

Original Paper

Becoming, Rheology and Deterritorialization: On Sensibility

Illustration in The White Peacock from the Affect Theory

Lin Xiaomeng^{1*}

¹ School of Foreign Studies, Nankai University, Tianjin, China, 300071

* Lin Xiaomeng, School of Foreign Studies, Nankai University, Tianjin, China, 300071

Received: September 4, 2024 Accepted: September 15, 2024 Online Published: September 27, 2024

doi:10.22158/sll.v8n4p31

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sll.v8n4p31>

Abstract

The White Peacock by D.H. Lawrence in the Victorian era distinguishes itself with delieantion in affect, different from other works with bold strokes of sexual love. The factors and the change of identity in affective entanglements between Lettie, George and Leslie reflect the great emphasis of the emotion involved in love on the representation of the subject. Dynamics of affect is pivotal in delineating the interplay between the self and the other, the rhizomatic “becoming” subjectivity, and the rheology within the narrative. This paper explicates the exerted power of affect as the change of intensity of life, the becoming to new identities attributed to affect, and the deterritorialization and rheology in Lettie’s subjectivity by drawing upon Gilles Deleuze’s critique of affect theory by Spinoza. The examination of Lettie’s marital and romantic choices under this perspective insinuates the vicissitudes of Victorian women’s vitality amid the complexities of love, the ideological nomadism of female subjects, and their emancipation from the entrenched frameworks of subjectivity. The inescapable outcome of their life trajectories and innate capacity for treating different affect movement. Although the affective power leads to the hybridity and contradiction of her action, her subjective consciousness and desire of self-confirmation against regulated, traditional love ethics are elucidated. This paper shed lights on the analytical lens from the empowerment of the affect on the subjectivity, that experiences of life energetic flow vary across diverse contexts, reflecting the multifaceted nature of subjectivity.

Keywords

The White Peacock, D.H. Lawrence, affect theory, becoming, rheology

1. Introduction

Taking affection and sensibility as the theme, majority of D. H. Lawrence’s masterpieces reflect the counter-performance of the affect relationship that was emerging, fluctuating and even executing lives

and realities in social life from the perspective of complicated relationship between men and women. Through protagonists' love and marriage stories, the author's reflection on marriage ethics and power of sensibility are embodied. His first novel, *The White Peacock*, scrutinizes the confusion, pain and disaster brought to people by the traditional ethics of marriage under the modern civilization and affection interwoven with natural desire under traditional ethics of marriage and love.

As for the literature review of this novel, the current research in academia realms majorly cover the following themes: Jiang Jiaguo (2003), Xu Chongli (1989) Squires (1970) discussed the opposition between the natural, rustic world and the industrialized one, where the alienation of human is revealed. Zhao Lili (2016), Xu Zhanqiang (2013) has explored the ecological philosophy of Lawrence in this story inspiringly, while Jiang Jiaguo (2003), Zheng Dahua (2001) and Booth (2002) Friedman (2000) probed into the love and marital ethics of Lawrence from a sociological, or a psychological lens in profundity. Besides, the probe into comparative literature with another work and the narrative techniques are also focused (Gao, 2005; Sproles, 1992).

To view comprehensively, discussion from the perspective of affect theory based on the love and sensibility entanglement is relatively rare and remains a relatively explorative literary realm. The mini-narrative of female protagonist Lettie's affect, energy and self-becoming against the meta-narrative in the grand proposition of Lawrence is less explored. By drawing upon the Western philosophy's interpretation of sentimental power as affect, this paper aims to delve deeper into the sensibility and subjectivity in an innovative way.

2. Analysis of Sensibility In White Peacock from the Affect Theory

2.1 Review of Lineage of Affect Theory

Illustrations on the affect (Note 1) boasts profoundly theoretical and philosophical foundation. Dominance of sign-perspective of linguistic school represented by structuralist, post-structuralist and deconstructionism sparked the revolt of these anti-essentialist discourses and theories at the end of the 20th century; under this context, the concept of affect began to arouse attention in literary criticism, developed by several generations of philosophers from Spinoza, Deleuze, Massumi, Belante etc. The affective turn reversed the critical standpoint from the outside "sign" to the affect or sensibility within interiority in modern human themselves. A variety of critical theories have assumed that human subjectivity is a construction of language and culture, being engendered by the outside world and material, meanwhile uninterruptedly exerting influence on the self's thoughts, to manipulate and even to counter-act.

The study of affect as a philosophical concept was initialized by Baruch de Spinoza, and critically inherited and further as a term regarding subjectivity, developed by Gilles Louis René Deleuze and Pierre-Félix Guattari. At first, Spinoza rejects Decartes's proposition referring the spiritual affective forces as the product of mind-body dichotomy, instead, in his masterpiece *Ethica in Ordine Geometrico*

Demonstrata (Note 2), he regards “affect” as active or passive body feeling, that is, the process of interaction between bodies, such derivative force can sway the power of physical activity (Spinoza, 2001), playing an indispensable role in the change of affections (Note 3). Besides, Spinoza also clarifies the relationship in some concepts. He first distinguishes between two basic categories of “adequate cause” and “partial cause”. This implies the action between cause and affect. The mind is alive when it has complete ideas, passive when it has incomplete ideas, and the more incomplete ideas the mind has, the easier it is to fall into passion, and the more autonomous it is” (Spinoza, 2001). In his view, if we are the adequate cause of things, that is, if the things that happen to us and around us come from our own nature and can be clearly understood by us alone, we may be called active; if we are the partial cause of things, that means, a partial cause of things that happen to us or around us, we are called passive. Here, affect is first and foremost a state of the body and its idea. “Cause” here emphasizes that the action of the body is “affect” after the confirmation of the mind, particular to mankind. Thereby, “affect” is defined as “the strain of the body, which will enhance or weaken, benefit or limit the power of physical activity, and also as concept of these strains” (Spinoza, 2001). Spinoza investigates and explores the 48 human emotions under such framework. The resultant interchangeability from an intangibly spiritual force as “God” and real existence as “Nature”. However, it should be noted that his advocacy is tinged with metaphysical color for he holds that the being or action state is finally determined by the God, a transcendental force. Spinoza’s interest lies in the motion and transformation from the one state to another, the dynamics from strong to weak or vice versa, through which what the body is in terms of the extent to which it can be affected and converted. (Liu, 2018).

Based on the precedent affective paradigm, as a post-modernist scholar aiming to dissolve the conventional, centralized philosophy, Deleuze made innegligible contributions in prompting affective turn. He made further revision and innovation on precedents, articulating the affect is seen as an infinite increase or decrease in the intensity of life when an object or body meets without an infinite entity behind it. Affect is “the rheology (increase or decrease) of the continuous intensity of the body’s force of existence or power of acting” (Seigworth, 2006). When effort is strengthened, a sense of pleasure is generated, and the power of action is also enhanced, and vice versa. The increase or decrease of force, is woven into “affect” in Deleuze’s view. Life synergize affects, and life is always freely created and generated on the way of “affect encounter”. Affect, not subordinate to any subject, liberates the body from the rigid “existence” through transmission of life activation, leading to an eternal “generation”. It contributes to the generation of difference, and stimulate the possibility of life in the dynamic process of constantly breaking the identity of oneself (Sotirin, 2006). Man has the conatus of action to maintain his existence with the effort of affects, which is, as the “transition from one state to another” and “the related change of affective body” (Deleuze, 2017).

With Guattari, in *Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze argues that life is “an affective interaction” and “a collection of generation-others” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987); “affection” means affectio; “affect” corresponds to Spinoza’s “*affectus*”. On further extension of Spinoza’s theoretical interpretation, he redefines “*affectus*” as affect, empowering the subject with potential to always be open to “generation” (Jin, 2020, p. 156). This distinction and relationship prevails Spinoza’s interpretation of body/mind dichotomy in affection and affect; instead, “intensity” is thereby invoked to clarify this relationship. Affect is “intensive” rather than “extensive” in interaction between bodies. Therefore, he negates the necessity of being confirmed by a human mind, indicating that occurrence of affect is not confined to the existent physicality in affect. Such opened views validate the possibility for affect theory in current post-modernist or post-humanistic world. Moreover, “affect” is incorporated into “rheology-becoming” system for its changeability and generativeness; under this premise, in most cases, so-called “positive affect” is emphatically expounded (Liu, 2018, p. 211).

Besides, the affect is also associated with power regulations to some extent. There is an affect politics whose aim is to break the existing norms of power (Ge, 2021, p. 109). Such thoughts are consonant with the implication of “Rhizomes”, in contrast to “tree”, to break through the shaped “tree” of life, and to generate the “rhizome” of arbitrary growth. The “tree” is solidified, in line with social norms, and can be clearly identified as branches, leaves, and stems; while “rhizomes” are decentralized and irregular, each part intertwined with each other, forming a “structure-free” configuration and an escape line to freedom (Mai, 2019, p. 190). In the transmission of this force, the individual expands his sphere of action, and freedom is thus promoted. Emotions are therefore intensive rather than extensive, cannot be quantified or consciously recognized, and can only be transmitted from one body to another as force or intensity (Colebrook, 2001, p. 39). At this point, affect is given a new life: it is the encounter and connection between bodies, and it is the flow of intensity. Life is a collection of emotions, always freely created and generated on the way to “affect encounters” (Smith, 1997, p. 279). In this sense, affect liberates the body from rigid “existence” through the transmission of vital strength, which is the key to eternal “generation”.

The highly flexibility of this perspective to apply in illustration of relationship of the body and the spiritual affection identifies that elaborate delineation of sensibility can be analyzed distinctly from a predominant, meta-narrative way. It presents great explanatory potential to delve into heroine Lettie’s fluid transformation in her initiatives and, subjectivity through her reaction of different sensibility becoming with other protagonists represented by George and Leslie.

The present literary research on *The White Peacock* mainly concentrates on the alienation, the love ethics, narrative techniques and the modernism thoughts embedded in it, while lacks a preoccupation on the affection-driven force exerting on the protagonist, therefore making an explorative space for the combination of affect-oriented narrative with the growth of character. The affect theory might help us better grasp what matters in texts that focus attention on the tremulations and upshots of affected bodies.

For as readers of cultural artifacts or of social practices, we are beckoned to articulate a more complete phenomenology of the aesthetic and of lived experience under the consideration of “affect”. In analysis, Lettie’s process of affect is corroborated that her consciousness and subjectivity undergoes “rhizome”, constantly encountering, associating via affect movements with others, experiencing change of life intensity in interaction with male or organless, inhuman objective bodies. There is both the negative affect and positive affect, which induced contradictions, different kind of “becoming”, as well as territorialization or deterritorialization in pertaining identities. With George, she continuously generating herself in a natural, unrestricted becoming state, to find fluidity in her identity in different sensible struggles, deterritorialize from her stifling marital territorialization towards the being state as freedom. While in strenuous marriage with Leslie, her contradictory choice between sensibility drives her to undergo the negative affect, retrospect the worldly stereotypes exerted on her in the territorialization of her state in smothering, traditional marriage paradigm, which arouse her underlying, real awareness in subjectivity as a becoming-able woman. Her affective performance is the inevitable consequence of fluid affects, which results different life force in herself. Although affect power leads to the hybridity and contradiction of her ideas and action, her subjective consciousness and the desire of self-confirmation against traditional love ethics is subtly demonstrated.

2.2 Rheology in the Affection to Affect

Aforementioned review has clarified the definition and the relationship of “affection” to “affect”. Affection, in contrast to affectus, is an inadequate pattern of superficial thoughts embodies the physical emotion. It is an executive effect of one body on another, the mixture of all objects in a condition. Affection, i.e., affectus, is the premise of affect. Based on the difference in the intensity of life force generated in the body, both Deleuze and Spinoza made distinct propositions, Spinoza believes that people have three basic emotions: pleasure, pain and desire, and anything can accidentally become the cause of these three affect. So the emergence of various affects combined by these three emotional changes contains a huge coincidence or congruence between a bad affect/affectus and a good one. The bad one is all sensibility or emotions which induce diminishing puissance for action; while the good one involves an increase in the puissance. A negative affect implies the individual is in a harmful relationship with himself, in which one cannot reach an understanding of “common notions”, while, the positive affect spawned can reach more subjectivity instead.

Based on Spinoza’s work, “affect” and “concept” is further distinguished by Deleuze, which can be applied to analyze to Spinoza’s definition in “bad affect” and “good affect” occurred in protagonists. He extrapolates that affects are fundamentally unrecognizable; the emergence of emotion must have a concept that pre-exists before itself, which precedes and directly leads to the emergence of an affect without a single inference mapping between them. To delve into the deeper reason of characters’ representation of different affect, the only method is to place the character in a specific situation and find possibility of the correlation between his/her concept and affect. In addition, affect emphasizes

people's "want" impetus and unique experience. Affect "precedes the identity and identity divisions to ascertain the state, and are represented by shifts that are unlocatable from the point of view of the starting point or the end point" (Liu, 2018, p. 206). Therefore, affect "is a category of pre-subject" (Guattari, 2016, p. 56), consequently our analysis should depart from the first moment of its unconscious sensibility, as well as the context of specific and undisguised intention of the character's behavior.

Hybridity in identity and action, resultant differentiated self in "affect", as well as the counter-force as presupposed concepts in subjectivity should be considered in the analysis of different "affect" in this part.

George and Leslie intricately linked with Lettie, serving as a symbol for distinct forces of body and corporeality. The fluctuation in life force intensity reifies different affects. In the interaction and acquaintance with two male protagonists, different affects are induced through affection, being stimulated and interwoven, thus incurring entanglement between subjectivity and other selves. It is in the mixture of bodies that affects are generated, either good or bad. Deleuze, in his seminal work *Critique and Clinique*, underscores that "affect" transcends the immediate effect of an object (body) on the "mine" but the "differential duration" between affection and affectus (Deleuze, 1998)—this encapsulates the genesis of joy or sadness, beatitude or pain. The transition from one state to another is characterized by, a transition, a becoming, a rise, a fall, a perpetual oscillation between states of being, a continuous of metamorphosis of force" (Deleuze, 1978-1981, p. 139). As Chinese scholar Liu Qianyu (2021) remarked, this perspective is integral to understanding to this narrative.

Lettie, as a scion of squire bourgeoisie of Nethermel Valley from her childhood, received higher education, that cultivates her refinement and decorum, enabling her to read and engage the "things pertinent to modern women". Her "every gesture bespeaks settleness and harmonious temperament in her "artist's subtle sympathy" (Lawrence, 1983, p. 202). However, her upbringing is also marked by adherence to the inexorable, stringent familial regulation that demand prudishness and compliance with the ethical, disciplinary, and normative etiquette and norms of femininity. Upon her encounter with the young farmer George, her latent sexual inclinations are aroused, making her enamored of George's masculine physique and his exuberant virility, whereby a so-called, basic affection as "desire" was elicited. The regulation inherent in growth against George's vitality releases tremendous tension, thereby she succumb to and fall in love irresistibly. The mutual attraction, communication and sincere sensibility from their organic interaction of two bodies is spontaneous and untamed. In discussion about Klaus's paintings and Griffinham's music, they are put in a natural, gratifying state. In joint discussion of the music of "Pastoral", she "caressed his cheek", inducing George to feel "a spontaneous sensation of a violent, unquenchable response, re-experiencing the muscles of his arms and the burning within his chest" (Lawrence, 1983, p. 146). In the appreciation of the artwork, they "lifted their gaze to meet each other's eyes, held each other's look for a moment, then returned their attention to the painting"

(Lawrence, 1983, p. 145); such candid exchange of glances within a physical entanglement that “compelled them to endure for a moment the pain that makes one smile, the suffering that has not yet been acted upon” (ibid.). Here the exaggerated “pain” reified the intensity of a surge of intense affect energy arose from the physical to the spiritual: “Dizzying, causing one to recoil, trembling through the moments after the fierce stimulation of a fiery passion coursing through the veins” (Lawrence, 1983, p. 146). Whether through the touch of their bodies or the interaction of their gazes, these corporeal responses ignited a torrent of love in their hearts. This made Lettie feel “thrillingly excited” (Lawrence, 1983, p. 147). This is an purest affection as love, which is subconscious, instinctive drive, without being constrained by rationality. It increases their puissance of act even to partake them in “tasting the forbidden apple” out of passion. Such “affect” makes her life intensity naturally released and amplified against the secularity, a differentiated body duration, making both of them establish a symbiotic relationship of emotional resonance, sharing a more liberated rhythm of life, rather than being confined within the cage of rationality. Affect is the way the body operates in a specific context by means of a multitude of possibilities according to the actuality. While, Lawrence, in his reflections, also recapitulated that “Sex likens to some kind of fire”. “Because it perpetually conveys a warm, shimmering feeling, and when that flicker transforms a pure glow, we attain beatitude” ... “As long as it exists, this sexual fire, this wellspring of beauty and anger, it burns inexplicably within us” (Lawrence, 1989, pp. 6-7). This affect can be construed as a natural revelation of unspoiled, pristine human nature beauty in vitality.

Besides, the heroine’s interaction with George epitomizes a yearning as a primitivism nature. Symbolically speaking, George’s simplicity/peasantry represents nature symbolically to some extent, it suggests the trend of human beings under industrial civilization to return to reconnection with nature. This interaction with a pure object opens up herself, “becoming” towards an open subjectivity and a rhizomatic multiplicity of the self in a free state.

It should be observed that Lettie’s experiences from distinctly different vital forces in her relationships with different male characters, stems from a “pre-exsiting” concept in her latent thoughts and subconsciousness. The preemptive coexistence of marital pre-concepts swaying between the rational and sensible affection leads to a differentiated, contradictorily hybrid self. Lettie’s affect is subject to her complex situation and contexts. Actually, her notions towards to marriage is deeply rooted in her values and views on love due to society ethics at that time, which exerts a reciprocal influence on her body in different circumstances, revealing a hidden yet significant affect power. In experience of eros, the innate, natural concept of male charm that pre-exists led her to choose George, while in choosing a marriage partner, under the macro social rational concept of love and marriage, she was predisposed towards Leslie, demonstrating a dual and contradictory nature embedded in human nature. In Lettie’s consciousness, “elegance makes a man”, “money makes a man”, and “money and elegance are always linked together” (Lawrence, 1983, pp. 260-261). Although she enjoys the freedom of the soul in her

interactions with George, she is in the secular system of the Victorian era and has long accepted the measure of marriage value by economic strength, becoming a member of that societal context and unable to break free from the mold. The pre-existence of mixed concepts is axiological, which has presupposed Lettie's "pre-subjectivity", ultimately causing her identity hybridity and an essential passiveness. It seems that she has genuine affect in love being endowed with the right to choose under the pull of different forces, but in fact, her all affect is forced to make choice under the manipulation of a already regulated ideology and unconsciousness from either the nature inclination or the social norm. Her cognition of either superficial affection or deeper affect is obscure. This "passive" and "bad" engendered affect is undoubtedly leads to a weakening of Letties' puissance of action and existence, and resulted that "...all of the things in life seems worthless and insipid...she had to empty her own potentialities...(Lawrence,1983, p. 290)", thus plunging her into a dilemma in extreme situations. Under such circumstances, Lettie's act of succumbing to secular conventions and rationality shows her obedience and strengthening to the de-subjectivity forces, which also corroborates her inclination to homogenization in affect in her marriage choice with Leslie. Her experiences echo the fluctuating essence of life energy emerged from "differential duration" between affects. This reflection resonates with Deleuze's perspective that "all the life is in rheology" (Deleuze, 1987, p. 60), an oscillation between rise or down, a continuous metamorphosis of force.

2.3 *Deterritorialization and Rhizome through Affect*

Deleuze's "rhizome" concept could be used for reference for Lettie's identity and subjectivity undergoing different "generation" via active affects in accordance with different response from the outside. This process is not to become a new and territorial emotional object, but to gradually open to new deterritorialized being perceptions. That is, the subjective perspective of the deterritorialization (Colebrook, 2001, p. 138). The term "deterritorialization" was coined by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophreniam*, referring to the breaking of a specific field or territory or boundary, which can be a specific field of knowledge or a specific physiological or psychological area (Deleuze, 1987, p. 240). Since affect is not attached to any subject, it is the realization of "a power of the pack" that breaks the territorialization beyond itself as a mere spiritual activity into a generative force, in a more extensive way. Furthermore, in Deleuze's philosophy, the source of affect can be either human or non-human bodies, which can make Letti attempt to form the deterritorialization and rhizome in affect movements. Philosophically "rhizome" has its own characteristics, which has long gone beyond the narrow definition of its original botanical, and was given life and vitality by Deleuze. Its characteristics are no longer confined to any isolated subject category, but like a dynamic, multidimensional infinite network. Along with deterritorialion, it is can also be applied into illustrations on subjects involved. It signifies a trend towards true pluralism, an aggregation of heterogeneity in a qualitative way. The relationship between "bodies" and affect is reciprocal bi-directional executing route, where the performing media, power or intensity of affect

emerged between Lettie and others, in return, can exert changes in life energy in the recipient.

Deleuze regards “spontaneity-affect” as a form of active affect. Active affect is the transition from the realm of emotions to the realm of action, and it is the necessary path to reach the “concept-idea”. Affect, as a passive reflection of the body to things, embodies the characteristics of the things rather than those of the body itself. Only spontaneous affect, or active affect, can enable the individual to break free from the lower stage of “affect-concept”. Active affect is not a question of “what should be done,” but a question of “what can be done,” a question of “I” making “me” affect. According to Deleuze’s “rhizome” theory, Since emotion is not attached to any subject, but is the realization of “a power of the pack” that breaks the self-domain (Deleuze, 2007, p. 228), Lettie enters different affective states when facing different subjects that can elicit her sensible response, such as George deeply attached, the nature she immersed in , and the outside affairs she likes to deal with, which all symbolizes the abundant force to inspire her to exert energy to do something positive.

This part is depicted implicitly particularly in Volume 2 & 3. In the first place, Lettie’s marriage to Leslie is fraught with discord, bad affection, where the state of her being became “territorialized” due to a decline power of act, which engendered languor, rigidity in her body. However, Lettie engages in the plural action towards a rhizome in various aspects, seeking positive affectivity conducive to self-development, becoming with an enhanced subjectivity.

Firstly, nature, as a ubiquitous spatial presence in the text, provides Lettie with a direction for “escape” and “becoming” in construction of via spontaneous affect. Within nature, she fervently senses the flow of freedom. Faced with mundane affairs, she continually finds solace and joy in her intimacy to the natural world in Nethermel Valley, establishing a symbiotic relationship with the flora and fauna, to banish the self and achieve spiritual deterritorialization under positive affect relationship with inorganic nature landscape. Here, the generation of affect is formed through the interaction of different symbolic non-human spaces with Lettie’s body. The outdoor nature, symbolizing freedom and openness, contrasts with the enclosed, domestic home, shaping different spaces; the former is “bracing and refreshing”, while the latter induces feelings of oppression, depression, and confinement. These two different space play an indispensable role in affect shift via distinct space production. In Lefebvre’s view of space, the production of space is related to release of bodily energy (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 180), which coincides with the direction of positive affect. Lettie, wandering in nature, is able to absorb the expansive, life-affirming energy of the natural space; this energy produces different embodied affect consciousness, thereby helping Lettie to achieve positive affect production and a dynamic “becoming” towards nature. As Lefebvre elaborated, “Energy release that causes some change in the world, no matter how small, can be considered “productive” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 179). Other non-human forces produced in the natural space also correlates the enhancement of Lettie’s life intensity. The scenery of the forest is an image that cannot be overlooked. This “becoming towards the minor” approach is an important part of Deleuze’s “becoming” philosophy. Whether it is becoming-animal/plant or

becoming-woman or child, these are all deterritorializations of specific subject authorities at different levels (Kang, 2016, p. 55).

“Look! she said,” it’s a palace, with the ash-trunks smooth like a girl’s arm, and the elm-columns, ribbed and bossed and fretted, with the great steel shafts of beech, all rising up to hold an embroidered care-cloth over us; and every thread of the care-cloth vibrates with music for us, and the little broidered birds sing, and the hazel-bushes fling green spray round us, and the heneyssuekle leans down to pour out scent over us. Look at the harvest of bluebells-ripened for us! Listen to the bee, sounding among all the organ-play if he sounded exultant for us!” She looked at him, with tears coming up into her eyes, and a little, winsome, wistful smile hovering round her mouth... (Lawrence, 1983, p. 236)

Through “becoming” towards animals and plants, such as reed, alder, ivy, honeysuckle, or cowslips, lapwing, mandarin ducks. Along with George, she wish to integrate herself as ivy: “If we were trees with ivy—instead of being fine humans with free active life—we should hug our thinning lives” (Lawrence, 1983, p. 231); “The sight of their clinging ,clambering riot gave satisfaction to the soul” (Lawrence, 1983, p. 232). In nature, Lettie, escapes confinement and suppression, thereby achieving the enhancement of life intensity and the plural interpretation of rhizome identity in interplay with nature.

Secondly, Lettie’s transition for a rhizome in her identity in post-marriage is inextricably linked to her courage to challenge the traditional feminine role and to engender a beneficial pre-existing notion as self-advancing affection within the realm of political engagement. Herein the sense of accomplishment and gratification derived from social affairs constructed a mutually incorporated relationship where positive affect for her, making her briefly to deterritorialize stereotyped role as a regulated female in the Victorian age, into the potentialities to choose the objects that she would like to perform the affect for in a reterritorialization in a new growth way. Besides, the elicited sense of positive engagement on her, is the verification in her simulated rhizome becoming, making her to attain the “common notions”. According to Deleuze, the “common notions” engendered herein propels the individual to venture to the furthest reaches of their affective and existential capacity, seeking to experience the zenith of intensity as well as the nadir, thereby exploring the “seuil”—your power carrying the intensity of affect—that delineates the spectrum of human experience.

In the Victorian era characterized by the dominance of male administration in political engagement, Lettie, accompanied Leslie to “Hollis” for meetings on multiple occasions, thereby breaking away from the subject trajectory that had been disciplined by the societal norms of the Victorian age. Such activities afforded her a distinctive affective experience, as she articulated, “I am in sympathy with the the socialists... The people are so earnest, the make me sad. But then, they are so didactic, they hold forth so much, they are so cock-sure and so narrow- eyed, they make me laugh” (Lawrence, 1983, p. 321). This subtle act of defiance against the established order, though occasionally mentioned in the text and highly veiled, should not be overlooked as an attempt to seek a positive affective “escape” in

Lettie's post-marital life. Deleuze perceives escape as a form of delirium, which is a deviation from the norm, where the line of escape abandons the established powers that confine us, leading to a deterritorialization of the individual. In the direct confrontation of abandonment, the line of escape—also known as the deterritorialization of the person—is thus derived (Deleuze, 1987, p. 44).

Therefore, her state here, reaching the “auto-affect”, by which Lettie gets rid of the concept what she relies on to exist through her husband or children, instead, a multiplicity component in her to engage in more complex context. A multiplicity has neither subject nor object, only “determinations, magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the multiplicity changing in nature” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2007, p. 226). Lettie extricated herself from the household to social affairs is a proof, which also opens her a “rhizomatic” self implicitly. “Multiplicities are rhizomatic, and expose arborescent pseudomultiplicities for what they are. There is no unity to serve as a pivot in the object, or to divide in the subject” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2017, p. 227). Such rhizomatic upshot thanks to her positive establishment of notion in affect decentralized her role as a disciplined woman as a minor but courageous attempt.

It also worth mentioning that, the sincere, visceral affect represented by George was transformed from the intimate affect to another affect generation as friendship. This treatment with seuil in romance conversion involves a pertinent shift in subjectivity in Lettie. By transmuting her amorous affect into a friendship bond, Lettie facilitates a rechanneling of the affect movement of love, thereby assuming a rejuvenated, intensified flow of life puissance imbued with novel vigor. Although Lettie and Leslie married and establish their lineage and George enters into matrimony with Merlin, yet the kinship between the two households persists due to frequent social activities by which the objects/bodies interact. Confronted by her erstwhile paramour George, Lettie assumes the initiative in forging a companionship. Lettie, once ensnared in the conundrum of the dichotomy between the rational negative affect and the positive allure of erotic longing, now manipulates the direction flow of affect. Such subjectivity against societal norms that dominates her marital affections, now, with a stance of agency, extricates herself from the melancholic, bad affect that had been subjected to discipline. On encountering George on her birthday in post-nuptial, “as he entered the room, she stood up and directly proffered her hand to him, standing with grace and luminous eyes, akin to a pair of radiant blue stars” (Lawrence, 1983, p. 347). This posture stands in marked contrast to her prior demeanor, which was circumscribed within the confines of a marriage entwined with domestic duties and the rearing of children. In this case, the change of the subject's initiative in creating conditions for affection is transferred from the previous contextual rules to Letties' own, becoming a differentiated “body”, as an extension of life transcending the discipline by marriage rules. Just as Deleuze remarked: “Life inaugurates with a pure tendency to difference, to produce, to differentiate, and it should be ambiguous in itself” (Lu, 2017, p. 34), which epitomizes a shimmering in Lettie's life.

To encapsulate, the grasp of agency, the establishment of several “escaping lines” in minor cases, corroborated the potential possibility for Lettie trying to initiate the performance of energy interchange in the organless bodies, either the nature, the attempt in political engagement or the shift, from a passive amorous affect to an equal friendship. Although these narratives are minor embedded in the whole story, they demonstrates the rhizome generation of Lettie’s self within an already homogenized female body because of her marital choice. Her rhizome process, although serves mini narrative of deterritorialization under Lawrence’s grand one, can be viewed as a redefined “becoming towards ‘woman’” in Deleuze’s affect perspectives. This process can be verified and theorized in related illustrations:

“The creation of a woman is not solely the purview of men; women, too, are instrumental in this process. The act of forging a woman entails liberating the molecular body from its constraints and reinvesting in its constituent elements to fully harness the diverse particles, velocities, and forces inherent in the organless body. Becoming of men is not as prevalent because they represent the dominant molecular entities within the social and biological hierarchy. Hence, the genesis of womanhood encompasses a multitude of movements and processes that transcend the boundaries of fixed subjects and stable structures. This conception challenges the traditional paradigms that confine gender identities to rigid molds, advocating instead for a fluid and dynamic understanding of femininity that is ever-evolving and multifaceted” (Hallward, 2006, p. 36).

In a nutshell, the affect theory takes the interaction between different bodies and objects, concentrating on the change and flow of direction of affective emotion energy, which raise difference, heterogeneity, possibility and multiplicity. Minor as they are, her different attempts through change the flow of affect direction, or the attainment of a deeper common notion with the nature, or her grasp of agency in treating and converting the previous romantic relation, contributed to the multiplicity color in her life via different affect process. Under these circumstances, the engaged self is dynamically formulated, stepping out of the known realm of what has been made and demonstrated, reaching for what hasn’t been made or represented. This dynamic, opened keynote of writing movements help scholars expand their realms of insight, and embrace the plurality of narratives, readings, and interpretations.

3. Conclusion

Through the thread of love entanglements and affection-resulted transformation in identities, as a representative work for its sensibility elements, *The White Peacock* proves that its illustration in affect on characters from Deleuze’s perspective is corroborated. Affect perspective can explain the excellence of Lawrence’s novels, but also show that art is not only a reflection of daily life, artists should probe into the affective experiences and life transformation and inject new vitality into life. With a critical touch of reality, this novel not only insinuates the antagonism between pastoral life and industrial age through the implication conveyed through the lens of love entangle among characters, but also reveals

related identity construction and converting process caused by affect contradictions existing in the modern society in a deeper sense. This story, seemingly delineates the superficial sensibility narrative, in profundity, constructing a kind of affective philosophy in terms of love, marriage and family relationship.

As a new theoretical approach to understanding experience, affect theories points to a contemporary cognition of difference, fluidity and transience by repudiating the absolute center and homogeneity. With Deleuze's inheritance and development of Spinoza's theory of "affect", affect perspective has widely influenced the humanities and social sciences such as literature, art, and even psychology with a trend of interdisciplinary research. It is prevalent that the subject becomes increasingly rigid and abominably fetish-oriented in a post-modern context, and there is numerous cases of emotional atrophy or other tragedies due to mistreatment in affect construction. Such macro context elicits the imperativeness to unearth complicated relevance from the exuberant affective interiority forces. Broadly viewing, literature, as the carrier of language, can not only be utilised as a communication medium, but also to clarify the emotion and affects structure as an unremitting life force in humanistic care. It prompts the affect flow to come into being and ripple in readers, so that galvanize themselves up from the numbness of daily life and release living vitality that has been imprisoned for a long time. In Deleuze's related inspiring perspective, if philosophy, art, and science can be "created", it means that they are not inherent but "generated". This calls for a symptomatic reading method which can urge us to break the confine of extreme rationality and conventional stereotypes in the dominant meta-narrative, and pay more attention to "affect" as the driving force of production. A grand but incisive point of view will expand our realms of insight, and embrace the plurality of narratives, readings, and interpretations in terms of sensibility literature.

References

- Booth, H. J. (2002). D. H. Lawrence and Male Homosexual Desire. *The Review of English Studies*, 53(209), 86-107.
- Colebrook, C., & Gilles, D. (2001). *Essential Guides for Literary Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Deleuzes, G., & Felix, G. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Trans. Brian Massumi). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . (1998). *Essays Critical and Clinical* (Trans. Daniel W. Smith & Michael A. Greco). London: Verso.
- . (2007). "2 'INTRODUCTION: RHIZOME'". *Transatlantic Literary Studies: A Reader* (pp. 226-231). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . (2017). Lecture Transcripts on Spinoza's Concept of Affect (1978-1981). *LES COURS DE GILLES DELEUZE*, 1(01). Webdeleuze. Tous droits réservés.
- Friedman, A. W. (2000). D. H. LAWRENCE: PLEASURE AND DEATH. *Studies in the Novel*, 32(02), 207-228.

- Gao, W. B. (2005). Constructing Symbolism at the Intersection of Tradition and Modernity—Talking about the Symbolic Art of Lawrence’s Novels. *Fiction Review*, (02), 93-96.
- Gattari. (2016). *Overlapping and existential emotions* (Dong Shubao, translated // Wang Min’an, Guo Xiaoyan. Production Volume 11: Deleuze and Affect). Nanjing: Jiangsu People’s Publishing House.
- Ge, Y. (2021). Deleuze’s Theory of Emotions and Generative Literature. *Research of Literary Theories*, 41(4), 109.
- Hallward, P. (2006). *Out of this World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*. Verso.
- Hernri, L. (1991). *The Production of Space* (Tran. Donaid Nichiolson-Smith). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jiang, J. G. (2010). Lawrence’s Ethics of Marriage and Love from The White Peacock. *Foreign Literature Studies*, 32(06), 90-97.
- Jin, W. (2020). What is Affection. *Foreign Literature*, (6), 144-157.
- Kang Y. J. (2016). The Deterritorialization of Deleuze’s Philosophy. *Journal of Wuhan University of Science and Technology (Social Sciences)*, 18(01), 50-55.
- Lawrence, D. H. (1983). *The White Peacock*. Cambridge University Press.
- . (1989). Sex and Beauty. *Sex and Beauty: Selected Essays of Lawrence* (translated by Yu Hongyuan, pp. 1-7). Shanghai: Shanghai Knowledge Press.
- Liu, Q. Y. (2018). The Genealogy of the Theory of “Affect”. *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art*, 38(06), 203-211.
- Lu, Y. (2017). Theoretical Resources for “Emotional Turns”. *Journal of Shanghai University (Social Sciences)*, 34(01), 30-38.
- Mai, Y. X. (2019). *Generation: Cultural Studies Keywords*. Nanjing: Jiangsu People’s Publishing House.
- Seigworth, G. J. (2006). From Affection to Soul. In C. J. Stivale (Ed.), *Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Smith, D. W. (1997). A life of pure immanence: Deleuze’s “Critique et Clinique” project. *Philosophy Today*, (41), 168.
- Sotirin, P. (2006). Becoming-Woman. In C. J. Stivale (Ed.), *Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Spinoza, B. (2001). *Ethics* (Trans. W. H. White). Hertfords: Wordsworth Editions.
- Sproles, K. Z. (1992). Shooting “The White Peacock”: Victorian Art and Feminine Sexuality in D. H. Lawrence’s First Novel. *Criticism*, 34(02), 237-259.
- Squires, M. (1970). Lawrence’s The White Peacock: A Mutation of Pastoral. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 12(2), 263-283.

- Xi, Z. Q. (2013). Poetic Dwelling: An Analysis of the White Peacock from the Perspective of Ecological Holism. *Journal of Yulin Normal University*, 34(01), 68-71.
- Xu, C. L. (1989). "The Tragedy of Modern Man: On Lawrence's White Peacock". *Foreign Literature Studies*, (1), 32-36.
- Zhao, L. L. (2016). Ecological Thought Interpretation of Plant Imagery in *White Peacock*. *Journal of Chifeng University (Chinese Philosophy and Social Science Edition)*, 37(02), 161-163.
- Zheng, D. H. (2001). The White Peacock: The Beginning of Lawrence's Philosophical Exploration. *Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, (05), 23-27.

Notes

Note 1. The corresponding English term refers to the emotional activity,

Note 2. It refers to the English version of Ethics by Netherland philosopher Baruch de Spinoza

Note 3. Meaning the representation of emotion