'Nature is a settled routine of crude old laws. One has to go beyond nature, break beyond. And that is one's destiny, that makes one break beyond the settled, arbitrary laws of nature'" (*FLC* 29).¹⁰ Here is the industrialist apparently defying Darwin: human will overcoming arbitrary conditions of natural context; capitalist individualism echoing the hubris of Greek tragedy in the face of a reified Nature.

But Connie's encounter with wild daffodils is used by Lawrence in version 1 explicitly to counter male hubris:

She herself saw it differently. She couldn't feel the laws of nature so arbitrary. It was the laws of man that bothered her. She couldn't feel anything very arbitrary about the tossing daffodils, dipping now in shade. If only one could be simpler, and more natural! If only one could be really simple! Men were so complicated and so full of laws. (*FLC* 29)

It is commonplace to recognise that in this novel, as elsewhere, Lawrence opposes nature and industrialism, or uses the natural to critique notions of materialistic progress. But the gendered

emphasis of this passage is as strong as its reductive escapism. Certainly it is the “laws of man” that provide the ultimate stumbling block to a continued relationship at the end of the novel. Certainly, as David Ellis points out, a “simpler and more natural” life in the body can be presented in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* as almost absurdly anti-industrial, as when Mellors says, “An’ if I only lived ten minutes, an’ stroked thy arse an’ got to know it, I should reckon I’ve lived *one* life, sees ter! Industrial system or not!” (*LCL* 223).¹¹ Simple identification with daffodils in this passage as an escape from the complicated lives of men is itself a wistful assertion on Connie’s part in this first version of the novel, which rather undermines the claims of those critics (and Frieda Lawrence) who preferred the first version. Indeed, the comment of the writer of the ‘Manuscript Report’ for the 1944 U.S. publication on its “fresh, almost rustic quality” (*FLC* xxxii) strongly implies a preference for a pastoral escapism.¹² Simplistic rustic escapism is always seductive, but Lawrence knows that ultimately complexities must be confronted and lived through somehow.

So the expansion of this passage in the second version from two paragraphs to seven also results in a more complex and positive release from Constance’s life with Clifford and all that it represents. Now there is an attempt to empathise with the daffodils, to “know their language” in the words of *The White Peacock* (*WP* 348). To the effects of wind in sound, scent and movement there now is added an element of cold: “Yes, there was a rushing and a roaring, as if the black horse were let loose among the cold stagnancy, and the flowers had come out to see him” (*FLC* 301). A wild black force, as if from the apocalypse, excites Constance in the wood and stirs, with the energies of spring, the cold stagnancies of winter. So now the daffodils are buffeted “with nowhere to turn their faces to, as the wind pounced on them with its invisible paws!” (*FLC* 301). But this drama produces in Constance a remarkable thought: “Perhaps they liked it! Perhaps it excited them too, when they had to shiver and flutter and try in vain to turn their faces from the blow”. It is tempting to read this as anthropomorphism and

therefore an insight into human emotions. But if this is read as an ecocentric insight – an act of biosemiology, of reading the language of daffodils – it would be an example of a process of strengthening the plants' survival strategy that turns apparent "distress" into a renewal of life-force (*FLC* 301). In establishing such a mode of thinking, this can be seen to prepare the reader for what follows:

Constance sat down with her back to a young pine-tree, that swayed against her like an animate creature, so subtly rubbing itself against her, the great alive thing with its top in the wind! And she watched the daffodils sparkle in a burst of sun, that was warm on her face; and she caught the faint tarry scent of the flowers; and gradually everything went still in her, so still, so still and disentangled! (*FLC* 301–2)

Again, a conventional reading of this passage could not fail to mention its phallic force and its preparation of Constance for her sexual relationship with Mellors. But it is also a moment of Constance learning from the forces of nature an empowered sense of her own nature, producing an inner stillness that "disentangles" her from her previous life. Her comment on the daffodils now is "How strong, in their frailty!". She cannot bring herself now to take them from "their own outdoor world" behind the walls of Wragby. "She wished she were strong enough to live without walls" (*FLC* 302). Her recognition, in that moment of stillness, of herself having an organic life like that of a flower or a tree prepares the reader for the iconic role of flowers in the buffeting but renewing sexual relationship that is to come.

In the third version, this scene begins with Constance remembering the gamekeeper, at Mrs Bolton's mention of the daffodils behind his cottage, in striking terms: "his thin white body like a lonely pistil of an invisible flower" (*LCL* 85). Quotations from Milton, the Bible and Swinburne, evoking the emergence of spring as a resurrection, are "swept through her consciousness" by the March wind, as is "the breath of Persephone" emerging from

hell into the spring, borrowed from *The White Peacock* where, as Proserpine, she is referenced as a fertility goddess (WP 135). So the celandines that are added to the anemones, primroses, violets, crocuses and jasmine of the second version carry a weight of thematic meaning before we arrive at the daffodils themselves. The cold is still there as prelude to the sunlit daffodils and the idea that “perhaps they really liked the tossing” in the wind in apparent “distress” (FLC 301). But the major change is the effect of leaning back on the “young pine-tree”, now more explicitly “rising up. The erect alive thing, with its top in the sun!” and watching “the daffodils go sunny in a burst of sun, that was warm on her hands and lap” (LCL 86). More than “disentangled”, Constance, now warmed by the same sun that warms the daffodils, is more positively released into her own nature: “And then, being so still and alone, she seemed to get into the current of her proper destiny. She had been fastened by a rope, and jaggling and snaring like a boat at its moorings. Now she was loose and adrift” (LCL 86). Of course, what this release enables will become a discovery of the body as nature and the appropriate site for the placing of flowers as a symbolic exchange in the context of uninhibited love-making. But this sexual exchange is only possible because Constance has learned through her engagement with the daffodils to be in a place that Mellors already inhabits, where nature is not “Other”, but “other”. Perhaps its ultimate realisation is in Constance’s experience of pregnancy: “She was like a forest, like the dark interlacing of the oakwood, humming inaudibly with myriad unfolding buds” (LCL 138).

In recent years attention has turned to the role of the body in this novel as an alternative space of refuge from the denatured society around the characters. Katie Gramich points out that:

Connie and Mellors are fugitives from their own classes, seeking to find an alternative space to inhabit away from the modern, industrialized, life-denying world. In this endeavour, the body can sometimes function literally as a barrier against the

outside world, as well as an alternative space in itself which they can jointly inhabit.¹³

Given my suggestion that "inhabitation" in the ecocritical sense is what Lawrence is seeking to establish in this novel, it is interesting that the body is regarded here as a site of confident at-homeness. Izabel Brandão makes this point more explicitly: "Love as the culmination of the erotic relationship is a final step in relation to the lovers finding in their bodies a home they cannot find anywhere else".¹⁴ But neither critic makes the point that whilst the body can be "a barrier against the outside world" – the social world – it is very much connected to the natural world in the novel.

At the end of *Apocalypse* Lawrence sums up his final desire: "What we want is to destroy our false, inorganic connections, especially those related to money, and re-establish the living organic connections, with the cosmos, the sun and earth, with mankind and nation and family" (A 149). At the end of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Lawrence offers Mellors's commitment to this connection: "We fucked a flame into being. Even the flowers are fucked into being, between sun and earth. But it's a delicate thing, and takes patience and the long pause" (LCL 301). In the long pause in their relationship at the novel's end, it is not at all clear that Mellors and Constance will find it possible to achieve positive connections with "mankind and nation and family". Indeed, the different attempts at endings in the three versions of the novel indicate that Lawrence had doubts about whether this necessarily marginalised utopian relationship could escape, even by farming in Canada, the pressures of class and capitalism that are overwhelming the rural Midlands, destroying the woods, the bluebells and "all vulnerable things" (LCL 119).

Whilst an ecofeminist reading of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* might hope to be able to overcome those horrors of the "phallic" expressed by early feminist responses to the novel,¹⁵ or the reluctance to consider dimensions of masculinity from more recent ecofeminists, by focusing on the possibility of tenderness

exchanged between humans and nature, and between genders, in an experience of “living in the very middle of creation” (LCL 241), a life in the woods outside the social world is not ultimately sustainable. Whilst Lawrence can demonstrate the possibilities for change towards “inhabitation” and away from nature as Other in a tenderly evolved relationship embedded in nature, he knows that such a relationship will be confronted by difficulties beyond the woods. Much will depend upon how positively the reader takes Mellors’s advocacy, or stoic acceptance, of “patience and the long pause”. A comparison of the human relationship with flowers in the first and last novels indicates how far Lawrence had travelled in his exploration of the human experience of biosemiology and its implications. But he could not avoid the realities of global capitalism any less than contemporary readers can avoid its current environmental consequences. As Lawrence points out in *A Propos of ‘Lady Chatterley’s Lover’*, “the ugly fact which underlies our civilisation” is the very denial of the caring, mutual exchange between men and women, men and men, humans and “the living universe” that *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* achieves in its limited but inspiring way (LCL 332).

¹ These are provocative but ultimately crude distinctions, as Fiona Becket reveals when she argues that Lawrence’s vision in *Apocalypse* “differs from ‘ecological connectedness’ precisely because Lawrence’s vision is human-centred; it prioritises the human. Man is the first term because the failure of responsiveness is a failure of, and in, humanity”: ‘Lawrence, language and green cultural critique’, in *New D. H. Lawrence*, ed. Howard J. Booth (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009), 157. In a novel, however, “ecological connectedness” may be both evoked and critiqued by the unique mode of ecopoetics that Becket describes in Lawrence’s work in her recent essays. Humans are responsible for the problem, but, of course, have only their human-centred mode – language, imagination, ecopoetics, an ecocentric aesthetics – through which to imagine what “ecological connectedness” might be.

² Keith Sagar, *'Art for Life's Sake': Essays on D. H. Lawrence* (Nottingham: Critical, Cultural and Communications Press, 2001), 181. Per. Com. quoted in Terry Gifford, review of *'Art for Life's Sake': Essays on D. H. Lawrence*, *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies*, vol. 3.2 (2013), 191.

³ "To contemplate the extermination of the human species, and the long pause that follows before some other species crops up, it calms you more than anything else" (*LCL* 218). In the MS the tone was less suggestive of seductive escapism and more strongly satirical about the "occupation" of intellectuals such as Birkin: "one of the most soothing of all occupations", says Mellors (*LCL* 359).

⁴ Terry Gifford, 'A Playful Novel of Reprise: An Ecofeminist Reading of *Kangaroo*', *Journal of D. H. Lawrence Studies*, vol 3.2 (2013), 109–19; Izabel Brandão and Terry Gifford, 'The Boy in the Bush: Lawrence, Land and Gender in Australia', *Études Lawrenciennes*, no. 32 (2005), 147–79; Terry Gifford, "'Anotherness" as a Construction of Nature in D. H. Lawrence's *Birds, Beasts and Flowers*', *Études Lawrenciennes*, no. 12 (1996), 7–16.

⁵ 'Queer ecologies' – the title of a section in Greta Gaard, Simon C. Estok and Serpil Oppermann, eds, *International Perspectives in Feminist Ecocriticism* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2013) – first came to prominence in Catriona Mortimer-Sandilands and Bruce Erickson, eds, *Queer Ecologies: Sex, Nature, Politics, Desire* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2010).

⁶ For a connection with Pan in *The White Peacock*, see the Ph.D. thesis by Anne Odenbring Ehlert, *'There's a bad time coming': Ecological Vision in the Fiction of D. H. Lawrence* (Uppsala: University of Uppsala, 2001), 167–8.

⁷ Keith Sagar, *'Art for Life's Sake': Essays on D. H. Lawrence*, 152.

⁸ See, for example, Wendy Wheeler, *The Whole Creature: Complexity, Biosemiotics and the Evolution of Culture* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2006).

⁹ Challenged in a review by Helen Baron, the editors of *The First and Second Lady Chatterley Novels* point out (*FLC* xxxiv, note 43).

¹⁰ By omitting a comma, *The First Lady Chatterley* text suggests that it is the daffodils that are "shivering in a burst of sunshine" rather than the orchard: "The little orchard at the back was all sparkling and shivering in a burst of sunshine [,] with wild daffodils that grew up the slope" (*FLC* 42).

¹¹ David Ellis, *D. H. Lawrence: Dying Game 1922–1930* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 393.

¹² The pastoral is often associated with a Romantic reading of Lawrence, although rigorous Romantic critiques will always recognise the tensions between the “simple” and the “complicated”, connection and separation, individuality and belonging. See, for example, Colin Clarke, *River of Dissolution: D. H. Lawrence and English Romanticism* (London: Routledge, 1969), 88–110.

¹³ Katie Gramich, ‘Stripping Off the “Civilized Body”: Lawrence’s *nostalgie de la boue* in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*’, in *Writing the Body in D. H. Lawrence. Essays on Language, Representation and Sexuality*, ed. Paul Poplawski (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001), 149–61, 159.

¹⁴ Izabel Brandão, ‘*Lady Chatterley’s Lover*: The Erotic Route Towards Home’, in *Il corpo, la fiamma, il desiderio: D. H. Lawrence, Firenze e la sfida di Lady Chatterley*, ed. Nick Ceramella (Firenze: Edizioni dell’Assemblea, 2008), 338.

¹⁵ A horror which even a sympathetic feminist scholar like Izabel Brandão needs to overcome in the opening of her essay above.