

Shakespearean Drama: An Ecocritical Study

(Thesis submitted to Nagaland University in partial fulfilment of requirements for award of

Ph.D. degree in English)

By

ANANYA DASH

Regn. No.-PhD/ENG/00134 (w.e.f. 20/08/2018)

Under the supervision of

Prof. Nigamananda Das



Department of English

School of Humanities and Education

Nagaland University, Kohima Campus, Meriema

2022

DECLARATION

I, Ananya Dash, hereby declare that the subject matter of my thesis entitled *Shakespearean Drama: An Ecocritical Study* is the bonafide record of work done by me under the supervision of Prof. Nigamananda Das and that the content of the thesis did not form the basis of the award of any previous degree to me or to the best of my knowledge to anybody else, and that the thesis or any part of it, has not been submitted by me for any other research degree, fellowship, associateship, etc in any other university or institute. This is being submitted to the Nagaland University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English.

24th February 2022

Ananya Dash

Regn. No. - PhD/ENG/00134 (w.e.f. 20/08/2018)

Countersigned by:

Supervisor

Head



Nagaland

University

(A Central University established by the act of Parliament, 35/1989)

Department of English

Kohima Campus, Meriema, Kohima-797004, Nagaland, India

NU/ Eng/2022/

9th February 2022

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled *Shakespearean Drama: An Ecocritical Study* is the bonafide record of research work done by Ananya Dash, Regn. No. PhD/ENG/00134(w.e.f. 20/08/2018) Department of English, Nagaland University, Kohima Campus, Meriema during 2018-2022. Submitted to the Nagaland University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English, this thesis has not previously formed the basis for the award of any degree, diploma, associateship, fellowship or other title and that the thesis represents independent and original work on the part of the scholar under my supervision. This is again certified that the research has been undertaken as per UGC Regulations May 2016 (amended) and the scholar has fulfilled the criteria mentioned in the University Ordinances for submission of the thesis. Plagiarism test of the thesis has been conducted and 4% of similarity has been detected which is permissible under the UGC regulations 2018.

Dated 24th February 2022

Kohima
SUPERVISOR

Prof. Nigamananda Das

Department of English

Nagaland University, Kohima Campus, Meriema

Kohima-797004, Nagaland,

Mobile: +919436608904/8575094585

Email: nndas69@yahoo.co.in



Nagaland University
(A Central University established by the act of Parliament, 35/1989)
Department of English
Kohima Campus, Meriema, Kohima-797004, Nagaland

PLAGIARISM TEST CERTIFICATE

Name of the Research Scholar	Ananya Dash
Ph.D. Registration Number	PhD/ENG/00134 (w.e.f. 20/08/2018)
Title of Ph.D. Dissertation	<i>Shakespearean Drama: An Ecocritical Study</i>
Name & Institutional Address of the Supervisor	Prof. Nigamananda Das, Department of English, Nagaland University, Kohima Campus, Meriema
Name of the Department and School	Department of English, Humanities & Education
Date of Submission	17/01/2022
Date of Plagiarism Check	09/02/2022
Percentage of similarity detected by the URKUND software	4%

I hereby declare/certify that the Ph.D. Dissertation submitted by me is complete in all respect, as per the guidelines of Nagaland University for this purpose. I also certify that the thesis/dissertation (soft copy) has been checked for plagiarism using URKUND similarity check software. It is also certified that the contents of the electronic version of the thesis/ dissertation are the same as the final hardcopy of the thesis/ dissertation. Copy of the Report generated by the URKUND software is also enclosed.

Ananya Dash

Date: 09/02/2022

Name and signature of the Scholar

Place: NU, Kohima Campus, Meriema

Prof. Nigamananda Das

Name and Signature of the Supervisor with seal

Acknowledgement

The development of this thesis, from a minuscule concept into to a full-fledged work, could not have been possible without the help, support and guidance of many individuals who have extended their service during the preparation and completion of this thesis. I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Nigamananda Das, for his infinite patience in helping me develop this thesis. His knowledge and guidance have been invaluable. A scholar could not have wished for a better supervisor. I am extremely grateful to my parents, siblings who supported me emotionally and who stood by me through all odds. I would also like to thank the faculty and staff of Department of English, Nagaland University, for their support

Furthermore, I am deeply thankful to my fellow students, colleagues, and friends whose challenges and productive critics have provided new ideas to the work.

This thesis is dedicated to my grandmother who took the lead to heaven before the completion of this work.

Ananya Dash

Research Schol

ABBREVIATIONS USED

<i>Cor.</i>	<i>Coriolanus</i>
<i>AYL</i>	<i>As You Like It</i>
<i>WT</i>	<i>The Winter's Tale</i>
<i>Wiv.</i>	<i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i>
<i>Tmp</i>	<i>The Tempest</i>
<i>MND</i>	<i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>
<i>Rom</i>	<i>Romoe and Juliet</i>
<i>MV</i>	<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>
<i>J</i>	<i>The Jew of Malta</i>
<i>Tro.</i>	<i>Troilus and Cressida</i>
<i>Lr.</i>	<i>King Lear</i>
<i>Mac.</i>	<i>Macbeth</i>
<i>Oth</i>	<i>Othello</i>
<i>Per</i>	<i>Pericles</i>
<i>Ham</i>	<i>Hamlet</i>
<i>JC</i>	<i>Julius Caesar</i>
<i>1H4</i>	<i>Henry IV, Part 1</i>
<i>2H4</i>	<i>Henry IV, Part 2</i>
<i>H5</i>	<i>Henry V</i>
<i>AWW</i>	<i>All's Well That Ends Well</i>
<i>Per.</i>	<i>Pericles</i>

Err.

The Comedy of Errors

TN

Twelfth Night

LLL

Love's Labour's Lost

Tit.

Titus Andronicus

CONTENTS

	Page Nos.
Declaration	
Supervisor's Certificate	
Plagiarism Test Report	
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
Abbreviations Used	
Chapter-I: Introduction: Theorizing Ecocriticism	1-50
Chapter-II: Shakespeare and the Renaissance Environmental Imagination	51-86
Chapter-III: Deconstructive Ecology, Culture and Colonial Hegemony	87-129
Chapter-IV: Romantic Ecology, Environmental Culture and Environmental Ethics	130-164
Chapter-V: Song of the Earth: Contesting Ecophobia and Celebrating Gaia Hypothesis	165-202
Chapter-VI: Conclusion	203-221
Bibliography	222-235

Shakespearean Drama: An Ecocritical Study

Abstract

Together with Ecology and Environment, Eco-criticism has been a subject of engaging interest for scholars and critics for the last several decades. There is no denying the fact that eco-critical study is basically grounded upon the study of literature in relation to ecology and environment, and that its primary purpose is to reclaim/restore the amicable relationship between man and environment. The onus lies in restoring a healthy ecosystem that thrives on an organic inter-connectedness between Man and Nature/environment on one hand, and biotic and abiotic elements on the other.

Unfortunately, this symbiotic relationship has been severely affected in the backdrop of Industrialization, advancement of science and technology and mushroom growth in human population that intensify deforestation, destruction and loss of pastoral landscape causing thereby global warming, seasonal and climatic changes and environmental pollution. To overcome the eco-crisis and environmental problems of all types, eco-critics and ecologist/ environmentalist have expounded various theories and critical concepts such as Romantic ecology, Deep Ecology, Eco-feminism, Social ecology, Ecophobia, Biophilia, Ecophilosophy, Environmental Ethics, and Gaia hypothesis- to name a few. Ecological/ ecocritical study of Renaissance literature in general and of Shakespeare's work in particular came into vogue in the last few decades and in this regard the contributions of Carolyn Merchant (*The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and Scientific Revolution, 1980*), Stephen Greenblatt (*Shakespearean Negotiation: The Circulation of Social Energy, 1990*), Lawrence Buell (*The Environmental Imagination, 1996*), Robert Watson (*Back to Nature: The Green and The Real in the Late Renaissance, 2006*), Gabriel Egan (*Green Shakespeare From Ecopolitics to Ecocritical, 2006*), Todd A. Borlik (*Ecocriticism and Early Modern Literature, 2012*), Dan Brayton (*Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration, 2012*), Gwilym Jones, (*Shakespeare's Storms, 2015*), Simon C. Estok (*Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia, 2011*) and Randal Martin, (*Shakespeare and Ecology, 2015*) deserve prominent mention .

These critics offer their judicious opinions about the dichotomy between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism that conditions the Renaissance environmental imagination/ sensibility. The present thesis is an attempt to situate Shakespeare's environmental imagination and his ecocritical sensibility knowing it fairly well that the Renaissance dramatist was a professed follower of Renaissance Humanism. Within the framework of six chapters, the thesis endeavours to discuss various nuances of Shakespeare's ecocritical outlook and ecological stance by offering an in-depth analysis of such plays as *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *As You Like It* and *The Tempest*. The analytical and interpretative methods of research have been followed all through the research work, and an attempt has been made to negotiate the ecocritical theories of Deconstructive Ecology, Eco-Imperialism, Ecophobia, Biophilia, Romantic Ecology and Gaia Hypothesis to situate Shakespeare's eco-consciousness in a convincing manner.

Chapter One under the title "Theorizing Ecocriticism" is devoted to an In-depth analysis of the concepts of 'Ecocriticism', 'Ecology' and 'Environmental Study' by analysing various theories related to the three branches of knowledge. The principal objective is to showcase the horrible reality that the Earth has been facing in form of eco-despair, eco-destruction, and ecophobia following the two World Wars and the anthropocentric propensity for large scale deforestation, desertification and loss of the pristine purity of pastoral landscape in the backdrop of human habitation/ rehabilitation, Industrialization and modernization. Richard Kerridge, Joseph Meeker and Cheryll Glotfelty tend to analyse ecological/environment issues through literature by focussing the interrelationship between human and cultural productions and environment with a view to achieving a balanced ecological thinking.

Laurence Buell in his *The Environmental Imagination* (1995) deprecates anthropocentrism and opines that an ideal environmental text should highlight the non-human elements and that human accountability to the environment should be a prominent part of the text's 'ethical orientation', which reminds one of Rousseau's emphasis on Environmental Ethics and the concept of 'Noble savage' and 'Wilderness Ethics'. Following Rousseau and William Wordsworth, Jonathan Bate expounded the theory of Romantic ecology and Ecopoetics and tended to celebrate the glory and grandeur of the Earth with a proto-romantic zest. Similarly, the 'Deep Ecologists' like Arne Naess postulated the idea that Nature should have care and protection for Nature's sake rather than for the sake of the human world. They also emphasized a holistic approach of inter connectedness and interdependence of the human

and nonhuman world. Closely related to 'Romantic ecology and 'Deep Ecology' are the concepts of 'Biophilia' and 'Gaia Hypothesis' developed by Edward O Wilson and James Lovelock respectively. Whereas Biophilia demands love and appreciation of all forms of life, Gaia hypothesis tends to celebrate and respect Earth –Mother Goddess Gaia in Greek Mythology. Love of nature, natural landscape /environment and all forms of life on the Earth -human, biotic and abiotic – constitute the hallmarks of eco-centric vision as opposed to anthropocentrism.

Chapter Two titled "Shakespeare and the Renaissance Environmental Imagination" provides a fertile background to situate Shakespeare's Eco sensibility in the backdrop of Renaissance ecology that oscillates between eco-centrism and anthropocentrism. The Renaissance mind decidedly experienced the 'crisis of Environmental imagination' following the emergence of New Learning, Renaissance Humanism, illimitable passion for power, pleasure, profit, commercial success, sea adventures, maritime activities and by possessing natural resources for human consumption. Shakespeare's Renaissance oriented environmental imagination was decidedly influenced by sea voyages and adventures undertaken by John Hawkins and Francis Drake on the one hand, and by boundless Renaissance urge for power, profit and pleasure on the other. Being a patron of the Elizabethan Court, he was obviously well aware of the policy of the rulers of Tudor dynasty who exercised their political powers to utilise nature/natural resources for England's commercial success, political gain and economic strength.

Shakespeare's copious reference to various voyages and adventures at sea in such plays as *The Merchant of Venice*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Pericles*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest* vindicate the fact. Shakespeare talked about, as in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the unruly wind, fog on the surface of the sea, rise in the water level of the sea, and the untimely flood that disrupted the balanced ecosystem. He was admittedly aware of the changes that took place in weather/climate and environmental condition in England following large scale deforestation in the 16th century. And this is evident from his plays like *As You Like It*, *Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Love's Labour Lost*. In the mouth of the melancholy philosopher Jaques, the dramatist denounces hunting of deer as a barbaric pastime. Like a romantic ecologist, deep ecologist and animal activist, Shakespeare calls upon humanity, through Jaques, to put a stricture on animal hunting: "To fright the animals and to kill them up/in their assigned and native dwelling place"! (*As You Like It*, 2.1. 61-63). Here the Renaissance dramatist not only demands freedom for animals in

their own dwelling place, but also makes a powerful plea for animal justice and preservation of environmental ethics. And the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It*, together with Perdita's natural garden in *The Winter's Tale* can be taken as brilliant instances of idyllic pastoral landscape conceived of by Shakespeare's ecocentric environmental imagination. Viewed from ecological and environmental perspective, Shakespeare envisages an ideal pastoral landscape, following the footsteps of the Greek pastoral poets like Moschus, Bion and Theocritus- a world bereft of hypocrisy and artificiality, complexity and conspiracy, deceit and treason symbolized by the court of Duke Frederick. It is in the pure and pristine landscape of the Forest of Arden that the Duke Senior seeks peace and happiness in a pollution free environment. In other words, through the Senior Duke, Shakespeare envisages a green world of Pastoralism and Gabriel Egan, in his book *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism* (2006), calls him the alter ego of 'Green Shakespeare'. Whereas in *As You Like It*, Shakespeare's environmental imagination is found to be decidedly ecocentric, in *The Tempest*, he projects the anthropocentric self of the Renaissance man by characterizing Prospero as a colonizer exploiting the world of nature. There has been a clashing of ideals between Prospero's anthropocentric outlook of colonization on one hand, and Caliban's claim for 'naturalness' and 'wilderness ethics' and Gonzalo's dream of a commonwealth and solidarity of dry land on the other. Shakespeare's environmental imagination is built upon the dichotomy and ambivalence between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism.

Chapter Three under the title "Deconstructive Ecology, Culture and Hegemony" attempts to problematize the degradation of natural landscape/ environment by banking upon Derrida's philosophy of Deconstruction as developed in his *Of Grammatology*, and Barry Commoner's 'eco-anxiety' and 'eco-despair' over 'eco-destruction'. In his book *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology* (1971), Commoner regrets a harmoniously constructed house of ecology based on healthy working of biotic and abiotic elements has been deconstructed by modern man following scientific and technological progress, march of civilization and industrialization, development of materialistic outlook and consumer culture and onslaught on nature and natural landscape. Nature's no more treated as a teacher, the interconnectedness between man and nature, between biotic and abiotic elements is cut off, and human beings notoriously utilize natural environment and forests/ pastoral landscape by taking nature in terms of 'free lunch' thereby destroying the balanced ecosystem/ ecology. Derrida uses the term Deconstruction to signify internal contradiction, destabilization and a sort of binary opposition between centre and margin, between Nature and Culture. Instead, he

argues that the coexistence of Nature and Culture leads to a sound ecosystem and their separation leads to deconstructive ecosystem. In the light of the above discussion, the present chapter is devoted to an analysis of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *As You Like It* to show the dichotomy between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism, which is evident from the ideological clash between Prospero, the colonial master and Caliban, the enslaved native, between Duke Senior and Duke Frederick in *As You Like It*, between the fairies epitomizing the higher hierarchical order and the human world in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

Chapter Four concentrates on another brilliant aspect of Shakespeare's environmental imagination- his romantic love of nature and landscape, and his engaging interest in Environmental Ethics/Culture. Titled as "Romantic Ecology, Environmental Culture and Environmental Ethics" this chapter theoretically banks upon Rousseau's Environmental Ethics as adumbrated in his two *Discourses* and the novel *Emile*, and Jonathan Bate's concept of 'Romantic ecology' as developed in his two seminal books, *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991) and *The Song of the Earth* (2000). Bate problematizes the concept of romantic ecology not as mere romanticization of ecology or environment, but in terms, of glorification of 'pastoral landscape', 'natural goodness', 'economy of Nature', love of pastoral landscape, language and pastoral way of life, and above all an engaging art of ecological consciousness.

Needless to say, Bate was profoundly influenced by Rousseau's ideas of natural goodness of man, and his nourishment of pristine purity and primeval innocence in a 'state of Nature' and 'noble savage' in the lap of 'wilderness'. It is in the state of Nature, that man receives the environmental lessons of ethics and culture from Nature, the best teacher. Despite Shakespeare's increasing awareness of anthropocentric vision of the Renaissance man, the Renaissance dramatist was profoundly influenced by the revival of the culture of romanticism in the Renaissance Age. Accordingly, his two plays- *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale* have been discussed in this chapter in the light of the theoretical reflections of Rousseau and Jonathan Bate. The Forest of Arden in *As You Like It* subscribes to the principles of Romantic ecology and Environmental culture. It provides an ideal idyllic setting where time is measured by no human clock. An air of freshness, freedom, purity, happiness and peace here reigns supreme, and everyone in the forest-right from the Duke Senior to Orlando, Rosalind, Jaques, Audrey and the old shepherd Corin- subscribes to the ethics of naturalness. Here, people enjoy the joys of spring and the rough wind of winter with peace

and patience and equanimity of mind. And like a romantic ecologist, the Duke enjoys close communion with nature finding "tongues in trees, books in the murmuring brooks, sermons in stones, And goodness in everything"(2.1.16-17). In the forest of Arden, romantic love between Orlando and Rosalind is intertwined with romantic ecology, as their love is enriched by conducive weather, seasons, months, birds and animals. Likewise, romantic ecology can be satisfactorily negotiated in the dramatic romance *The Winter's Tale* wherein Perdita, like Rosalind, is imagined as a tender flower that signifies purity, peace and natural goodness. If Rosalind stands for 'rose', Perdita is identified with 'lily' on the one hand and Virgin Mary on the other. Whereas Sicily, the world of King Leontes, epitomizes artificiality, cruelty, suspicion and revenge, Perdita's natural garden in Bohemian landscape is far away from pride and pretence, cruelty and politics of Power.

The Bohemian landscape abounds in pastoral glory and is enriched with trees, plants, creepers and countless flowers that are characteristic of Romantic ecology. Perdita is essentially a lover of flowers, and bedecked with flowers and foliages, she is imagined as 'Flora,' the goddess of flower in Greek mythology. Like Dushyanta wondering at Shakuntala's natural beauty, Florizel praises Perdita's natural dress. And like Kalidasa's Shakuntala, Shakespeare's Perdita is not a creeper, but Nature herself! And *The Winter's Tale* remains an inexhaustible treasure house of flowers reared in the conducive condition of romantic ecology.

Chapter Five titled "Song of the Earth: Contesting Ecophobia and celebrating Gaia Hypothesis" problematizes the theory of ecophobia as developed by Simon C. Estok that etymologically means 'fear of man for losing home'. In the backdrop of eco destruction, Estok developed the theory to bring to the fore man's eco anxiety and eco despair, eco depression and fear for Nature's rage and fury which is manifest through climate change, unpredictability of weather and violent reactions from the primordial elements of Nature. The ecophobic condition/state of mind representing the anthropocentric Renaissance outlook is discussed in this chapter with special reference to Shakespeare's *King Lear*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar*. In *King Lear*, the old king realises that he has done greatest injustice to Cordelia, Nature's Lucy, by depriving her of property/land and paternal love. Injustice to Cordelia is in fact injustice to Nature and natural goodness, and division of an ecologically balanced Kingdom causes environmental tragedy, fear for Nature and environmental unpredictability. That is precisely the reason why the old king is chastized by Nature in the Storm scenes through incessant rain, violent wind/storm, thunder and lightning which create an ecophobic situation.

Like Lear, Macbeth and Brutus too epitomize anthropocentric arrogance and lust for power and hegemony. For the sake of power, the valiant general of Scotland in *Macbeth* kills his innocent King Duncan, and the innocent murder of the King in sleep is in fact a murder of 'natural goodness' reminiscent of the banishment of innocent Cordelia in *King Lear*. Macbeth sleeps no more, as he has killed the innocent King in sleep, and like Lear he goes mad, and their suffering and chastisement in the hands of Nature arouses ecophobia not only in themselves, but also in the audience/reader. Ecophobia runs through both the plays, and the 'foul weather' and 'violent storm' in *King Lear* can be correlated with the foul weather, thunder, lightning and the supernatural fear of the witches on the heath in *Macbeth*. After Caesar's murder, Brutus too, like Macbeth, sleeps no more and is haunted by fear. G. Wilson Knight in his *The Wheel of Fire* (2001, 145) aptly observes that 'one of the worst terrors of the Macbeth and Brutus experience is imagined as a loss of the sweet curative of sleep.'

In the second half of the chapter, a panacea for ecophobia is offered through an analysis of the concept of Gaia hypothesis which signifies celebration of the Mother Goddess Earth. Since time immemorial, Earth has been celebrated as a benign mother, an epitome of love, affection, sacrifice and benevolence. Viewed from ecological perspective, if the mother Earth is benevolent, affectionate and lovable, it is imperative on the part of human beings to love all lives- human and non human-so that a sound ecosystem can be retained. The emphasis is laid on love of all forms of life on the earth which obviously points to a sense of responsibility and obligation on the part of the human world towards the world of Nature so as to counter ecophobia and anthropocentric vision of life.

With this objective in view, the chapter offers an analysis of *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale* in the light of the theory of 'Gaia hypothesis' and biophilia, which means love of life. Through the miraculous magnanimity and benevolence of the Forest of Arden, one can locate the principles of biophilia and Gaia hypothesis. Like a mother, the forest embraces everybody and treats everyone with the ethics of peace, benevolence and natural goodness. The forest is therapeutic, as the wicked characters like Duke Frederick and Oliver do change here and realize their mistakes under the benign blessings of Mother Nature. In mother's kingdom, pride and pretence, jealousy and envy, revenge and cruelty are all alchemized into love and happiness. Duke Frederick, who came with a large army to the forest to take revenge upon his brother, underwent drastic changes under the influence of a holy hermit. Repentance dawns upon him; and the Duke gives up his "bloody intentions" to become an anchorite."(5.4.168). The Old Shepherd Corin is a perfect son of Mother Nature/Earth who

lives with perfect naturalness, peace and happiness without any hatred or ill-will for others. In *The Winter's Tale*, Shakespeare inextricably blends the human and the non human world and as such flowers and seasons are correlated with different stages of man- childhood, youth, and Old Age. Perdita and Florizel are surrounded with the flowers of spring time and summer, and her bountiful rustic garden attempts to reclaim the Edenic paradise that stands for a balanced Eco system where Mother goddess Earth is in a state of everlasting bliss.

The concluding chapter summarizes the findings of the foregoing chapters. An in depth analysis of Shakespeare's several plays from ecocritical perspective reveals that Shakespeare's environmental imagination can be situated paradoxically on the altar of ambivalence and dichotomy. On the other hand, his romantic sensibility and irresistible interest in nature, romantic love and romantic ecology satisfactorily showcase his ecocentric sensibility as is evident from the analysis of his *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale*. On the one hand, being a court poet, Shakespeare was inevitably aware of the topical, socio-political, cultural and environmental issues and problems that confronted the Elizabethan people, politics and rulers. Under the profound influence of Renaissance humanism, Shakespeare was admittedly aware of the Renaissance man's propensity for power, profit, commercial success and utilisation of Nature and natural resources anthropocentrically for political, economic and commercial gains. The ecophobic situations in *King Lear*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar*, the environmental unpredictability in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and notorious passion for animal hunting in *Merry Wives of Windsor* and *As You Like It* 'succinctly reveal that Elizabethan environmental imagination was largely homocentric/anthropocentric. Knowing it fairly well that Shakespeare, the romantic writer, was environmentally conscious, the tug of war between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism in his plays remains a permanent feature of ambivalence that characterizes the Elizabethan environmental imagination at large.

Chapter –I

Theorizing Ecocriticism

Ecocritical discourse is grounded upon the study of literature in relation to ecology and environment. It basically examines the interconnection between literature and the science of ecology by applying ecological concepts to literature. This discourse acts as a bridge between the literary works and the environmental issues happening in the surrounding. While highlighting the several environmental issues and crises faced by the world, Environmental study and Eco-criticism obviously point to restoration of harmonious coexistence of the human and the natural worlds with emphasis on a sound ecosystem. Needless to say, a sound ecosystem is based on a mutual interworking /interaction of the biotic and abiotic elements. Although the abiotic elements such as land, water, fire and air require immense protection from various types of pollution, the biotic elements point to various life forms including human beings, animals, birds, trees and plants that need to sustain their existence, freedom and healthy coexistence with others without being threatened by desertification, deforestation and hegemonization of the human world with an anthropocentric vision instead of an ecocentric approach to Nature and Environment.

The living organisms in the surrounding maintain a symbiosis obviously forming an integrated relationship between the human and non-human world, but man has struck a discordant note by cutting his umbilical cord with his life supporting systems. In fact, civilization, with its materialistic inclination, has taken man away from nature distorting his collective perception and vision finally turning him into a predator. His quenchless greed drives him hard to amass wealth and power willfully without thinking for a while, the result of the pursuit. While doing so, man has failed miserably to notice the crumbling down of the world, because of his callous fever for power and glory. While jolted by ego-consciousness and anthropocentric attitude, man has put himself in the centre, thereby causing imbalance in the ecosystem in the backdrop of colonialism, globalization and

capitalism. In the aftermath of Enlightenment and Industrialization, man has become an increasingly egocentric, utilitarian and profit oriented mechanical being. With the galloping growth in population, advancement in science and technology, the whole world has faced grave environmental crisis in form of global warming, nuclear wastage dumping, toxic waste contamination, overconsumption, and rapid reduction of natural resources. With the high-speed exposure of the industrial enterprise and technology, jeopardizing the natural ecosystem and biodiversity, it has become an ominous challenge for the ecologists and environmentalists to influence human species so that they appreciate their drive to shelter and preserve environment for the existence of eco-friendly stability/harmony. A sense of urgency to restore the damage done to the earth was felt by many ecologists, ecocritics and environmentalists who tended to evolve an interdisciplinary approach, by amalgamating ecology, environmental studies and literature with emphasis on the literary constructions/representation of nature and environmental crisis in eco-literary discourses.

Derived from the Greek word 'okios' which means 'house' and 'kritis' meaning 'to judge', Ecocriticism, according to the ancient Greek mind, indicates a sacred place where the human, natural and cultural phenomenon are all found in an 'integrated relationship'. And as the civilization and culture progressed, this harmonious relationship was broken and increasingly vitiated by industrial, technological advancement and human greed for notoriously exploiting nature and environment for human consumption. The Greek emphasis on 'sound judgement', according to William Howarth (1996) and the healthy nexus of human, natural and spiritual elements in a 'household' can be extended to interdisciplinary approaches to ecocriticism that involve, physical sciences, social sciences and humanities with emphasis on eco-philosophy, psychology, feminism, geography and even political mode of analysis bringing thereby to the fore the hegemonic outlook of the modern and post-modern man (69). Such an approach is already spearheaded by Glotfelty (1996) in her comparative perspective to ecocritical discourse. She observes that ecocriticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment. Just as feminist criticism examines language and literature from a

gender conscious perspective, and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of modes of production and economic class to its reading of texts, ecocriticism takes an “earth-centred approach to literary studies” (xviii).

Ecocriticism surfaced as a new movement among the academia in the West in the 1990's and William Rueckert coined the term 'Ecocriticism' in an article titled: “*Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*” (1978) which denotes the application of ecological concepts to the study of literature (18). As such, Rueckert suggests an ecological poetics by applying ecological concepts to reading, teaching, and writing about literature. In this connection, the amicable relations between literature and nature are examined in terms of ecological concepts. Rueckert was followed by Cheryll Glotfelty who in her introduction to *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology* (1996) argues for the mutuality inherent in ecological literary criticism and embraces the customary definition of ecocriticism put forward by the Association for the Study of Literature and the Environment, that ecocriticism forms the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment thereby foretelling an ecocentric approach in literary discourse.

The critical school in Ecocriticism began in 1993 when Patrick Murphy started an umbrella body for environmental studies: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment (ISLE), a publication of the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE). With Scott Slovic as its first elected president, ASLE's declaration as reproduced in *The Ecocriticism Reader* is: —to promote the exchange of ideas and information pertaining to literature that considers the relationship between human beings and the natural world and to encourage -new nature writing, traditional and innovative scholarly approaches to environmental literature, and interdisciplinary environmental research (1996, 18). Glotfelty boldly states that ecocriticism takes an earth-centered approach to literary studies rather than an anthropocentric or human-centred approach (18). Being multidisciplinary in nature, Ecocriticism blurs the boundaries of established disciplines, humanities, art and science bringing them together for collective action to

rebuild the ecosystem. In this respect, Cheryll Glotfelty's *The Ecocriticism Reader* (1996) an anthology of eco-poetical thoughts in America, co-edited with Harold Fromm, and Lawrence Buell's *The Environmental Imagination* (1995) formed the foundational texts respectively.

Whereas Glotfelty discusses how nature is represented in literature and to what effect is the environmental crisis seeping into contemporary literature and how science is itself open to literary analysis, in his recent book *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and the Environment* (2003), Glen A. Love insightfully articulates that any study of literature without reference to the natural conditions of the world and the basic ecological principles that underlie all life is bound to be lop-sided and incomplete (56). Love defines Ecocriticism as a literary inquiry that "encompasses non human as well as human contexts and considerations" (1) and points to the significance and the relevance of sciences and social sciences for the study of literature. It hinges on the interrelationship between the material world and human culture thereby focusing on the cultural artifacts language and literature. He further contends how literary studies have neglected and curtailed the significant role of biological foundation of human life in cultural imagination thereby establishing humanities strongly in the field of natural science. He claims that the literary academics must correspond to the physical/environmental exigency in substitution of 'anthropocentric' concerns with 'ecocentric' ones. This anthropocentric attitude is further schooled by cultural influences along with their genetic orientations, further embracing both human and non-human considerations.

Glen Love puts forward the issues the "two cultures" face together and highlights that a great deal of world literature deals with the pastoral and with the relationship between human and non-human beings. Ecocritics, according to Love, have infused fresh sensitivity in addition to the emergent voice of nature, while trying to read literature. This particular 'voice' can be at best expressed, in literature and, through human representations of non-human creatures and landscapes. He further observes that ecocriticism can be concentrated through multifarious approaches and subjects that come

beneath the canvas of environmental literature such as nature writing, deep ecology, ecology of cities, ecofeminism, literature of toxicity, environmental justice, bioregionalism, lives of animals, revaluation of place, interdisciplinary, eco-theory, expansion of the canon to include previously unheard voices, and reinterpretation of canonical works from the past (5).

In the post-modern era, Ecocriticism has inevitably become interdisciplinary to be included in the wider canvas of cultural studies. In this connection, Greg Garrard in his book *Ecocriticism* (2004) aptly defines it as the study of the relationship of the human and the non-human throughout human cultural history and entailing critical analysis of the term 'human' itself (15). To Garrard, eco-consciousness/environment consciousness is required to "define, explore and even resolve ecological problems in the wider sense" (6). As a literary discourse, it encompasses non-human as well as the human contexts and considerations. To him, ecocritics may not be qualified to contribute to discussion of issues about problems in ecology, but they must nevertheless transgress disciplinary boundaries and promote their own 'ecological literacy' as far as possible (5).

In much the same way, Richard Kerridge in his book *Writing the Environment: Ecocriticism and Literature* (1998) holds that ecocriticism is "literary and cultural criticism from an environmentalist viewpoint", precisely because it analyzes the concept of 'nature' in relation to the cultural developments that have led to the present "global ecological crisis"(15). Kerridge argues that Environmental issues require analysis not only in scientific terms, but also as literary discourses and cultural figurations. Like Garrard, he also upholds the voice of the non-human 'other'. Here, it is pertinent to mention that environmental consciousness stems out of what Lawrence Buell so perceptively calls 'the environmental imagination'(*The Environmental Imagination*,1995) and sensibility of human beings that prompt them to understand with the help of their third eye, the enormous beneficial powers of nature.

Lawrence Buell in his book, *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing and the Nature Writing and the Formation of American Culture* (1995) forwards four parameters for classifying a text in view of environmental consciousness: Firstly, Buell argues that the non-human environment should work as an actual presence in the text and not as a deceptive so as to emphasize the fact that both human and non-human worlds are combined. Secondly, Buell maintains that the text has to accept that the human interest is not the only legitimate interest. Thirdly, the text needs to emphasize that human accountability to the environment is a part of the text's ethical orientation. Fourthly, the text should put emphasis on the fact that environment is a process rather a static condition. Both Garrard and Buell highlight the fact that ecocriticism cannot be considered in isolation from Environmental Studies.

Simon C. Estok in "A Report Card on Ecocriticism" (2001) argues that ecocriticism can be defined as a study that takes into consideration the natural world as an entity of thematic study and its obligation of making connections between humans and non-human world, in the process ushering in new pathways in the academic field of literary research. He observes that this action will further open into new avenues in the academic field of literary research and also show content to the people involved in a mission of protecting earth.

Meanwhile, Lawrence Buell in *The Future of Environmental Criticism* (2005) outlines ecocriticism as the environmentally oriented study of literature and the arts in relation to the theories that underlie such critical practice (138). He highlights two fundamental terms of ecocriticism such as the "first wave ecocriticism" and the "second wave ecocriticism" or "revisionist ecocriticism". The first wave ecocriticism draws attention to genres such as nature writing, nature poetry, and wilderness fiction (138). Although the second wave ecocriticism supported the philosophy of organism, it had a preference for issues on environmental justice and also for social ecocriticism that takes urban and degraded landscapes as seriously as 'natural' landscapes. While so doing, he

subscribes to the fact that western academy concentrates on ecocriticism only as “environmental criticism” (35).

Ecocriticism which rose as a fundamental offshoot of the rise in ecological awareness during the 1960s, owes much to Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* (1962) which highlights how man’s use of pesticides altered the natural balance of earth. Even though Carson’s book was the first to deliberate on the issues of environment, it had overwhelming impact on public opinion that ushered in a powerful beginning of criticism and opposition in contrast to the chemical industry. Carson’s work even helped raising several moral questions that are relevant for environmental justice. *Silent Spring* has been credited with launching the modern environmental movement and for these, the American Chemical Society labeled the work a National Historic Chemical Landmark in 2012. According to Glotfelty & Fromm, the waves of ecological awareness to which the publication of *Silent Spring* undeniably contributed, influenced all fields of scientific and cultural studies and research (1996,101). However, it is important to observe that while other branches of Humanities began addressing the environment issues in the wake of crisis in 1970s, it was in 1990’s that environmental studies developed as an important discipline in the field of literature.

Joseph Meeker’s *The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology* (1972) is a seminal work in the field of literary ecology wherein he highlights the role of literature in analyzing the interrelationship between human cultural productions for balanced ecological living. To him, literature should be tested to identify its influence on human behavior and natural behavior. The term ‘literary ecology’ was coined by him to refer to “the study of biological themes and relationships which appears in literary works” and observes this work as an exploitation of the connection between human cultural production and the possibility of balanced ecological living. To him, understating the process of nature and its impact on human culture constitutes an important process in an ecocritical theory. Other influential texts which contributed for the establishment of ecocritical theory include Raymond William’s *The Country and the City* (1975) and Leo

Marx's *The Machine in the Garden* (1964). William suggests a British prospect on nature and urbanism in literature (Buell 2005, 20).

Ecocriticism not only highlights the attitude and practices that have so far contributed to modern day ecological issues but also shapes human response through literature, towards natural environment by analyzing the representation of the physical worlds in literary texts. Karl Marx, on the other hand, writes from an American perspective and offers a cultural history of attitudes towards nature and industrial technology in literature by introspecting American pastoralism and its usage in defining the American experience. He points to its interaction with industrialism, by looking for connections between literature and culture. With the publication of Lawrence Buell's *The Environmental Imagination* (1995) and Cheryll Glotfelty & Harold Fromm collective work *The Ecocriticism Reader* (1996), nature writing, environmental literature, interdisciplinary eco-theory and ecocriticism received immense support from the literary community to ecological issues. Glotfelty's work not only presents a definition of environmental studies but also pays attention to discover all answers as to how literary critics can respond to the environmental crisis. However, the notion of environment as described in this approach is far more inclusive and all comprehensive. She is of the opinion that in ecocritical studies "nature per se" is not the only focus as it includes preview topics such as "the frontier, animals, cities, specific geographical regions, rivers, mountains, deserts, Indians, technology, garbage and the body" (Glotfelty 125).

Of late, Ecocriticism has entered academic course lists worldwide, along with the creation of interdisciplinary academic faculty positions to teach them. Peter Berry affirms in his *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (1995) that ecocriticism has no universal model. He provides a list regarding what Ecocritics do, which includes interpretation of literature from an ecocritical outlook, applying ecological issues to the presentation of the natural world and displaying gratitude for ethical positions towards nonhuman nature. To Berry, the study of the relationship bet-

ween the human and non-human is the most common concerns of ecocriticism, throughout human cultural history. Meanwhile, this study also calls for critiquing the term 'human' itself, implying to remove the focus away from man-centered vision to earth-centered outlook. It is a by-product of culture as opined by historian Donald Worster. In his book *The Wealth of Nature* (1993) Worster maintains that we are indeed facing a global crisis as to how ecosystem functions because of our failing ethical system. He observes that getting through crisis requires deep understanding of nature precisely because it needs understanding to reform them. He further observes that historians, anthropologists, and philosophers can help with their understanding in this regard although they cannot contribute much to the reforming (34). The study of animals can arguably be regarded as an important aspect of ecocriticism. This is precisely because non-human animals after all are a central constitutive part of what has traditionally been considered "nature". In this connection, Greg Garrard holds that loss of inhabits for a variety of animals has posed formidable threats to environment. Garrard in his book *Ecocriticism* (2004) highlights fundamental aspects in the animal studies-firstly, in terms of their representation in history and culture and secondly the philosophical considerations of their rights. Scholars engaged in animal studies strongly reject the utilitarian idea of anthropocentric morality to support 'principle of equality'. The utilitarian ideology put forward by the philosopher Jeremy Bentham is foregrounded upon the principles that everyone is entitled to an equal well being regardless of family, nation, race and species. These ideas of Jeremy Bentham is further attested by Peter Singer in his work *Animal Liberation* (1975) in which he argues that brutality to animals was similar to that of slavery. Singer argues that such illogical animosity that mankind exhibit in conducting animals as totally different from humans is referred to as 'speciesism'. He views that just as women or Africans have been treated wrongly on the grounds of "morally irrelevant physiological differences" so also animals bear the brunt of being inferior. (Garrard 146). Others who have made significant contributions to the study of animals include Mary Midgley's *Animals and Why They Matter* (1983), Tess Cosslett's *Talking Animals in British Children's Fiction* (2006) and Deborah D. Morse and Martin A. Danahay's *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representation of Animals in Vic-*

torian Literature and Culture (2007). And these works admittedly advocate animal welfare. The interconnection between human being and nature has always been on the forefront in ecocriticism, and pastoralism and wilderness ethics bear true testimony to this fact. Even in Western culture, the pastoral is understood as a major influence that led to the shaping of the overall understanding of natural environment in a philosophical way. Greg Garrard holds that the genre of pastoral has somewhat shaped the construction of nature in literary works, right from the classical period down to the recent times.

The term 'pastoral' traces its origin from Latin word 'pastor' which means 'shepherd' and this pastoral is credited to the Greek poet Theocritus who composed poems on the life of Sicilian shepherds in his *Idyls* in the 3rd century B.C. It was picked by the Roman poet Virgil who established the model for traditional pastoral poem. To Virgil, it commonly means a singing competition between two shepherds or a lamentation over the loss of love as well as for a dead shepherd. In recent times, the term pastoral garnered importance through its extension by William Empson in his work *Some Versions of Pastoral* (1935). Empson advocates simple life rather than the complex one and by simple life, he means to the life led by the shepherds and innocent children and the common man. Empson believes that pastoral as literary mode can at best be used as a productive approach to condemn the principles of the hierarchical power structure of the society.

Leo Marx in his book *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (1964) classifies the pastoral as being born from the eagerness to live a life of simplicity and tranquility in close communion with nature. It is contrasted with a busy, technology-driven urban existence. Marx identifies two distinct modes of pastoral the 'popular and sentimental' which embodies simple and idealistic depiction of rural idyll and the 'imaginative and complex' which is obviously points to a more reflective and candid but imagination expression of the longing for nature. Glen A. Love in his book *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and the Environment* (2003) claims that pastoral trope carries out a perceived psychological need of readers towards *biophilia*

which means ‘love for country life’. To Love, pastoral “can be a serious and complex criticism of life, involved not merely with country scenes and natural life, but with a significant commentary on the explicit or implicit difference between such settings and the lives of an urban and sophisticated audience” (2003, 66). Simultaneously, Terry Gifford offers three kinds of Pastoral. Firstly, it points to a literary tradition that entails a retreat from the city to the countryside. Secondly, viewed in a broader sense, it indicates any literature that celebrates country life as opposed to its urban counterpart. Thirdly, it refers to the depiction of idealised rural life concealing the stark realities of hardship (Gifford 1999, 1).

Laurence Buell in his book *The Environmental Imagination* (1995) examines the pastoral ideology in American literature in relation to Thoreau, who provides a judgement of Walden’s environmental projects through an extensive inquiry of the writer’s acknowledgement in the literary history of America. More emphasis is given on the importance of nature writing in the literary canon which also forms a vital aspect in ecocriticism. Buell looks into the complexity of the pastoral’s relationship with ecological issues, stating that “historically, pastoral has sometimes activated green consciousness, sometimes euphemized land appropriation. It may direct us toward the realm of physical nature, or it may abstract us from it” (Buell 1995, 31). However, he contends that modern works are shifting their focus from pastoral towards ecocentric concerns, viewing that “as this ecocentric repossession of pastoral has gathered force, its center of energy has begun to shift from representation of nature as a theater for human events to representation in the sense of advocacy of nature as a presence for its own sake” (52). Similarly, Jonathan Bate also highlights Wordsworth’s use of the pastoral in his book *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991) and claims that “pastoral poetry as reformulated by Wordsworth brings about admiration for nature and political emancipation” (*Romantic Ecology* 25).

Unlike the pastoral which depicts the human beings dwelling within the natural world, the trope of wilderness refers to the natural environment on earth that has not been

altered by humans. In this connection, Greg Garrard states that “Wilderness” means “nature in a state uncontaminated by civilization” (67). It is nature, a space of pureness which is unruffled by the human society. Garrard in his work, *Ecocriticism* observes that the term “wilderness” is derivative of the Anglo Saxon word “wildeoren” which means wild beast. To him, in the Bible the word wilderness refers to an uninhabited place, where animals graze in an isolated area which is bereft of humans and untainted by immoral action.

Greg Garrard mentions three forms of wilderness such as Old World, Sublime and New World. The concept of wilderness as represented in the Bible was a place of isolation which brought a sense of freedom and purity. On the other hand, the sublime ‘wilderness’ found its expression in Romantic poetry in which it eventually became an abode of purification and naturalness. Lastly the ‘New World wilderness’ is associated with the establishment of wilderness as a criterion of American cultural identity by whose writings and political activism serves as a vital basis for the welfare of National Parks. However, the depiction of wilderness forms an important question for Ecocritics and they take into consideration how the concept of wilderness has altered over time and represented in literature(56).

It is this interdisciplinary approach that underpins different nuances of Nature and Environment which facilitate the rise of different theories for problematization in ecocritical discourse such as Romantic Ecology, Deep Ecology, Eco-Marxism, Eco-feminism, Eco-Philosophy, Psychology, Environmentalism, Ecopoetics, Cornucopia, Ecophobia, Gaia Hypothesis and Cultural Studies/Cultural Geography. These theories/philosophies with their distinct perspectives have enriched ecocriticism in a big way for the last five decades. A succinct analysis of these theories will throw light on the significance of ecocriticism and its interdisciplinary approach, while helping in the appropriation of the respective texts taken for study in the chapters. In addition to the emergence of the ecocritical discourse, the study of English Romantic Poetry played a significant role in diverting the attention of intellectuals towards nature and providing a

fertile ground for ecocritical theory and practice by throwing light on crucial questions concerning human-nature relationship. In this connection, Jonathan Bate, deserves recognition for launching the practice of ecocriticism in British Romantic Studies in the early 1990s.

Bate in his book titled *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and Environmental tradition* (1991) popularized the phrase ‘romantic ecology’ as a manifesto for a new ecological criticism, and tends to consider Wordsworth as the founder of green politics, heralding the way for modern environmentalism and ecocriticism. His book aims to situate Wordsworth as the first true ecological poet in the perspective of romantic ecology and ‘Green politics’ and argues against criticism done in previous decades in order to substantiate his viewpoint. Bate defines Romantic ecology as “a theory of ecosystems and unalienated labour” grounded not in idealist and elitist text but in the pragmatic and populist texts of the time” (Bate 10). He puts forward such issues as nature, the pastoral tradition, the notion of ecology during the Romantic period, ecological ethics and geography and establishes the groundwork for “literary ecocriticism”(11).

One of ecocriticism’s basic hypothesis is that literatures both mirrors and further build human reaction to the natural environment. As Lawrence Buell states it, literary texts function as “acts of environmental imagination” that may “affect one’s caring for the physical world” building that world “feel more or less precious or endangered or disposable”(Buell 2). It is because of the romantic literature that the non human world is valued with nobility. The Romantics appreciates nature as a counteracting agent to the damage caused by Enlightenment, industrialism and capitalism. With the advent of British Romanticism, Wordsworth’s poetry has become the center of attraction in the arena of ecocritical discourse. Among the critics who studied Wordsworth, minutely and ecocritically, Jonathan Bate emerged as an authority who interpreted the poet’s work by using green politics that was challenging, both politically and eco-critically.

In addition to the ‘Romantic Ecology’ of Bate, four significant aspects have been taken into consideration in problematizing British Romantic poetry in the context of green ecological consciousness. The first aspect which Bate hinges upon is the importance of pastoral language which recognizes the vital importance of the natural world to Wordsworth. By examining Wordsworth’s vision of pastoral, he contends that there is no opposition between the poet’s love of nature and his revolutionary politics. He reviews Wordsworth’s application of the pastoral and notifies the reader that it is only after his visit to the city that he became conscious of his obligation to nature. It is the Pastoral poetry that is understood as a permanent and enduring power, which makes it possible in locating the poetry of the Romantics which is largely fixed to the land.

“The Economy of Nature” forms the second important aspect of Romantic Ecology which provides a clear understanding of ecology during the 19th century. It tends to mean that nature has its own economy and economic laws. He starts off with Darwinian definition as given by Haeckel, and offers the reader with an insight regarding the historical development of Erasmus’s theory of evolution. At the same time, Bate puts emphasis on the importance of vegetation to show the influence of living creatures on the whole ecosystem, and also relates this theory to the laws and economics of nature. As in the Romantic age, emerging scientists of the time were busy in scientific discoveries pervading the universe. The Romantics, through their writings tried to counteract science and bring society closer to the natural world. Bate goes further to explain the interconnection between science and poetry, while citing the example of Darwin’s writing about photosynthesis and Wordsworth’s writings about flowers. He discusses one of Wordsworth’s work “The Excursion”, which became later as “*A Guide to the Lakes*”. Bate claims that according to second edition of the Guide, it is quite relevant to the Economy of nature, considering the fact that it served not only as a companion for tourists or a geographical resource, but also as a provider of a new perspective as to how the ecosystem functions. Wordsworth’s work demonstrates that human’s economy and nature’s economy are interdependent, thereby forming a harmonious relationship.

Another important aspect of Romantic ecology includes the reaffirmation of an “ecological ethic” (Bate 11). “The Moral of Landscape” puts emphasis on a discussion of Modern painters and how Wordsworth’s “The excursion” still affects emotionally on people in today times. Bate uses this phrase to indicate the ecological consciousness which is developed within John Ruskin’s art, leading the reader to further understand the moral implications of ecological matters in literature and fine arts. He focuses exclusively on the connection between Wordsworth and Ruskin and how the latter expressed his idea on Wordsworth’s work (*The Excursion*). It is Ruskin’s work which champions the ecological consciousness and Bate believes in this new transition in literary criticism which stands out as a moot point for modern literary criticism. The final important aspect in the Romantic Ecology is focused on “The Naming of Places” and it explores the “motif of naming places” (Bate 11). Bate shifts his focus from a historical outlook to another portion, one that concentrates instead on ecology and geography. He maintains that Wordsworth is “as much geographer as historian” so “he was a poet of Lakeland more than a poet of England” (Bate 85). Bate understands the poet’s concern with names and his work showcases his interest in naming places, people, and locations in his poems. Bate argues that as the *Lyrical Ballads* gained momentum, there lies a movement from sentimental to spontaneity and simplicity that restores the reader back to nature. Moreover, Wordsworth serves as a viaticum of affinity between humans and nature in very many ways - economically, spiritually and artistically.

Lastly, the philosophy of ‘Romantic Ecology’ as theorized by Jonathan Bate establishes Wordsworth as an ecological poet in the ecofriendly environment of both nineteenth century and today, by appreciating the manifestations of nature’s pristine beauties and exquisiteness. The modern ecology as an ideal neo-Romantic concept is further strengthened by Bate’s re-examination of William Wordsworth from the green perspective. Bate concludes that Wordsworth should be a glorified soul of ecologism for he puts himself fairly in the green tradition by instructing his readers to look at, dwell and respect the natural world, and to be skeptical about material and economic progress.

According to Bate, Wordsworth not only sponsored a tradition of environmental consciousness but also exercised a vital influence on modern environmentalism. His works play a vital role in restoring the severed connection between human and the natural environment thereby enriching ecocriticism in modern times. Like ecocriticism, environmental criticism, green cultural studies, ecocritique- ecopoetics has preferably been used more comfortably through the term “ecopoetry”. This theoretical phrase was brought into play by Jonathan Bate’s in *The Song of the Earth* (2000). Besides dwelling on a tradition that locates modern environmental consciousness in Romantic poetry, Bate defines ecopoetics “not as a set of assumptions or proposals about particular environmental issues, but as a way of reflecting upon what it might mean to dwell with the earth” (Bate 34). It is an ecocritical coinage which refers to the inclusion of an ecological or environmental perspective into the study of poetics. The word ‘ecopoetics’ owes its origin from the classical Greek word “*poiesis*”, meaning “making” of the “*okios*” which is the Greek ‘home’ or ‘place of dwelling’ thereby bringing about an intercommunication between poetry and ecology. He further asserts that *poiesis* supports the way to dwelling since its metre vibrates with “nature’s own rhythms” which indicates an echoing of the song of the earth itself” (75). Ecopoetics as a discipline suggests a method of viewing the world that enfolds art and science, and poetry, being a product of culture, is hardly possible to bring forth an association between two distinct fields. Yet the former is completely new in its use of poetic devices and scientific underpinning. But Jonathan Bate argues that there has been a network of intimate relations as well as apparent hostility, between culture and nature” (Bate 245).

In this connection, he maintains that a synthesis is merely possible between culture and nature by citing an example of the science of ecology. This was made possible by Charles Darwin’s theory of natural selection, analogous to the biological science, which further was again attainable on account of Thomas Malthus’s ethics, borrowed from the social science of economics and human population study. Bate brings into question the idea of poetry in a world ruled by rapidly improving scientific insights and technology. By illustrating the equivalence of Darwin and Malthusian ethics, Bate

advocates that similar to naturally selected species within evolving ecosystems, poets and their poems perform work which is important within our human ecology (Bate 245-46).

Bate has drawn his theory of poetics from Gary Snyder, one of the most significant American environmentalist and ecopoet of twentieth century who compared poetry with a climax ecosystem in which certain organism recycle dead biomass. Gary Snyder draws a comparison between poetry and 'climax' which is an important concept in scientific ecology. In scientific ecology, 'Climax' is basically defined as that state in which the communities of creatures in forests, ponds, oceans, or grasslands move to a certain condition which is called 'Climax'. In a climax ecosystem, a high portion of energy comes from the recycling of dead biomass and this condition further holds abundant balance and energy in its network. Snyder maintains that in art, when we expand and enhance ourselves by recollecting memory and embodying our sense of understanding, it releases the energy within ourselves (2007, 32). Art is an assimilator of unfelt experience, sensation and memory for the whole society because of its rhythmic and mnemonic intensity which becomes an efficient system for recycling the richest thoughts and feelings of a community. Every time a poem is read or discussed, the energy is recycled back into the cultural environment. This is how the process of survival and modifications functions in the realm of art which is similar to the 'climax' ecosystem (quoted in Bate *The Song of the Earth* 246-7).

It is worth noticing that Bate traces its origin of ecopoetics to the Romantic movement of the late 18th century. The movement maintained allegiance to what has been stated so far in Wordsworth's preface to *Lyrical Ballads* as "the beautiful and permanent forms of nature"(1798, 264-265). Romantic poets called for a communion with such forms as they improve and intensify our bonds with nature while severance with these forms isolates us from nature. This particular notion of Romantic poetry that unifies the mind and heart with the beautiful forms of nature has been conceptualized by Bate as 'ecopoetic'. This realization of the beauty and balm of nature prompted the Romantics

and the American transcendentalists like Wordsworth, Emerson, Thoreau and Whitman to characterize Nature as a goddess and as friend, philosopher, spiritual and moral guide of mankind. For Rousseau and Wordsworth, Nature is the greatest teacher and their critical notions and perspectives went a long way to facilitate the rise of Environmental Ethics and Romantic Ecology - a concept which is brilliantly problematized by Jonathan Bate in *Romantic Ecology, Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991).

Whereas the monarchs of wit in the 18th century subscribed to the notions of 'Nature methodised' (Alexander Pope), the romantic philosopher Rousseau gave a clarion call for 'return to Nature' and expounded the concepts of 'Natural man' 'Noble Savage', 'Primitive Purity', 'Primeval Innocence' and ethics of wilderness' in his philosophical treatise (*A Discourse on the sciences and Arts*, 1750). Rousseau asserts that it is the progression of science and arts that has caused the corruption of virtue and morality. Jonathan Bate while vindicating his view on romantic ecology and environmental purity rejects the Marxist approach to Nature, and in *The Song of the Earth* (2000) he hinges upon the necessity of bringing man closer to nature and earth thereby forwarding both eco-centric and earth-centric approaches (14). Bate argues that literary works should be studied in relation to the rural setting and the idea of man and nature living in constant communion (27). Bate draws attention of the readers to other environmental crises such as global warming, rising of sea level, changing pattern of season, change in climate and more predominantly the grave issue of scarcity in rainfall. Bate argues that a markedly changed attitude is highly desirable in 21st century and eco-critical discourse should highlight burning environmental issues in order to protect the environment and ecosystem as a whole (23-24). At the same time, Bate provides an insightful critical paradigm for appreciating Nature after Rousseau's *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1754), wherein the idea of 'state of nature' is stated and it was later on problematized by the theorists of 'deep ecology' and 'eco-poetics'.

Jonathan Bate in *The Song of the Earth* deals with this issue of the function of poetry in ecological matters to examine whether poetry holds the ground firmly in the world ruled by technology. Bate uses the phrase 'ecopoetics' to describe this kind of literary production which maintain an ecological base in his answer. He contends in to support pastoral theme as it presents the enduring question of the relationship between humankind and the natural world which according to Bate, "is in fact, the only theme, that is poetry itself" (Bate 74). Bate offers ominous environmental threats regarding the environmental crisis and mourns that for reason or the other, environmental problems have not culminated into action. Bate assumes that there is something wrong in the deep matrix of Western culture. This is where a constant development is required in human consciousness. According to Bate, "The business of literature is to work upon consciousness" (Bate 23). Thus, in *The Song of the Earth*, Bate echoes some fundamental questions, consisting of the aims and purposes of literary criticism in the time of environmental crisis. He indicates the same approach as Cheryll Glotfelty emphasized, but more precisely, he states that the sole aim of literature is to work upon human consciousness. He further vindicates the view that our place of dwelling constitutes a great ecosystem of which humanity is an integral part of the whole.

Deep Ecology is perhaps the most important radical doctrine in environmental ethics which concentrates on maintaining security of the green planet. Deep ecology which is non-anthropocentric in its point of view establishes the fact that Nature needs immense care and protection for the sake of nature only and not for the sake of the benefit of human beings. The term 'deep ecology' was invented by Norwegian philosopher Naess in a famous 1973 English-language article, "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary" which intends to bring forth a change in the anthropocentric human thinking towards an ecocentric vision. It bears a holistic focus and an acceptance of the interrelatedness and interdependence of human and non-human.

Deep ecology suggests unique standard of human responsibility so that it can change the human exploitation of nature into mutual co-participation with nature. It also relies on the fundamental interconnectedness of all life forms and natural features, by proposing a sense of appreciation for all life forms. Naess has provided the basic content of deep ecology by contradicting it with the “shallow” ecology movement that wanted so far to amend some of the important practices of industrial society to cut down its stress to the environment. As mentioned above, the science of ecology highlighted the fact that man and nature had an interdependent relationship. Naess very soon realized that Ecology as a science which is concerned with philosophy and truth cannot comprehend the moral questions regarding how one should exist. Naess claims that the essence of Deep Ecology as compared to the science of Ecology is to ask deeper questions. For instance, Ecology as a science does not ask what kind of a society would be the best for maintaining a particular eco-system. Why did he feel that deeper questioning and deeper commitments are required to address the ecological crisis of the present century (Naess 1). He added the title ‘shallow’ to present the ecological movement apparently, because the way it deals with environmental problems is purely anthropocentric in approach.

Most significantly, the ecologists are highly upset about the pollution of water, air and land of the universe. They yearn for a better future in pollution-free society but this is for their offspring, for the future generation of human beings so that they can have fresh water to drink, fresh air to breathe and enjoy walking through wilderness. Naess anticipates that such anthropocentric attitude is embedded in exploitation of the natural world and hence felt the necessity of a new environmental ethics which can champion for biospheric egalitarianism where no one is superior to the other by bringing down the anthropocentric ethics. His ideas were immensely appreciated in America by George Sessions and both of them presented eight points of deep ecological perspective which includes: the intrinsic value of human and non-human life and justifies that the inherent worth of human and non-human on earth have value in themselves; priority is given on the richness and diversity of life which subscribes to the realization of these values; the repudiation of the exploitation of human in the non-human world through a vital message

that they can only make use of natural resources to satisfy their needs without reducing its diversity and richness; requirement of a limited human population; the rejection of human interference in the non-human world which is excessive, and rapidly worsening; immediate need to change in economic, technological and ideological schemes; the act of appreciating life rather than abiding by an increasingly higher standard of living; and lastly, the obligation for the application of the fundamental changes (Naess 49-50).

Deep ecologists contend that their fundamental aspects are not new but rather borrowed from the “ancient truths” of pre-industrial society and non-urban thinking. When the deep ecologists insist on returning to nature, nature claims a formal role for him in developing an ecosophical approach to nature. Naess defines ecosophy as a philosophy of ecological harmony or equilibrium. However, Bill Devall asserts that, Deep ecology goes beyond a limited piecemeal shallow approach to environmental problems and ventures to articulate a comprehensive religious and philosophical worldview. Deep ecology has its fundamental aspects which form the basic intuitions and experiencing of ourselves and Nature which comprises of ecological consciousness. Deep Ecological sense of self requires a further maturity and growth, an identification which goes beyond humanity to include the nonhuman world (67).

An important principle of deep ecology is “biocentric egalitarianism” which is also known by other phrases that amalgamate biocentric, biospherical, and ecological with equality and egalitarianism (Naess 1973: 95) maintains that biota (ecology) do possess equal intrinsic value while it rejects differential valuation of organisms. The ethics of Biocentrism is well connected to the all-encompassing self-exploration which intends that if we harm the rest of Nature then we are on the verge of crushing ourselves. There are no boundaries and everything is interrelated” (69). It is imperative because all organisms have “an equal right to live and blossom and to reach their own individual forms of unfolding and self-realization within the larger self” (72). Biocentrism as an ideal perspective offers a blueprint of the belief that human beings are neither exceptional nor poor than other creatures but are equal to everything else in the natural world. Naess

hinges upon the need to be rather peaceful and courteous in our language as well as our actions. According to him, when two people exist and strive together in an amicable environment, the quality of life becomes greater and deeper. Deep ecology calls for acceptance of intrinsic value in nature. And by affecting a shift from a human-centric culture to a nature-centric system of values, Deep Ecology, thus brings it into opposition with that of the Western philosophy and religion. With regards to such view, deep ecology introspects and challenges anthropocentric relationships with the environment and provides ecocentric alternatives. As quoted by the sociologist Bill Devall, along with George Sessions, “all organisms and entities in the ecosphere, as parts of the interrelated whole, are equal in intrinsic worth” (1985, 67). It foregrounds the value of nature in and of itself, the equal right of other species, and the importance of small communities. Since the late 1990s, however, the field marched forward to the more social ecological positions that sought to exercise domination over ecocriticism today (Lawrence Buell 97-98).

The ‘Poet Laureate’ of ‘Deep Ecology’ Gary Snyder embodies a combination of deep ecology and social ecology. By social ecology it is meant, that social and environmental problem are closely intertwined and humans accomplish a sense of self-realization through taking part in a creative and non-dominating human community. In view of the early 1970’s, Snyder has set his ideal in connection with bioregionalism, which is a complex movement that centers on the uniqueness of distinctive local regions. Social ecology which serves as an approach intended to evaluate the environmental and social thought of any writer. Deep Ecologists indeed believed that nature possesses the same moral standing and natural rights as human beings. This is how Deep Ecology proposes a mutual respect not only for all life forms but also towards landscapes such as rivers and mountains. Although the platform of deep ecology stated regarding what should be done, Naess states confidently that individuals do have initial rights to put forward their own ideas and the eight points are not decisive. He further asserts that creative thinking is not meant to be characterized in a restrictive way in ecological movement; instead thinking can move limitlessly in any directions (Naess 56). However,

deep ecology is criticized for its theory as well as its strategies. As challenged by critics regarding the source of nature's intrinsic value "just because something exists, they say, does not make it intrinsically valuable" (Tong 242).

The critics disapprove of earth's interest as being equal and even more important than humans and claims that the earth would have value interdependent of humans. Moreover, deep ecologist's cry for lasting population decline throughout the world, have been understood as being misanthropic, Fox contends that it is an invalid criticism as deep ecologists are not against humans but against human-centredness (279). Naess clearly states the possibility of maintaining a diversity of cultures, while still decreasing the human population (Bodian 29) which could further lessen the apprehensions of those concerned, who is alarmed with the fact that calls to diminish the population are designed to take place at the expense of some racial groups over others. Yet population cannot be blamed alone for the environmental considerations and Jael Silliman refuses to condemn ecological problems on overpopulation on the grounds that these hasty explanations pay little attention to the component of each situation like the complicated histories of colonialism, corporate extraction, government policies and subsidies, economic inequalities, and growing fundamentalism worldwide which according to him are, in fact more pertinent than overpopulation (Garrard 8).

Deep ecologists assert that an initial change in ontology will ultimately lead to a different perception in ethical attitudes. In this respect, a non-dualistic, ecocentric understanding is necessary to lead us to treat nonhuman beings with compassion and care. This amicable understanding would help us to recognize and appreciate the differences among the various constituents of life, instead of treating everything as interchangeable raw material. On the whole, Deep ecologists explicitly advocate that such a nondualistic approach of perception is quite obvious from "postmodern" science, which conceives of nature as a, self-regulating, original, pertaining to a developmental method capable of creating self-conscious forms of life.

Meanwhile, Social ecologists believe that nature must ultimately be approached in light of human needs thereby rejecting deep ecology's "insensitivity to intra-human politics" because they believe that relations between human beings have a direct effect on how people treat the environment (Plumwood 1993,72). Some major factors such as violent capitalism, globalization and the self-interests of multinational corporations as observed by social ecologists constitute an abuse of the environment. Social ecology stems out from the Marxist Ideology as a general framework to understand how environmental degradation can emerge from social predicaments. Primarily developed by Murray Bookchin, social ecology was heavily criticized, due to its rigid dogmatic approach towards Marxian principles. Bookchin, who highlighted the connection between the environmental degradation and the exploitation of human beings so far, contends that better treatment of the environment can only be possible when the class division is eradicated. Social ecologists advocate that anthropocentric approaches are not supposed to be blamed for environment concerns; rather such issues develop from systems of dominance or brutality of humans by other humans.

There are some social ecologists who criticize deep ecology's apparent ability to understand many of the very real and complex socio-political reasons behind humanity's relationship with their environment which has allowed the social ecologists to follow a position that is neither monistic nor dualistic. For instance, Peter Kropotkin's idea of 'mutual aid' forms a basis for social ecology rather than "supporting a *laissez-faire*, competitive capitalist and unequal social order" (Barry 67). However they can be accused of over simplicity and generalization, that nature does not necessarily provide such model for equality and that evolution and survival are as often characterized by aggression and strength as by mutual aid and cooperation (Bate 2000, 40).

Ecofeminists take an exceptionally feminist approach to environmental consciousness. Just like deep ecology, ecofeminists unearth the beginning of environmental problems susceptible to privilege human interests, while others argue more specifically that androcentrism, the tendency to conceive of nonhuman nature in

terms of human male interests have usher patriarchal cultures, in the Western society to associate and exploit women and nature. Provided that, deep ecology recognizes the anthropocentric dualism of humanity/nature as the final connection of anti-ecological beliefs and practices, ecofeminism heavily condemns the androcentric dualism of man/woman. Deep ecologist believes in personal transformation with the help of cultivation of a “biocentric perspective” and growth of one’s testimony to extend the domain of nature. While sharing a biocentric viewpoint, ecofeminists have denounced deep ecology on account of its masculinist bias. The difference between deep ecology and ecofeminism lies in the fact that deep ecologists identify the problem as anthropocentrism, whereas the ecofeminists label the problem as androcentricism and hierarchial dualism. Ecofeminism is a divergent field of environmental ethics, which emerged from various social movements such as the feminist, peace, and ecology movements in the late 1970s.

The term ‘ecofeminisme’ was christened in 1972 by the French Feminist Francoise d’Eaubonne, who developed the “*Ecologie-Feminisme*” group contending that the destruction of the planet is due to the profit motif inherent in male power” (32). In *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (1980), Carolyn Merchant declares that throughout history nature has been anthropomorphized as female throughout western and non-western cultures, expounding the patriarchal mind set in which “like wild chaotic nature, women needed to be subdued and kept in their place” (132). This particularly book deepened the critique of the double patriarchal exploitation.

However, ecofeminists explicitly claims that there are similar connections between the domination of nature and the domination of some human groups including women. Ecofeminism points to oppressive conceptual frameworks which states about the ideals and beliefs that determine the observation of people towards the world. The key aspects of oppressive scheme contains dualistic approach such as reason/nature, knowledge/intuition, culture/nature, where the importance, given to one disjunct emphasizes the superiority over the other. This is how the distinction between reason and

nature is stressed and rationality is given higher value. Ecofeminist Val Plumwood states that the opposition between reason and nature, where reason is seen as masculine and nature as feminine, lurks behind all dualism (Plumwood 1997: 44). Further, ecofeminism looks for ending the dominance and tyranny by bringing forth the oppressive conceptual groundwork wherever found by inscribing alternative scheme.

Ecofeminist Karren Warren asserts that environmental damage is a serious aspect of violence. Warren and Plumwood respectively put forward the societal and philosophical insight offering better scope, intensity and dynamism. Plumwood's further analysis leads to separating men from women, human from nature and reason from emotion. She argues for both affinity and difference in the continuity in human-nature relationship. Plumwood in her book *Feminism and Mastery of Nature* (1993) offers six important theories that characterize harmful sociological attitudes towards women, men, civilization and nature which includes: the recognition of the female with the sphere of physicality and nature (woman= nature assumption); the assumed inferiority of the sphere of women and of nature (inferiority of nature assumption); the conception of both women and nature in terms of a set of dualistic contrasts opposing the sphere of nature to that of reason or the human (dualistic assumption); the corresponding identification of the male with the sphere of reason, of true humanity and culture (men=reason assumption); the assumption of the superiority of the sphere of reason, humanity and culture to that of nature (superiority of reason assumption); lastly, the conception of the human or cultural sphere in terms of a set of dualistic assumptions opposing it to nature (dualistic assumption) (33).

Ecofeminist philosophy amplifies well-known feminist critiques of social doctrines of domination such as sexism and racism to nature. In this connection, Greg Garrard writes, "Ecofeminism calls for an end to all oppression, arguing that no attempts to liberate women will be successful without an equal attempt to liberate nature" (Shiva 1993, 132). Warren's examination clearly demonstrates that ecofeminism, which claims the fundamental interconnectedness of all life, suggest a suitable groundwork for an eco-

logical ethical theory for women and men who negates to operate on the basis of a self or other disjunction. Birkeland opines that “it is an awareness that begins with the realization that the exploitation of nature is intimately linked to western Man’s attitude towards women and tribal cultures” (22). Thus, ecofeminism is a social movement, and a practice, which proposes a political breakdown, examining the connection between androcentrism and environmental destruction. On the contrary, Greta Gaard vindicates from a different approach than Birkeland by putting emphasis on the fundamental hypothesis of ecofeminism which states that the ideology authorizes dictatorship on those discriminated on the basis of race, gender, class and physical abilities and species, being the same ideology approves of the oppression of nature (1). Simultaneously, Ecofeminists are more engrossed in delving into the dichotomy that has led to the depreciation of both women and nature, and of other groups monopolized by masculine western rationalism (5).

Being a diverse school of philosophy, ecofeminism is deeply rooted, due to its multifarious range and vision. Liberal ecofeminism, for example, is grounded in the liberal feminist’s perception of women’s equality through legal, political and social liberal reform. It calls for new approaches to increase the participation of women in climate science and decision-making. Liberal ecofeminist argues that women unlike men can become scientist, natural resource managers, lawyers, legislators and contribute in making environment a better place, even in the conservation of natural resources also, if equal opportunities are being provided (Merchant 2005: 200). Unlike liberal feminists, they examine capitalism for the interpretation of the natural world as a body of resources to be abused and believe that women can rise above breaking the barriers of social stigma of being a child rearing machine and play her own part in environmental projects.

Cultural ecofeminism is a response to the belief that women have a direct connection with the natural world. Sherry Ortner argues in her 1974 article “*Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?*” that cross culturally and historically, women are closer to nature because of their physiology, social roles and psychology and assert how women

brings forth life from their bodies, the pleasures and pains of menstruation, pregnancy, childbirth, lactation, nursing children and domestic caretaking(190). Vandana Shiva writes in *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Survival* that the ontological shift for an ecologically sustainable future has much to gain from the world-views of ancient civilizations and diverse cultures which survived sustainably over centuries. These were based on an ideology of the feminine as the living principle and on an ontological continuity between society and nature-the humanization of nature and the naturalization of society (39-40). She launches an attack on the Western patriarchal ideologies of development that has disregarded and ignored the feminine gender.

While on the other hand, Social ecofeminism is influenced by social political factors and envision building society by turning down the economic and social hierarchies. Social ecofeminists view oppression of women and nature as a direct consequence of capitalism and patriarchal structure. Social ecofeminists do not rely on the concept of essentialism like the cultural ecofeminists, as it offers severe complications by contending that women and men are endowed with innate abilities that are boundless and enduring, an effect of their biology. Carolyn Merchant states that the relationship between production and reproduction as highlighted in socialist ecofeminism are as important as the relationship between production and ecology for social ecofeminists (2005, 15). According to Noel Sturgeon, "Ecofeminism is a movement that makes connections between environmentalism and feminism; more precisely, it articulates the theory that the ideologies that authorize injustices based on gender, race and class are related to the ideologies that sanction the exploitation and degradation of the environment" (*Ecofeminist Natures* 1997, 132). It is important to echo that ecofeminism is not entirely involved with gender oppression and environmental exploitation but also promises to expose the prominent ways in which the whites, patriarchal structure, and the elites retain their superiority and predominance in terms of oppression, subordination of women of colour, class and the natural world. The interpretation of ecofeminist regarding devastating issues such as colonialism, racism and subjection further add immensely to

the degradation of ecology which is conceptually associated to the supremacy of all the oppressed human groups.

The concept of EcoMarxism has always been received with a skeptical perspective, because of the internal conflict between Ecologism and the communist legacy. And this difference can be observed on the basis of the two theories. Whereas as ecologism showcases a more dualist approach to the understanding of the world and views an objective world which is individualistic from our minds. The Marxists develop an anthropocentric attitude to nature. Needless to say, Marxism is deeply etched in materialism in that everything in this world is the culmination of material interactions. Marxism maintains that it is basically the inner cognizance that provides interpretation and value to the world. The anthropocentric nature of the communist legacy is clearly visible in the social ranking of living things that Marx has rooted, and highlights his materialist attitude. David Pepper states that by doing so, Marx has failed to identify the inborn value of nature and its resources, hence depicting the environment as a “*social category*” (*Eco-socialism* 1993, 114). Marx in his theoretical text, *Das Kapital* calls nature the ‘universal subject of human labour’ by maintaining that “all raw material is the subject of labour” (1887, 128). This form of discrimination in referring value and interest in a particular unit of classification puts human beings on a pedestal and embodies an important gap between Ecologism and Marxism.

Eco- Marxism is an ideology that tends to amalgamate certain aspects of the traditional Marxist political ideology with ecology and “green politics”. Greg Garrard defines EcoMarxism as a study that deals with the structural conflict between workers and owners in which the owners gain undue benefit (5). According to Marxists perspective, human beings and nature comprise of two vital agents in the overall creation of wealth, and so is the need to exercise control on them. Whereas the EcoMarxist argues that capitalism that subjugates the proletariat is also the exact force that subjugates and destroys nature further letting destruction usher a sense of liberation in both. In this connection, Kovel and Lowy mentions that capitalism in its extended form causes envi-

ronmental degradation “rampant industrialization and societal breakdown” which stems from globalization (2001, 45). John Bellamy in *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth* (2010) criticized the parasitic relationship between capital and nature by stating that capitalism does not undermine its condition for existence in the long run, however it can continue to grow in the midst of vast destruction and chaos.

Alienation from nature and one’s own self forms an important perspective in EcoMarxism. It suggests a sense of separation of humans from the product of their own labour, being distant from nature and other beings (Bottomore 1983). From the standpoint of the Capitalist, the isolation of a working class is an individual problem, whereas the EcoMarxists observes it as a social issue. By vindicating this point, Pepper registers that “since through labour we produce things, and since in producing things we change the nature of what we are, then labour is a means of creating what we are of self creation” (1993, 45). In Capitalism, workers through their extreme labour produce things that change themselves and nature. Another important aspect would be deforestation which has emerged out of some major factors that includes the growing population which has pressurized the government in seeking land to settle its citizens and re-adjust spatial planning. Deforestation is mostly driven by commercial interests. As Norman Myers states that the “greatest concern over the loss of forests is that there is a considerable body of evidence to suggest that it is leading to an unprecedented loss of biological diversity” (1983, 33). And the opposing forces have used deforestation during wars as a military strategy which is known as scorched earth which has brought severe consequences such as soil erosion as well as hydrological imbalances.

Meanwhile EcoMarxists consider the mode of production itself, which is the “pyramid of productive forces surmounted by productive relations which constitute capitalism” (Pepper 67). The chopping of trees by the capitalists at an unprecedented rate continues with the possible motive of increasing their agricultural production, livestock with little regard for nature. This act is precisely because of the Enlightenment ideal that

projected nature as “free gift” which is to be handed over to mankind. However, EcoMarxists condemn this act of capitalistic agriculture by calling it irrational and consider deforestation as environmental imperialism by focusing on the capitals, exploiting the land with no regard for the future generations. EcoMarxism seeks to emphasize that human are a part of natural ecosystem and nature also forms a part of humans thus citing an effect of the exploitation of one on the other, as both are interlinked.

Ecosophy is the other name of new expression for ecological philosophy or ecophilosophy which is derived from a combination of Greek words ‘eco’ and ‘sophia’. Whereas ‘Eco’ comes from *oikos* meaning ‘household’ and *Sophia* meaning ‘wisdom’ respectively. Therefore, ecosophy exactly implies ‘wisdom of household’. It is a philosophy which promotes an exploration of diversity of human–nature relationship so as to foster “deeper and more harmonious relationship between place, self, community and the natural world” (Drengson 1999, 23). The term ‘ecosophy’ was coined by Arne Naess, who defined ecosophy as a philosophy of “ecological harmony or equilibrium”. It is a philosophical perspective or a system inspired by our living conditions in the ecosphere. According to Drengson, ecosophy intends to offer “not only ‘facts’ of pollution, resources, population etc but also value priorities” (1). Ecosophy further demands human beings to accept a lifestyle without disturbing the stability of nature and visualize a certain synthesis of love of wisdom with the dwelling place or home. Furthermore, it promotes a comprehensive learning of the problems that are common to both ecology and philosophy by taking an ecological approach that human beings are inseparable from the natural world.

Concern for environment, also known as environmentalism has always been on the forefront in the western world. The term ‘Environment’ is derivative of French word ‘Environ’ which implies “surrounding”. Hence, it refers to the completeness of the physical surroundings, circumstances, conditions, on the earth, especially affected by human activity. As Greg Garrard defines it as “the very broad range of people who are

concerned about environment issues such as global warming and pollution, but who wish to maintain or improve their standard of living as conventionally defined, and who would not welcome radical social change, will be described hereinafter as ‘environmentalism’(21). Environmentalism prefers an eco-friendly approach to living by deconstructing the modern way of living. In this way, preference is bestowed upon the rural way of life. Environmental ethics puts emphasis on the ethical relationship of a human being with the natural world. It emerged as a philosophical discipline in the 1970s, due to the realization of the adverse effect of industrialization, population growth and economic expansion, and its impact on nature and environment. As Kay Milton in her “*Environmentalism and Cultural Theory*” (1996) states that environmentalism appears to have grown over the past thirty years, out of long-standing but relatively low-key minority interests, to become significant, but far from dominant political influence at national and international level. Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* inspired the environmental movement which documents the environmental effects brought over by the use of (DDT) and agricultural chemicals in animal and human bodies. Environmentalists were more concerned with the environmental imbalance in form of threats such as pollution, exploitation of natural resources, deforestation, and accelerating rate of extinction of species and observed that it is impossible to bring harmony in humans and nature without learning to coexist in balance with the natural environment. They have criticized the industrial modernity as, “a distinctive modern movement in which science plays an indispensable role: by the method and technology” (Kerridge 533).

In connection with the degradation of the environment Val Plumwood, claims that “the massive process of biospheric degradation and the failure and permanent endangerment of many of the world’s oldest and greatest fisheries, the continuing destruction of its tropical forests and the loss of much of its agricultural land and up to half its species within the next thirty years” (2001, 1). Environmentalism, not only refers to the restoration and preservation of earth’s ecosystem, but also indicates the degradation of natural beauty and contamination of natural resources. In *The Comedy of*

Survival: Studies in Literary Ecology, Joseph Meeker asserts that as the world's only literary creatures, humans have the responsibility to determine the role of literature in the welfare and survival of mankind and the natural environment and also to examine the insight it offers into human relationships with other species and with the world around us (1974, 3). Since, literary theorists put their entire focus on environmental issues, a new field of literary theory emerged in 1905, which is termed as ecocriticism.

Ecocriticism, is considered as 'Green Studies' and is by nature interdisciplinary. While drawing our attention to the relationship between literature and physical environment, it also encompasses natural sciences and cultural studies. Environmental concepts such as Green ideology, Land ethic, Environmental Ethics, Biodiversity, and Ecology are obvious in the arena of environmentalism. It is coupled with issues such as restoration, urban environments, pollution, resource depletion and their connections with poverty, environmental policy, social justice, and sustainability, which are intertwined to the discourses of sociology, economics, ecology and ethics. Meanwhile, these discourses bear testimony to multiple debates, identified by the subtle variation within them and despite the complications; environmental discourses have played a vital role in building up ecocritical awareness.

One important texts in the development of environmental studies is David Pepper's *Modern Environmentalism: An Introduction* (1996) which throws light on the development of environmentalism with vital environmentalist themes, examined to illustrate how environmentalism revives many issues and problems that are part of longer established political, economic, social and cultural debates. He delves into the questions regarding social change and the need of establishing the desired ecological society from distinct outlook within radical environmentalism. Whereas, Joni Adamson's *American Indian Literature, Environmental Justice, and Ecocriticism: the Middle Place* (2001) broadens the framework of what is currently considered environmental literature and provide an orientation to literature that is more theoretically, and ecologically informed.

Adamson has analyzed how the concept of “wilderness and nature” creates blind spots in the environmental movement and also examines the necessity to develop broad concepts such as nature, justice, and place that are rooted not only in reciprocal relationships to the natural world, but in our diverse cultural histories, and in our different relationships to colonial oppression also. Environmentalism attempts to maintain a balanced association between humans and all the natural systems which they rely upon in such a way that all the components are granted proper degree of sustainability. Ecocriticism is then an earth centered approach which observes life and examines human and nature relationship by collecting physical or scientific network among them. However, within ecocriticism there is an undercurrent of taking nature as the source of truth and the earth as the super organism (Gaia theory).

Gaia hypothesis has been an important theory for global environmental consciousness. With its origin in James Lovelock’s *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* (2016), Lovelock asserts that the Earth's self-regulating system itself creates a sustainable life to exist on the planet and this principle of self-regulation further decides the fate of life to exist on other planets. As defined by Lovelock, Gaia constitutes “a complex entity involving the Earth's biosphere, atmosphere, oceans, and soil; the totality constituting a feedback or cybernetic system which seeks an optimal physical and chemical environment for life on this planet” (2016, 18). Since its inception, Gaia theory has drawn attention of some ecologists though it has not been adopted by main stream ecocriticism. As Garrard states, "Gaia has been attractive to deep ecologists and eco-spiritualists as well as climatologists, hydrologists and philosophers of science"(74) championing for a nature-based spirituality, with divinity located in this world. The term ‘Earth’ is derivative of the Greek word *Gaia* which personifies “Mother Earth”. Developed by James Lovelock and Lyn Margulis in 1970s, Gaia Hypothesis formulates that the functions of our planet as a single organism maintains a balanced ecosystem, required for our survival. It is the biomass that self regulates on the earth, making the physical environment more hospitable to the species which constitute its “life”. The idea of Gaia is

dynamic as it creates a geo-physiological balance of energy. It is basically related to the scientific approach inclined toward human body which has numerous cells and bacteria of various types that interact in a complex system. He claims that life on earth offers a cybernetic, homeostatic feedback system, driven automatically by the flora and fauna of the region, which leads to the balance of global temperature as well as chemical composition. It claims that the living organism unconsciously controlled the global system of surface temperature, atmosphere composition and salinity of ocean. By this analogy, Lovelock intends that life maintains conditions which are suitable for its own sustenance. The Gaia hypothesis received much criticism from scientists, theorists all over the globe regarding its imprecision, teleologism, mythological name and against the principles of natural selections. Stephen Jay Gould condemns Gaia for being a metaphorical description of Earth processes, by inquiring about the actual mechanisms by which self-regulating homeostasis was regulated (29). Meanwhile, Lovelock explains that no single mechanism is culpable, that the connections between the various known mechanisms may never be known, that this is accepted in other fields of biology and ecology as a matter of course, and that specific hostility is reserved for his own theory for other reasons.

W. Ford Doolittle, a biologist in his article "Is Nature Motherly" in *CoEvolution Quarterly* journal (1974) contended that "nothing in the genome of individual organisms could provide the feedback mechanisms Gaia theory proposed, and therefore the Gaia hypothesis was an unscientific theory of a maternal type without any explanatory mechanism(56). In the book *The Revenge of Gaia*, published in 2006, Lovelock puts forward his argument concerning the lack of respect that human beings have for Gaia. He foretells the repercussions of destroying biodiversity, and further testing Gaia's capacity of minimizing the effects of greenhouse gases in the biosphere. According to him, this will reduce earth's negative feedback and expand the possibility of homeostatic feedback potential further ceasing global warning. With the help of microscopic organisms and forests, Gaia extracts greenhouse gases and discharges in the atmosphere, but the destru-

ction of this environment will further eradicate human beings with tropical deserts, inhabiting on earth in the coming century. The Gaia theory positively asserts Lovelock's ideas that the theory by the turn of the century would be rooted as the intellectual field of environmentalists, scientists, and sustainability practitioners.

Ecocriticism, as a developing methodology in Shakespeare studies, opened significant pathway for Shakespeare's critics. It attempts to justify its challenges and separate itself from other disciplines. But the commitment to extend the scope and broaden the boundaries of ecocriticism also requires to include discussion of "environmental ideas and representations wherever they appear" (Kerridge 5). In this fashion, a rising concern was felt regarding how contempt for the natural world seemed absolute as it is an apparent and recognizable discourse which came to be termed as 'ecophobia' or 'paradigm'. The concept of 'ecophobia' is developed by Simon C. Estok in his *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia* (2011) where he advocates the study of ecophobia as a branch within Shakespearean ecocriticism. By contending that ecocriticism itself galvanizes interdisciplinary methodology, Estok engages in various approaches as well as the paradigm of ecophobia and defines ecophobia in his introduction as "a uniquely human psychological condition that prompts antipathy towards nature" and it can embody "fear, contempt, indifference, or lack of mindfulness"(1). He applies the concept to discuss Shakespeare's plays so that it can define an analytical framework interpretation, further disclosing the text to a new perception. He intends to widen up the analysis of nature, by adding a research paradigm that will unmask and demonstrate conflicts in Shakespeare's plays. Moreover, the term opens opportunities in analyzing nature in respective ways, similar to the terms such as racism, misogyny, homophobia which opens up studies of the representations of women, race, and sexuality respectively.

The paradigm of ecophobia is very much concerned with raising awareness of ecological and social issues, in order to stimulate political activism. From a broader pers-

pective, it may be defined as an irrational and a groundless hatred of the natural world (6). Ecophobia is viewed, as a severe condition that torments people of every human community around the world, it builds up deep-seated meaning and a dark ecological significance prevailing social systems. It develops into an appropriate justification in the service of economic development at the expense of the natural world. His argument is satisfying in that ecophobia needs conclusive social investigation. He builds his theory of ecophobia on theories of rubbish ecologies, affect and material ecocriticism, among many other related theoretical visions. According to Estok, control of the natural environment, understood as a god-given right in Western culture, seems to imply ecophobia, just as the use of African slaves implies racism. Similarly, misogyny is to rape as ecophobia is to environmental looting and plundering. Like racism and misogyny, with which it is often allied, ecophobia is all about power.

One key issue is the notion of control which is given importance in theorizing ecophobia. It is characterized as a desire to tackle the forces of nature, which is perceived as adverse and alarming. Estok puts emphasis on the biblical imperative about human relations in relation to the natural world which gives man divine power to exercise control over everything. In a twisted tone, the more control, man appears to have upon the nature, the less, it truly obtains. In this connection, Neil Levy states that, “We are not in control of the non-human world, because we are unable to predict with any accuracy the effects of our actions upon it” (210). Christopher Manes observes that, “if ecological humility is one of the hallmarks of ecocriticism, though ecophobia is one of the hallmarks of human “progress” (17). Estok problematizes the concept of eco-phobia, which emphasizes the idea of unpredictability of nature- her rage and fury and also the ruthless victimization of men by storm, weather and climate. He recognizes the powerful presence of non-human elements in Shakespeare’s oeuvre and briefly analyzes *King Lear* and *Coriolanus* to illustrate the social and environmental causes that often give rise to the expression of ecophobia in literary and cultural texts. Ecophobia extends a huge groundwork which helps discuss and theorize Shakespeare and offers new insights on the dramatist and his opinions about the natural phenomenon.

Cultural geography, also known as human geography, is a fundamental ecocritical concept, which extensively studies the various cultural aspects of a work of art. It is also a geographical response given to the so-called cultural turn that helped cultural studies loom large as an academic discipline. As a subfield, cultural geography examines the cultural values, the cultural diversity of society, and highlights the dissemination of cultures over space, place and identities of people. Wagner, states that “cultural geography attempts to explore the human problems in the society that connect to race and poverty, age and gender, ethnicity and alienation. Spatial imagination, historical awareness, cultural sensitivity and ecological insight, as well as that observational gift upon which fieldwork depends, can all play a part in rendering service, and committed engagement will enrich our vision as well” (*Readings in Cultural Geography* 1962, 8). However, cultural geography puts emphasis on ‘culture and nature’ altogether, manifesting practices of self, group, and the creation of “others” while concentrating upon environment, society and place. Cultural geography draws attention upon studying the cultural landscape rather than the pre-determined regions based on environmental classifications. It is interesting to observe that how society and culture emerge from the local landscapes as well as shapes those landscapes also. This intercommunication between human and the natural landscape altogether builds up to establish cultural landscape. Cultural geography aims to look upon the study and theories of cultural dominion or assimilation over cultural colonialism, application of cultural ecology and cultural landscapes.

An important point that comes under cultural geography is the study of landscape. Landscape constitutes a part of aesthetic philosophy and an important concept related to human geography and environment. The word “Landscape” which is derivative of the Dutch word *landschap*, implies scenery, landform or countryside. Landscape is composed of natural elements such as lakes, hills, mountains, sea, building and structure, valleys, elements of natural landscapes and human activity. It has influenced the behavior of people dwelling in any particular place. Landscape basically refers to an area of land

which contains a montage of patches or landscape components. J.B. Jackson defines landscape as, “A landscape is not a natural feature of the environment but a synthetic space, a manmade system of spaces superimposed on the face of the land, functioning and evolving not according to natural laws but to serve a community” (1984, 68). The varieties of landscape such as desert lands, agricultural landscapes can provide a better understanding of earth when analyzed in distinct categories like landscape, ecology, and cultural landscape, which establish a modified divergence of landscape.

Landscape ecology is a multidisciplinary approach which deals with the association between human societies together with their specific environment. It is analogous to the biophysical and the socioeconomic conditions. The application of landscape implies an overall reflection of a society's culture and is not an autonomous structure. It echoes the collision which causes the destruction of the society that creates or occupies it. On the other hand, Marcia Langton in her article “Homeland: Sacred Visions and the Settler State” (2000) understands the vibes that land and landscapes shared by settlers and aboriginals are differently fancied; Whereas settlers view an vacant wilderness, primitive people observe a spiritual landscape, occupied by ancestors and the proof of their creative feats (16).

The term ‘cultural landscape’ was first used by Otto Schlüter, a geographer who aimed his attention on Landscape as a ground for geographic analysis, while highlighting the activity of human beings in embodying the landscape patterns. Further, he expounded the view that ‘the essential object of geographical inquiry was landscape morphology as a ‘cultural product,’ which developed as a paramount exponent of the significance of the cultural landscape contrary to the natural landscape. According to him, landscape has two forms: the ‘original landscape’ which refers to the landscape that existed before humans persuaded changes and the ‘cultural landscape’- a landscape which is shaped by human culture. Cultural landscape embodies transformed human environment as a part of the natural landscape, which amalgamates human activity, natural resources, forestlands and

agricultural landscapes. They are reflective of human beings and natural transformations to landscapes. Leslie Marmon Silko says that landscape also includes humans and their actions are extremely dependent on the unpredictability of the weather. She is of the opinion that survival in any landscape depends on how people make the best use of all the available resources. Further, she believes that the identity of the individual strengthens only when he identifies himself with the landscape of his dwelling place (1996, 35).

Furthermore, in the ecological methodology, Ecocritics have brought about a moderation in the relationship between nature and culture, whereas the recent ecological crisis is the repercussions of human culture. Man started living in close proximity with nature in the natural environment, whereas culture remained connected with the geography of a landscape. Ecocriticism maintains a cordial network in the maintenance and protection of landscape in order to rescue the human race. This particular way shifts demanding focus from social relations toward natural relationships and observes the individual as a member of ecosystem. It highlights the 'literary sense of place' not as setting but as a necessary style of maintaining connection with or separation from a specific natural background. For that reason, ecocriticism becomes a crucial part of literary scholarship in view of literature that cannot disconnect characters from nature as they naturalize either wildly or effectively.

Ecocriticism is an interdisciplinary approach where all science come together to examine natural world as illustrated in literature. Ecocritics have always emphasized the significance of science of ecology in the realm of literary studies and argue that the idea of ecology has been integrated into literary studies in the last decades or so. Kerridge views that the ecocritical discourse encompass the study of literature in addition to its "ecological context" (325). He provides the definition of ecology as the biological study of life forms combining their natural interrelationships, and existence in their collective environment (450).

The word ‘ecology’ is derived from two Greek words ‘oikos’ and ‘logos’ which implies to ‘habitat’ and ‘science’ respectively. Therefore it is stated as the science of our habitat and Ernst Haeckel coined the term to refer to the scientific introspection into interrelationships existing among humans, plants, animals and our non-living environment. It highlights that man and nature are quite mutual and neither of the both can be analysed in terms of isolation from the other. Ecology analyzes the interconnection among all kinds of animals and plants which includes the mutual correlation of the biotic communities along with their non living environment. So, both these biotic and non living environment are subordinate upon each other, thereby establishing an intersection that combines the knowledge about man as well including his environment with distinct viewpoint. Ecologists explores to examine the relations of the animal to its organic and environment in a comprehensive manner. Ecology comprises the study of complex interrelations referred to as the ‘conditions of struggle for existence’ by Darwin (Bate 36).

Bate considers ecology as a “holistic science”, concerned in a large perspective, with “the relationship between living beings and their environment” and between the biotic and abiotic elements as they exist in an ecosystem (36). He further observes the study of ecology as an academic field as a non human science, referring to the study of animals and plants. Ellen Swallow was the first critic who used the term ecology to refer to man’s relationship with the environment and she even campaigned for clean water, pure air and better living conditions in the industrialized Eastern United States of the late nineteenth century. Joseph Meeker in his work *Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology and a Play* (1972) made the connection between literature and ecology, even before Rueckert. He uses the term ‘literary ecology’ to imply the study of biological themes and relationships which is reflected in the literary works. Bate in *The Song of the Earth* considered Meeker’s work as one of the earliest books that deal explicitly about the topic of ecological literary criticism (180).

As a field of ecology, Ecosystem represents the linkage of non-living thing along with its climatic attractions and interconnection altogether within a community of living organisms. Both these living and non living organisms exist in a well balanced way depending on the support of nutrient circle and energy. Ecosystem, as defined by Arthur George Tansely, is “the whole system which includes not only the organism complex, but also the whole complex of physical factors forming that we call the environment of the biome the habitat factors in the wildest sense”(1935, 125). Ecosystem denotes a systematic ecosphere in the “environment” where the biotic and abiotic coexist together, which helps to maintain sustainability in the society among people, animal and other abiotic elements of Nature. The abiotic elements such as land, water, fire and air and the abiotic elements such as human beings, animals, birds and plants work in healthy relationship thereby pointing to the continuation of a sound and balanced ecosystem. Ecocritics put emphasis on projects which entails the welfare of ecosystem, ecology, psychology, ecophilosophy and other disciplines.

The study of ecology and ecosystem has become more than a scientific study of the natural surroundings, especially related to literary studies which focus on how human activities can have a destructive impact upon the environment. Therefore, ecocritical studies are important following the realization that the world stands on the verge of an ecological disaster. It is important to discuss the growth of environmental studies, while examining the root cause behind the environmental crisis as faced by the world. In this context, Carolyn Merchant in her essay, “Nature as Female” (1980) has taken preventive steps to investigate the philosophical reasons behind its origin of environmental crisis as faced by the world and she further introspects the different constructs of nature as reflected in art and literature from the ancient times to the present century. Ecocritic Kerridge opines that constructs of Nature, over a period of time as manifested in the various literary images expressed in art and literature, have led to consequences that have precipitated the holocaust against nature. Ecocritics in their literary discourses seek to negate such dualisms that underline much of our cultural practices in regard to the envi-

ronment (Kerridge 530). According to Merchant, the modern age witnessed a grave environmental crisis precisely because “the world we have lost was organic” (15). In such organic community, nature was identified as a nurturing mother, a kind beneficent female who provided for the needs of the universe in a planned manner. But with the advent of science and technology, this image of earth as a nurturing mother changed as the ‘economic’ and ‘technical’ man attempts to mechanize and rationalize the world view. Furthermore, the second image of earth as ‘disorder’ entails the idea of power over nature and control in terms of colonial hegemony. According to Carolyn Merchant, by the sixteenth century, when the western culture became predominantly mechanized, the ‘female earth’ and ‘virgin mother’ were shaped as submissive to machine and technology. These images of domination and power operated as a cultural tool sanctioned for nature’s exploitation and degradation against Mother Nature (2005, 58). Although Merchant condemns science as accountable in a large way for the catastrophe against nature, Lynn White claims that Christianity to a large extent is at fault for gifting humanity that an anthropocentric and hegemonic status that prompted him to ridicule the non-human world. Her powerful statement regarding “Christianity as the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen” is indeed remarkable (White 45).

The term anthropocentrism is derivative of Greek words ‘*anthropos*’ and ‘*kentron*’ which implies ‘human being’ and ‘center’, therefore, stating as humancentredness. Anthropocentrism embodies a belief that human beings are at the center of the universe. It is often recognized as the seed of present-day ecological issues which ranges from devastation of wilderness and ozone depletion, to loss of biodiversity and overpopulation. Timothy Clark in his book *Ecocriticism on the Edge: The Anthropocene as a Threshold Concept* observes that, anthropocentrism is “the view that human beings and their interest are solely of value and always take priority over those of the non-human” (2015, 3). The ideology of anthropocentrism has been described in various religious beliefs. For instance, Christianity supports the most anthropocentric views; in respect to the section 1.26 of Genesis which states that, “man should have dominion over the other

creature of the earth” (Kerridge 537). This particular depiction affirms that everything, which is available in the lap of nature, is made for the consumption of human being. Lynn White, in her article titled, *The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis* (1967) contends that it is due to the Bible which offers advice for human being as to how to view the environment. By doing so, she presents an anthropocentric outlook of Christianity, which was also a dominant environmental belief in Western cultural society. However, she accepted that religion was effective in deciding the observation of people with regards to the environment. She powerfully claimed that “Christianity is “the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen” and this anthropocentric viewpoint becomes the cause of the environmental crisis (1967, 1206). Christianity, made it possible to exploit nature, which has resulted in the formation of environmentally destructive policies. According to White, authors such as Tertullian and Saint Irenaeus of Lyons maintained that God shaped Adam by foretelling the image of the incarnate God, the Second Adam. It maintains that man shares God’s perfection of nature thus establishing not only a dualism between man and nature but also establish the fact that it is God’s will that man may exploit nature for his own needs. Thus, Christianity and its teachings offered the philosophical justifications for the West in exploiting the ecosystem not only in their countries but also in the new, virgin colonies that the European super powers were discovering and colonizing all over the world. The eighteenth century ideology with regards to the faculty of reason and rationality increased the damage and destruction of the environment. Reason gave human beings the supreme power to differentiate himself from other creatures and place himself at the height of the universe where he is not only detached from nature but also antagonized her as superior. These ideas were championed by philosophers and thinkers such as Rene Descartes and Francis Bacon. In this way, the figure of the Cartesian Dualist, who stands apart from his environment, finally came into being. In this connection, Kerridge in his essay “Environmentalism and Ecocriticism” argues that the segregation of humanity from nature has been examined by Rene Descartes problematized in his treatise, “Discourses on the Method” (1637).

According to Descartes, the reasoning constitutes the power that separates humankind from non-human and this statement as demonstrated in the above essay, cites rationality as the governing principle of the Cartesian method and this philosophical grounding not only pushed forward the separation of humanity from nature but also passed on to man his superior, anthropocentric position. It is evident from the above discussion that since environmental problems result from an interaction between ecological knowledge and its cultural inflection, such problems require analysis in cultural as well as scientific terms. And Ecocriticism as a critical discourse not only highlights the fact that man is responsible for the devastation caused to nature in the modern world but also provides new interpretation to place, setting and environment thereby putting emphasis on the balance between humanity and man.

On the whole, by studying the representation of the physical world in literary texts and in the social contexts of their production, ecocriticism attempts to account for attitudes and practices which contribute to modern day ecological problems. The present research is an honest endeavour in this direction and through a critical analysis of Shakespeare Plays; it would be profitable to see how literary texts can be the best medium of representing ecological questions and concerns so as to establish the age-old affinity between man and environment.

Works Cited

Adamson, Joni. *American Indian Literature, Environmental Justice, and Ecocriticism: The Middle Place*. U of Arizona P, 2001.

Barry, John. *Environment and Social Theory*. Routledge, 2007.

Bate, Jonathan. *The Song of the Earth*. Basingstoke and Oxford, 2000.

Bate, Jonathan. *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition*. Routledge, 1991.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester UP, 1995.

Bellamy, John, et al., editors. *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism's War on the Earth*. NYU Press, 2010.

Bottomore, Tom. editor. *Karl Marx*, Blackwell. 1979.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing and the Formation of American Culture*. Harvard UP, USA, 1995.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Clark, Timothy. *Ecocriticism on the Edge: The Anthropocene as a Threshold Concept*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Devall, Bill and George Sessions. *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*. U of Michigan, 1985.

Doolittle, W.F. "Is nature really motherly?" *CoEvolution Quarterly*. 29:58-63.1981.

Empson, William. *Some Versions of Pastoral*. Chatto and Windus, 1935.

Estok, Simon.C. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Estok, Simon. "A Report Card on Ecocriticism", *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, 96(November 2001) 1, 220-238, DOI: [10.1179/aulla.2001.96.1.04](https://doi.org/10.1179/aulla.2001.96.1.04)

Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2004.

Gifford, Terry. *Pastoral*. Routledge, 1999.

Glotfelty, Cheryll, and Harold Fromm, editors. *The Ecocritical Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. The U of Georgia P, 1996.

Howarth, William. "Some Principles of Ecocriticism" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. U of Georgia P, 1996.

Jackson, John B. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. Yale UP, 1984.

Kovel, J and Michael Lovy. "An Ecosocialist Manifesto". *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*. Paris. 2001, Retrieved from <http://www.cnsjournal.org/manifesto.html>.

Kerridge, Richard & Neil Sammells. editors. *Writing the Environment: Ecocriticism and Literature*. Zed Books Ltd, 1998.

Levy, Neil. "Foucault's Unnatural Ecology." *Discourses of the Environment*. Edited by E'ric Darier. Blackwell, 1999.

Langston, Marcia. "Homeland: Sacred Vision and the Seller State", *Artlink*, vol. 20. (1), pp.11-16, 2000.

Lovelock, James, et al., editors. *Gaia, a New Look at Life on Earth*. Oxford UP, 1979.

Lovelock, James. *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth is Fighting Back and how We Can Still Save Humanity*. Allen Lane, 2006.

Love, Glen. A. *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and the Environment*. U of Virginia P, 2003.

Manes, Christopher. "Nature and Silence" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. edited by Cheryll Glotfelty, and Harold Fromm. U of Georgia P, 1996.

Marx, Karl. *Das Kapital*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, USSR, 1887.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. Oxford UP, 1964.

Meeker, Joseph. *The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology*. Scribner's Press, 1972.

Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. Harper and Row. 1980.

Merchant, Carolyn. *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*. Routledge, 2005.

Milton, Kay. *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory: Exploring the Role of Anthropology in Environmental Discourse*. Routledge, 1996.

Myers, Norman. "Biodiversity and the Precautionary Principle", *Ambio*, vol.22, no. 2/3, Biodiversity: Ecology, Economics, Policy, May.1993, Springer, pp.74-79, *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4314050>. PDF download.

Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary", *Inquiry*, 16:1-4, 95-100, 1973, DOI: [10.1080/00201747308601682](https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682).

Ortner, Sherry. "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" *Women, Culture, and Society*. edited by Rochelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere. Stanford UP, 1974. pp. 67-87.

Pepper, David. *Eco-socialism: From Deep Ecology to Social Justice*. Routledge, 1993.

Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. Routledge, 1993.

Plumwood, Val. "The Ecopolitics Debate and the Politics of Nature". *Ecological Feminism*. edited by Karren J. Warren, Routledge. 1994.

Rueckert, William. "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, U of Georgia P, 1996.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse On the Sciences and the Arts*. In Basic Political Writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing, 1987.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse On the origin of Inequality*. In Basic Political Writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing, 1987.

Shiva, Vandana. *Monocultures of the Mind*. Bloomsbury Academic, 1993.

Shiva, Vandana. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development*. Zed Books. 1989.

Silko, Leslie Marmon. "Landscape, History, and the Pueblo Imagination" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm U of Georgia P, 1996.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. Avon Books, 1975.

Sturgeon, Noël. *Ecofeminist natures*. Routledge, 1997.

Tansley, Arthur.G. "The Use and Abuse of Vegetational Concepts and Terms". *Ecology*, vol.16, no.3, Ecological Society of America, Wiley, 1935, pp.284-307, *JSTOR* <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1930070>. PDF download.

Theocritus. *Idylls*. Translated by Anthony Verity, Oxford UP, 2002.

Wagner, P.L. and Marvin W. Mikesell. *Readings in Cultural Geography*. U of Chicago P, 1962.

Worster, Donald. *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination*. Oxford UP, 1993.

White, Lynn, Jr. "The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 March.10, 1967, vol.155.Issue. 3767, pp.1203-1207, [DOI:10.1126/science.155.3767.1203](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.155.3767.1203).

Chapter II

Shakespeare and the Renaissance Environmental Imagination

Environmental imagination is primarily shaped by environmental condition and cultural ecology of an Age. At the same time, environmental imagination of a writer is profoundly influenced by his contemporary history and geography, ethics and philosophy, politics and culture. And that is precisely the reason why ecocritics, ecologists and environmentalists very often emphasize a holistic approach to environment that encompasses among other things ‘eco-poetics’, ‘environmental ethics’, ‘Gaia culture’, ‘biophilia’, and ‘environmental culture’ as well. There is no denying the fact that ethics is as such associated with moral conduct and that by the same logic, an environment is also guided by some ethical principles pertaining to preservation of landscape, weather, climate and a sound eco-system. A Sound eco-system is built upon a healthy working of biotic (living) and abiotic (non-living) elements that enrich ecology. To be precise, what constitutes the environmental imagination of an ecoconscious writer is his engaging interest in biotic and abiotic elements, awareness about change in weather and climatic condition and above all, an ecocentric approach to appreciate an integrated notion of ‘interconnectedness’ between man and behavior/nature.

Lawrence Buell in his seminal book *The Environmental Imagination* (1996) envisages “better ways of imagining nature and humanity’s relation to it” (2). While deprecating ‘homocentrism’ and ‘anthropocentrism’ as ‘human-centered bias of perception’, Buell maintains that an ideal environmental text embodying its author’s environmental imagination should have four essential parameters. Firstly, the non-human element/environment is not to be taken as a mere background or setting in a text, but as a ‘powerful presence’. By emphasizing the efficacy of environment as an active force in a text, Buell tends to vindicate the fact that “human history is implicated in natural history” (7). This is fairly applicable to the Renaissance environmental imagination of Shakespeare. Secondly, the “human interest is not to be understood as the only legitimate

interest''(7) thereby deprecating the anthropocentric vision of the 'technical' and 'economic man'. In order to substantiate his argument, Buell cites the example of American romantic poet Walt Whitman's poem "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking" wherein the bird is "endowed with a habitat, a history, a story of its own" (7). Thirdly, Buell argues that "human accountability to the environment is part of the text's ethical orientation" (7) obviously pointing to the relevance of environmental ethics in a literary text. In a number of Shakespearean plays including *As You Like It*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, the ethical dimension of Shakespeare's environmental imagination can be satisfactorily situated. Last but not the least, an ecoconscious writer, according to Buell, should bear in mind that environment is a 'dynamic process' rather than a static construct, and that it needs nourishment and protection which is a human responsibility. This is really significant for a Shakespearean text in which the Renaissance mind/imagination is constantly threatened by an anthropocentric urge to spoil/destroy the beauty and pristine purity of forests/pastoral landscape/environment under colonial hegemony and dynamics of power. The Renaissance environmental imagination had been under the profound influence of classical pastoral tradition, medieval romance, and the contemporary Elizabethan history, politics, religion, and maritime environment which facilitated an anthropocentric vision of life and nature under the impact of 'Renaissance humanism'.

Behind the egocentric outlook and anthropocentric vision of the Renaissance men, Scholars locate a decided influence of classical Greek and Latin culture with special emphasis on their love of life and beauty of pastoral charm and bucolic setting and above all, their irresistible love for the physical world and materialize perfection of the human body. The secular world was viewed with visual perception and auditory effect and this is all the, more applicable to the Renaissance men's appreciation of Nature and pastoral landscape. In this connection, James Donaldson's observation deserves mention:

The Greeks loved everything that was beautiful; but it was

in the human body that they saw the noblest form of earthly beauty;

they did not confine their admiration to the face. It was a perfect and

harmonious development of every part that struck them with awe (1907, 5).

Search for beauty- beauty in body, nature and art, and a keen sense of its appreciation are the characteristic features of the Greek mind. Imbibing the mystic of Eros, Greeks were passionate lovers of what is magnificently beautiful and were sensitive to all kinds of beauty-both celestial and terrestrial. And Plato's discourse on beauty in the mouth of Diotima in *Symposium*(c.385-370) vindicates this point, the Renaissance men's urge for boundless freedom, vaulting ambition and irresistible desire for power, profit and pleasure and also the life of adventure at sea- which is all the continuation of the Greek concept of irresistible love for life (Hedone). It is this love for life that prompted the Renaissance travelers, voyagers and the sea-farers to develop a propensity for always discovering 'a new world' of curiosity, beauty and excitement. This is precisely the reason why the Renaissance man is called the man of wild imagination, tempestuous passion, curiosity, passion for knowing the unknown and for exploring the unexplored and finally 'a subliminal egotist' attempting to establish a homocentric vision of life and an utilitarian approach to the world as a whole. In Ecocriticism, this attitude is explained in terms of anthropocentrism.

There is no denying the fact that long before the emergence of technological modernity following the Industrial Revolution and proliferation of the ideas of Enlightenment, the Renaissance Age had nourished an egocentric/homocentric vision of life and an anthropocentric vision of Nature. It was an Age that sanctioned enormous liberty, illimitable power, boundless passion, imagination and ambition and above all, liberation of the 'self' from the bondage of medieval theocracy. It is not God, but man that was of primal importance for the Renaissance man and goaded by vaulting ambition for power, pleasure profit, wealth, commercial success, scientific discovery, New Learning, curiosity and spirit of courage/heroism, the Renaissance man tended to vindicate Shakespeare's vision of a 'brave new world' and the wonderful concept of 'Renaissance man'-of wild imagination and tempestuous passion: "What a piece of work

is man?" (*Hamlet* 2.2.295). The Renaissance environmental imagination had been under the profound influence of classical pastoral tradition, medieval romance, and the contemporary Elizabethan history, politics, religion and maritime environment which facilitated an anthropocentric vision of life and nature under the impact of 'Renaissance humanism'. During the Tudor and Stuart rules of Henry VII, Mary Queen of Scot, Queen Elizabeth I and James I, England became a sea-faring nation of thrilling adventures and commercial success. The frequent wars at sea with the Spaniards coupled with several sea expeditions/adventures and voyages launched by John Hawkins and Francis Drake thrilled the Elizabethan mind with jubilant joy and excitement for the brave new world of freshness and irresistible passion for the unknown and the infinite. Richard Hakluyt in his "Voyages" (1589) recorded the various sensational sea adventures in Pacific, Indian and Atlantic Oceans which enthralled the mind and heart/imagination of the Renaissance people. Shakespeare's innumerable references to sea experiences and British ships sent to different directions in *The Tempest*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Merchant of Venice*; the attack of Spanish ships and ports by English soldiers, sailors and pirates; King Philip II's invasion of England and the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 and the return of Drake and Hawkins with plenty of gold, silk, silver and costly gem stones fired the Renaissance imagination of Christopher Marlowe. Shakespeare tended to situate sea/ocean and the treasure of sea as the core of Elizabethan environmental imagination.

Both Marlowe and Shakespeare have profusely alluded to treasures of sea/nature in *The Jew of Malta*, *Dr. Faustus* and *The Merchant of Venice* and even the wealth of love is imagined as 'merchandise' (3.1.31-34) in *Romeo and Juliet*. The Renaissance imagination was admittedly influenced by the visual appeal of the sea-treasures and particularly the costly pearls, gold, diamond, emerald, sapphires and turquoise extracted from the bosom of sea. For instance, in the very opening scene of *The Jew of Malta*, the Marlovian hero Barabas, the jew merchant sleeping on the heap of gold ecstatically relishes with visual alacrity the glittering beauty of such costly gemstones as diamonds, emerald, pearl and sapphires:

Give me the merchants of the Indian mines,

That trade in metal of the purest mould;
The wealthy Moor, that in the eastern rocks
Without control can pick his riches up,
And in his house heap pearl like pebble-stones,
Receive them free, and sell them by the weight;
Bags of fiery opals, sapphires, amethysts,
Jacinths, hard topaz, grass-green emeralds,
Beauteous rubies, sparkling diamonds,
And seld-seen costly stones of so great price (*The Jew of Malta* 1.1.23-32)

In much the same way, in *Troilus and Cressida*, Shakespeare's Renaissance imagination has prompted him to imagine Cressida's bed as 'India', the land of glittering gold and Troilus, the Renaissance hero, visualizes his beloved Cressida as pearl:

Tell me, Apollo, for thy Daphne' love,
What Cressida, what Pandar, and what we?
Her bed is India; there she lies a pearl." (1.1. 103-105)

It is now evident that the Renaissance environmental imagination cannot be separated from the socio-political and cultural history of the contemporary England and that life at sea, sea-adventures and massive maritime activities played a big role in shaping the Elizabethan environmental consciousness. It is the Renaissance propensity for power, prosperity, commercial success and sea-adventure that stimulated the rulers of Tudor dynasty to elevate England to a big political power by utilizing nature and natural environment resources for their political gains and economic strength (2006, 393-402). An unbridled desire to tame nature and utilize her resources for human welfare gradually

developed the egocentric/anthropocentric vision of the Renaissance man; and yet the life at sea/ocean fired the wild imagination of the Renaissance people and writers, politicians and courtiers. As discussed earlier, the sea-adventures of sailors and their narratives of success and warfare became subjects of discussion everyday and everywhere in city, court and country side during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. And William Shakespeare and Edmund Spenser, being the patrons of the Queen, were decidedly influenced by these narratives of sea-life and adventures. Dan Brayton in his marvelous book *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration* (2018) observes that voyages in the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico tended the Renaissance writers, “to locate in literature, a representation of human life that defines humanity as part and parcel of the maritime environment (12). What counts much for Brayton is ‘not the culture of plunder’ but the ‘Maritime Environment’ with which Elizabethan imagination was largely enlivened and enriched. To Brayton, Shakespeare was the representative writer of the Renaissance who offered a counter to the ‘culture of plunder’ and tended to imagine “the ocean not as a void, waste space, adversary or vast fish cooler, but as an integral part of our being” (12).

Needless to say, towards the fag end of the 16th century, London had become the ‘centre of maritime and mercantile England’ and the river Thames, “the preeminent maritime superhighway” (2). Evidently, the sea/ocean secured an increasingly significant place in the Elizabethan psyche not only culturally and economically, but also from the standpoint of ecoconsciousness. Right from traders and navigators to poets, dramatists and artists/painters, the voyages and adventures at sea engaged the sensitive attention of both the elite and the Renaissance men. What is striking to observe is that even the Elizabethan painters were enthusiastically inclined to portray human life in terms of a ‘sea voyage’ on canvas and that the enlightened Elizabethan mind was found actively engrossed in “rethinking the ocean’s relationship to cultivation” (Brayton 2).

Keeping in view the relationship between humanity and marine ecology, Brayton contends that any literary representation or discourse on Renaissance would remain lop sided in the absence of its discussion and the inevitable connection with Elizabethan marine ecology (23). Significantly, the very physical geography of England vindicates

Brayton's contention, Britain, during the Renaissance, had an immensely long coastline and was surrounded by the North Sea, Celtic Sea and North Atlantic Ocean, besides the river Thames that constitutes the heart and soul of the English culture and British way of life. Besides Brayton, Patricia Smith Yaeger too deliberates on the 'historical exploitation' of the 'oceans as a form of capital' thereby emphasizing the linkage between Renaissance literary/cultural discourse and maritime/oceanic studies (2010, 545).

In the light of the above problematization on environment ocean and marine ecology offered by Buell, Brayton and Yaeger, it would be befitting and profitable to situate Shakespeare's Renaissance environment imagination by analyzing some of his relevant plays and poems at this stage. To begin with poem Sonnet no.64, one locates how Shakespeare's philosophical mind hovers round the dichotomy between transitions of earth/human existence and the immutable nature of Time/Death epitomized by sea/ocean. In Shakespeare's vision, ocean/sea is a veritable mystery paradoxically imbibing both creative and destructive nuances of preservation, mutilation and mutability of life as the epitome of ruthless Time/Eternity. The mutability of the coastal landscape is pitied against the ruthless and destructive scourges of the 'hungry ocean' that devours constantly and attempts to devour the terraqueous coastal landscape. The moot point is: who controls the 'kingdom of the shore'- the human world epitomizing politics and anthropocentric culture or the invisible and indestructible Eternity/Time signified by hungry ocean. Shakespeare writes:

When I have seen the hungry ocean gain

Advantage on the kingdom of the shore

And the firm soil win of the wat'ry main

Increasing store with loss and loss with store (Shakespeare Sonnet. 64, 5-9)

The mood is one of depression and despair and the tone is characteristic of Renaissance melancholy as the poet mourns the loss of coastal landscape signaling envi-

ronment catastrophe. At the same time, Shakespeare points to a series of environmental issues involving the nature of 'hungry ocean' as both 'a massive material and metaphysical force invading the "kingdom of the shore", the future of coastal landscape and of human existence, the burning question of boundary and fluid frontier, ecophobia for the 'hungry ocean' and a retaliatory move to tame the oceanic space (Nature), and finally the theme of mutability of earthly existence that affects representations of 'space' and 'place'. At the same time, the poem also indicates the age-old war between man and nature, between landscape and 'real'-materialization of the external world and above all landscape as an ideological construct embodying imaginative, aesthetic and spiritual nuances. The Renaissance environmental imagination therefore involves a mixed fabric of many-sided implications and shift in sensibility towards sea/ocean and nature at large because of a whole range of socio-cultural phenomena. There is a constant negation and sometimes anthropocentric and ecophobic relationship between the human world and that of nature epitomized by the sea- landborn human beings infinitely hungry and passionate, free and ambitious to enjoy the fruits of the sea and utilize its resources thereby converting themselves from pure ecocentric admirers of Nature to what Brayton calls 'a hungry ocean of consumers' (50).

As a result of this anthropocentric assault of plundering ocean/sea, the vast and infinitely copious treasure house of natural resources is ravished and ransacked by the human world by reducing nature to an 'emblem of loss'. The ocean is therefore hungry with both positive and negative implications. Shakespeare's environmental sensibility is largely affected by this dichotomy and tug of war between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism. Significantly, Brayton points to another facet of ecological/environment criticism which is based on mutual interconnectedness between 'man' and 'nature', the mutual impact of the "sea on human life and of humanity on the sea" which 'gives new meaning to Shakespeare's 'imaginative ecology' (50). By the same logic of interconnectedness, Shakespeare's 'hungry ocean' and the 'kingdom of the shore' are interlinked features of the 'ecopolitical landscape'. Brayton puts it very aptly:

The hunger that impinges on "the kingdom of the shore"

is no longer merely a void but a constitutive feature of the
 spatiotemporal setting of human life; no longer quite the
 ahistorical void of tradition, the ocean is one of the determining
 landscapes of human existence (50).

Shakespeare's environmental imagination grounded upon the notion of interconnectedness can be further extended to an ecocritical analysis of his last play, *The Tempest*. Here, Shakespeare foregrounds the inviolable interconnectedness of land, sea and human survival on the island/ seacoast in the backdrop of the European colonial mindset that characterizes the Renaissance and the post- Renaissance Enlightened Period of the 17th and 18th century. Prospero's intrusion into the island in fact signifies the expansionist colonial mindset and the vision of a 'brave new world'. Significantly the play is set in the marine environment that encompasses the sea, the coastal landscape and the possibility of human civilization and culture. Gonzalo's vision of a commonwealth and his powerful plea for 'solidity of dryland' reminds the audience/reader of the mutability of the terraqueous coastal landscape as described in his Sonnet no.64. Gonzalo pleads:

Would I give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of barren ground:

long health, brown furze, anything" (*The Tempest* 2.1. 65-67).

The dichotomy between 'hungry ocean' and 'solidity of dry land' infact vindicates Shakespeare's dialectical Renaissance environmental imagination. Gonzalo's plea and plaintive lament for 'solid dryland'(2.1.65) can be correlated with the quasi-colonial vision of Prospero, Sycorax, Caliban and the drunken Stephano and Trincolo to master in their own way, the dry terrain of the island that saved them from the 'tempestuous sea'. Shakespeare's environmental imagination experiences many sided tensions between the natural and the supernatural, sea-water and sea-shore, land/coastal landscape and the 'tempestuous sea'. Like the 'hungry ocean' of the sonnet already discussed, the sea in *The Tempest* is characterized by duality-aesthetic appeal caused by the fantastic beauty of

the sea and its ferocity that indicates mortality and mutability of the human world shaken by ecophobia-fear for loss of life and torture in the hands of the 'rich' but 'strange' sea. With Shakespeare's wonderful imaginative colouring through personification, the sea acquires a mysterious significance- of both beauty and fear, wonder and awe in the song of Ariel, the captured spirit enslaved by Prospero. Ferdinand is told by Ariel that his father, the King of Naples has undergone a mystic metamorphosis thirty feet below the surface of the sea (3.3.71). The sea has miraculous power to change his bones into a piece of 'coral', his eyes into 'pearls'. Each and every part of his body has been changed into something 'rich' and 'strange' (1.2.399). Shakespeare's environmental imagination here works in conjunction with his romantic imagination characterized by supernatural glory and strangeness. Though the underlying theme is one of death and mutability of human existence, Shakespeare makes it pleasant and aesthetically relishable. It is told that the sea nymphs living in the sea do ring the death bell of the king of Naples every hour. The use of rhetorical devices like alliteration assonance and personification combined with the musical quality of the song, "Full fathom five thy father lies, (*The Tempest* 1.2.397) reveals Shakespeare paradoxical preoccupation with life and death; and his environmental imagination is coloured with a proto-romantic zest for life at sea.

Much before John Keats, Shakespeare did sing and celebrate the song of the earth and this is fairly evident from his keen interest in everything on the coastal landscape and environment of the island in *The Tempest*. As is characteristic of his art of characterization wherein Shakespeare's universal mind picks up characters from the king to the cobbler, from the Queen to the cabbages (12), his love of the wind, air, food, dryland, brown furze and the nameless beauty and small native creatures of the island- crabs, pignuts, fish, Jay's nest, the nimble marmoset etc- stands as true testimony to this fact. Moreover, Caliban as a native product of the island epitomizes the earth and its nameless pristine beauty, primitive glory and primeval innocence. Though he is downplayed by the anthropocentric colonial master Prospero and his daughter as a civilized slave, Caliban is as tender and innocent as 'crab' and 'fish'. Trinculo calls him

‘a strange fish!’, “A fish. He smells like a fish.... A strange fish!” (2.2.23-25). Nevertheless, this ‘fish like crabby subaltern’ is the embodiment of all that belongs to the earth and stands out as a product of the maritime landscape. And Prospero angrily hurls upon him: “Thou earth, thou!” (1.2.56). Like the medieval Robinhood, he is a man of the forest gathering food and firewood and is guided by what Pogue Harrison would call ‘natural law, the law of the forest’ (Harrison 1992). Caliban also forecasts Rousseau’s eco-philosophy of primitivism and ‘noble savage’ which was dominated by the eco-politics of the intruder Prospero. He is the singer of the beauty of the Earth representing the ecocentric facet of the Renaissance environmental imagination, whereas Prospero, the dominant colonizer stands for the anthropocentric vision of Renaissance humanism forcing Caliban to cook and collect timber which is an obvious onslaught on his art of naturalness. Yet, this wonderful creation of the island embodies the delicacies of the marine environment -‘half-fish’ and ‘half-flesh’- by combining both the elements of sea and land. Whereas ‘fish’ as such represents the seawater, the ‘flesh’ points to both sea and land. At the same time, his characteristic naturalness and noble savagery tends to establish Caliban as a ‘hybrid product’. In this connection, Dan Brayton aptly observes:

Whether ‘aquatic beast’ or New World indigene, Caliban is
defined by an ontological hybridity whose condition of possibility
is the sea. Caliban’s hybridity extends to his relationship to the
coastal ecosystem, he inhabits: Is he a sea creature or a creature of the land?
Perhaps, like a crab, he is something of both (58).

Brayton acclaims Shakespeare’s Renaissance environmental imagination that conceives of Caliban both “an earthy creature and a fishy one ontologically proximate to animals and part of a local food” (59). That Caliban is a product of maritime environment and coastal topography becomes obvious from his description of the island before Prospero. Caliban shows him and minutely describes the delicacies of the island with sensuous and gustatory appeal for the Elizabethan mind. Here it is pertinent to mention

that the Elizabethan imagination/mind not only took delight in visual appeal and auditory charm, but also evinced keen interest in gustatory appeal which is associated with attractive eatables. The Renaissance environmental imagination therefore extends its aesthetic appeal/appreciation from sight (visual perception) to sounds (music in nature) and also to sensuous appreciation of beautiful flowers, fruits, roots and animals for consumption. It may be strikingly noted that apart from fish, oysters and crabs were considered to be “the popcorn of Elizabethan theatergoers” (Lorenzi 2010, 20). Caliban’s engaging interest in the gustatory delicacies of the island which he shows to his colonial master is brilliantly articulated by Shakespeare in *The Tempest*:

I prithee, let me bring thee where crabs grow;

And I with my long nails will dig thee pignuts;

Show thee a jay’s nest and instruct thee how

To snare the nimble marmozet; I’ll bring thee

Young scamels from the rock. Wilt thou go with me? (2.2.179-185)

The quoted lines from *The Tempest* introduce the reader/audience to the local foods available on the sea-coast. Interestingly, Shakespeare made use of the double variety of crabs-both animal and vegetable which carry great ‘gustatory appeal’ (sour crab apples). The ‘double crabs’ representing both ‘land’ and ‘sea’ tend to justify the fact that Shakespeare’s environmental imagination pays equal importance to both ‘land’ and ‘sea’ and that “the wild harvest he describes is part of the coastal topography of a thoroughly marine environment”(Brayton 59). At the same time, it is also interesting to note that both the types of crabs were considered to be the common food in early seventeenth century England. And Andrew Gurr goes to the extent of saying that the animal variety of crab was treated as a popular snack at the open air theatre (1996, 55).

In *The Tempest*, Caliban is, as Brayton rightly puts it, a “crabby subaltern himself”, who shares an obscure relationship with Prospero and other outsiders on one hand, and a benign relationship with coastal environmental on the other. His is a space in which the

‘hungry ocean’ and ‘the kingdom of the shore’ can hardly be separated from each other. Both Caliban and Prospero represent two opposite poles of Renaissance environmental imagination. Whereas the original native of the island epitomizes the natural coastal ecosystem, Prospero, the outsider and the embodiment of anthropocentric New learning and Renaissance dynamics of power, stands for a ‘brave new world’ of power and politics. Nevertheless, one thing is certain that the human interaction with the marine environment in *The Tempest* reveals clearly how the ‘oceanic space’ plays a vital role in transforming and ‘reconceptualizing the globe as an aquatic ball instead of an enclosed garden’ (Brayton 93). Shakespeare’s environmental consciousness is caught between two paradoxical perspectives. On the one hand, the limitless and unfathomable sea exercises its aesthetic effects through its fish, fresh air, crab, birds, animals, sea creatures, fruits, trees, plants and roots in the island so as to inculcate a serene and creative eco-consciousness. On the other hand, with the march of expansionist and colonial outlook of the Renaissance mind/people, Prospero the colonizer exercises his magic power to enslave Caliban and the spirits and even creates an illusionary tempest to bring about a ship wreck for materializing his selfish political interest of winning his enemies in a diplomatic way. No doubt, the sea has miraculous treasures within and has transforming power as well to shape the human mind and the physical environment.

With the rapid historical, political and cultural changes and frequent attempts by the human world to tame and utilize nature in the backdrop of urbanization, capitalism, new learning and new technologies, the anthropocentric outlook has posed a formidable environmental threat and invited frequent ecological disasters and reactions from nature. Robert N Watson in his book *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance* (2006) locates two important factors behind the rise of the egocentric/anthropocentric perception. To Watson, the New Learning prompted by empirical science inspired one group of Renaissance thinkers to confront epistemological doubts, whereas another coterie of people associated with Renaissance humanism “threatened to produce a cognitive crisis among another set of thinkers by revealing that the world is less observed than constructed” (5-6). Shakespeare’s engaging interest in

‘oceanic space’, dynamics of sea and marine ecology can be further fortified with the help of Renaissance astrological beliefs and strong fascination for moon, tide and lunar/solar eclipses. The Renaissance man’s enormous interest in fluctuating streams of salt water and the reactions of the sea/oceanic tides under the influence of the moon and other ‘stars’/planets shape significantly the Renaissance environmental imagination. This is all the more evident from the copious use of ‘tidal metaphors’ by Shakespeare. Brayton aptly observes:

Tidal metaphors are a major part of the discourse of nature
in Shakespeare’s writings, from the narrative poems to plays
spanning his career, an imaginative linkage develops human ontology
and the physical and the physical environment through comparing
human emotions with the tides and moving water currents, eddies,
floods. The poet not only writes of tides as metaphors, he also demonstrates
a thorough awareness of ideas as a very literal, physical force exercising
a powerful influence on history (86-87).

A close analysis of Shakespeare’s tidal metaphors and references to moon, solar/lunar eclipses would succinctly show his ecocentric endeavour to depict human connection to the oceanic space and the Renaissance man’s interest in astrological beliefs. Brayton argues that “Shakespeare imagined an ontological connection between human life and the ocean that is as much material as it is metaphorical, an insight he shares with modern ecologists, environmental ethicists, and a handful of ecocritics” (87). Shakespeare’s astrological knowledge adroitly connected with and conveyed through tidal metaphors can be located in his plays like *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Winter’s Tale*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Henry IV* and *A MidSummer Night’s Dream*. There is no denial of the fact that Elizabethan audience/people showed as much interest in witchcraft, sorcery, fairies and other supernatural agents as in astrology and occult love. And the

role/functions of Ariel, Puck, Titania, Oberon, ghosts and witches, ominous birds, thunder and lightning in Shakespeare's plays satisfactorily vindicate the fact that Elizabethan imagination was enriched with supernatural and superstitious beliefs on one hand, and environmental consciousness on the other.

The history of astrological beliefs goes back to the ancient Indian, Babylonian and Sumerian civilizations (2000 BC) and it became an endearing part of Elizabethan cultural heritage. Since science was still in its infancy, the Elizabethans had largely formulated their imagination and thought process after superstitious and astrological beliefs. Moreover, bad harvests during 1590s and frequent outbreak of plagues circumstantially propelled the Elizabethan people to repose full faith in occult beliefs, supernaturalism and astrology in a state of helplessness. Theatre couldn't operate and there was a surprising halt in Shakespeare's dramatic career during the devastating plague for seven years. Astrology being the most popular occult system of belief in Elizabethan England, the Renaissance men held the opinion that the stars and planets did exercised profound influence on their imagination and way of life (1979, 29). This is evident from the popularity of almanacs among the common Elizabethans and in *A MidSummer Night's Dream*, in the mouth of a rustic called Nick Bottom, Shakespeare puts that- an almanac should be consulted for determining how a 'bright moon will be favourable for the craftsman's production of Pyramus and Thisbe (Bernard Capp 27).

Significantly, Henry VII, Henry VIII, Mary Tudor and Queen Elizabeth had court astrologers. Though the common people had no thorough knowledge in astrology, they were guided by the folk beliefs in eclipses of the moon and the Dog Star. Belief in Astrology created a deep seated feeling in the Elizabethan people that stars exerted a powerful influence on human mind, imagination and personality as well as on the physical environment in which they were placed. This led to the serious belief that man was but a puppet of the stars. This is evidenced from *Romeo and Juliet* wherein the grief torn romantic hero, standing outside the Capulet tomb, wrongly believes that Juliet is dead:

O! here

Will I set up my everlasting rest

And shake the yoke of inauspicious stars

From this world-wearied flesh (5.3. 109-111)

As in Indian astrology Renaissance astrology too recognized the influence of the “inauspicious star” on the mind and imagination of the Elizabethan people. Their astrological belief became firmly fortified when natural calamities, disease and famine and the impending danger of war threatened the disruption of social, natural, political and cultural order. Here, it is pertinent to mention that the Elizabethan people recognized both ‘moon’ and ‘sun’ as two shaping forces that determine both the creative and environmental imagination of the Renaissance man. For instance, moon was recognized as a planet of romance, fickleness and wild imagination precisely because this planet of emotion swiftly changes its place in the zodiac system. And this Elizabethan belief exercised enormous influence on Shakespeare’s environmental imagination as well. His plays, more predominantly his dramatic romances, have recorded the characteristics of changeability and fickleness of moon whose action/reaction is decidedly felt in the tidal behavior of the sea in full moon night. Precisely speaking, in Shakespeare’s discourse on nature, the moon, the sea and the tide and their impact on human mind constitute an inviolable tie. In *Romeo and Juliet*, to take another example, the moon guides lover’s imagination and the renaissance dramatist call the fickle planet “the inconstant moon, That monthly changes in the circled orb” (2.2.108-110). The negative aspect of moon is vindicated both in Indian and Elizabethan astrology wherein insanity, eccentricity and mental instability in human personality is connected with the weak moon. Shakespeare’s environmental imagination is largely influenced by moon’s double function- causing highly emotion reaction in both human mind and the sea with proto- romantic zest on the one hand and causing ecodestruction and insanity in human mind on the other. This is all the more evident in/from *Othello*, the renaissance tragedy in which Shakespeare characterizes an erring moon:

It is the very error of the moon;

She comes more near the earth than she was won't,

And makes man made" (5.2.109-111).

In much the same way, it is the chuckling moonlit night that stimulated marooning passion in Lorenzo and Jessica to elope in the absence of Shylock at home. Not only that, weak moon according to Elizabethan astrological belief develops murderous passion and criminal psychology because of the insane/unstable mind caused by mind and the murderous psychology of Macbeth and Othello and the insanity of Lear, Hamlet and Lady Macbeth can be astrologically attributed to the adverse effect of the 'inconstant moon'. Here it is important to note that unlike the higher celestial spheres, the moon, being fickle does not revolve perfectly and regularly around the earth. At the same time, the inconstant moon changes in phases as well as distance thereby causing change, disorder in nature and madness in man. Both lunar (moon) and solar (sun) eclipses forecast ill health, misery, suffering, mental disturbance and catastrophe in nature. The Renaissance mind was admittedly influenced by such a belief. For instance, in the mouth of Gloucester in *King Lear*, Shakespeare forecasts great danger and reaction in the world of nature which is caused by the solar and lunar eclipses. That Renaissance environmental imagination cannot be separated from contemporary history becomes evident from Shakespeare's representation of the great eclipses- the solar eclipses in 1605 and the lunar eclipses in 1606. Gloucester observes:

These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us:

through the wisdom of nature can reason it thus and thus,

yet nature finds it scourged by the sequent effects.

Love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide: in cities, mutinies;

in countries, discord: in palaces, treason and the bond cracked between

son and father. This villain of mine comes under the prediction;

there's son against father: the king falls from bias of nature;

there's father against child (*King Lear* 1.2.115-125).

The astrological prediction in the lines quoted above points to the fact that the ominous eclipses dismantle an otherwise well ordered cosmos. Gloucester reinforces the renaissance belief that the planets disturb our natural order which results in the collapse of relationship in family and in the civil society at last. The same kind of chaotic situation in the kingdom of Denmark is evident from Horatio's speech after the death of King Hamlet:

Did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets;

As stars with trains of fire and dews of blood,

Disasters in the sun; and the moist star

Upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands

Was sick almost to doomsday with eclipse" (*Hamlet* 1.1.116-120)

These powerful lines from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* satisfactorily vindicate the fact that renaissance environmental imagination works in tandem with renaissance astrological belief. Shakespeare was well aware of the impact of the lunar eclipses and solar eclipse on the sea which is manifest through the behaviour and reaction of tide and sea water. Since the moon defined as 'moist star' stands for water, cold and wild imagination, lunar eclipse more often than not influences the tide of the sea and the human mind as well. In the mouth of Horatio (1.1.118-119) Shakespeare brings to the fore the distinction between sun and moon-one representing 'fire' and the other symbolizing 'water'. However, taken in conjunction with sea and its tide, the sun and the moon exercise their influences in sky and sea and on earth thereby fortifying the renaissance environmental imagination. Shakespeare is quite clear about the decidedly significant influence of moon on Neptune's empire (sea) and also brings to the fore the bitter fact

that the moon's detrimental effect makes both the human and natural world sick with eclipse almost to doomsday. Needless to say, Shakespeare creates an ecophobic situation through the visual appeal of the unruly tides created by the sea by Neptune's empire and the sickness of human mind and heart which is evident from the unusual behaviour of birds, animals and human beings in Shakespeare's tragedies.

The discussion on moon and sun, sea and tide, coastal environment and their impact on human mind can be further correlated with the four medieval humours which influenced the renaissance imagination as well. The four bodily humours were part and parcel of Shakespearean cosmology which the renaissance dramatist had inherited from the ancient Greek philosophers such as Aristotle, Hippocrates and Galen. While centering round the four primordial elements such as earth, water, air and fire, these humours further point to four characteristic qualities of human beings/temperament. Whereas water symbolizes cold/cool temperament, fire stands for heat, haughtiness and arrogance. On the other hand, air stands for dryness and earth is associated with moisture. Interpreted in medical terms, the four humours are defined as choleric (yellow bile), melancholic (black bile), phlegmatic (phlegm) and sanguine (blood). The four humours are also associated with four seasons. While phlegm is associated with 'autumn' along with water, maturity, cold, moist and the planet Moon, choleric is associated with fire, heat 'summer' and the planet Mars, melancholic is associated with earth and 'winter', old age, and the planet Saturn, whereas sanguine (blood) is connected with spring, adolescence and the planet Jupiter. What is significant to note here is that the four humours connected with different seasons and different stages of a human being is further taken in conjunction with climatic condition which enriches the renaissance environmental imagination in a big way.

Navigators and adventurers into the sea during the Renaissance took much interest in Astrology and Astronomy. John Dee, Thomas Allen, and Leonard Digges were famous Renaissance astrologers, whose great minds gave a new Philip to the Elizabethan people to evince keen interest in Astrology as an art (Capp 19). But the reformation of the Eng-

lish Church put an end to ritualistic worship, magic/exorcism and consequently the popularity of astrology started dwindling. In this connection Bernard Capp observes:

The popularity of astrological practitioners and later of printed guides supports the suggestion that they were supplying a need apparently ignored by the English Church after the English Reformation: “the harnessing of supernatural powers to help men avert danger and overcome obstacles in their daily lives (15).

Yet, the rise of the almanac made astrological knowledge accessible to the general public. At the same time, the Elizabethan interest in order or what E.M.W. Tillyard proposed as ‘The Great Chain of Being’ constituted in the order of – God, angels, planets (including the stars), man, animals, plants and inorganic matter. ‘The Great Chain of Being’ was further extended to another form of hierarchy in which God was the chief human being, whereas the sun was the chief planet and a king was the chief of men (41). In the process, the Elizabethan mind was conditioned by ‘order’ rather than ‘chaos’ (10-16). The Elizabethan obsession with order tended to arouse astrological interest in the Elizabethan people. Astrology provided theoretically a means of controlling chaos and earthly disorder. The importance of sun and moon, sea, tide and time in relation to human life and coastal environment has been recurring subjects of discussion in Renaissance environmental discourse.

While interfusing astrological beliefs with environmental questions during the Renaissance, Shakespeare has focused time and again the importance of ‘sun’ and ‘moon’ that determine the health and happiness, anxiety and suffering of Elizabethan rulers and their kingdom, people and their go of life in the society guided by astrological and superstitious /supernatural beliefs. For instance, in the historical play *Henry IV, Part-I*, Prince Henry hold how human life like the ebb and flow of sea is governed by moon with its creative and detrimental and effects. Falstaff, the embodiment of Renaissance wit and humour, proposes to become ‘Diana’s foresters’ and minions of the moon’. With his

characteristic wit and humour, he further adds that, “we be men of good government, being governed as the sea is, by our noble and chaste mistress the moon, under whose countenance we steal” (1.2.30-33). The two expressions ‘minions of moon’ and ‘chaste mistress the moon’ bring to the fore the double nature of moon-one that dominates and makes others minions (servants), and the other that guides pure lovers as their guide and hence ‘noble and chaste mistress’. That the relationship between ‘moon’ and ‘sea’ is inviolable becomes obvious from Falstaff’s observation that people should be servants of good government, just as the ‘sea’ is governed by ‘our noble and chaste mistress of the moon’. Prince Henry attests Falstaff’s observation that human life is determined in the Elizabethan environmental context, in tandem with sea and moon. Prince Henry observes:

Thou sayest well, and it holds well

too; for the fortune of us that are the moon’s

men doth ebb and flow like the sea,

being governed as the sea is, by the moon. (*Henry IV, Part 1* 1.2.34-37)

With his characteristic constitutional rhetoric skill, King Henry V, the candidly frank and extremely sophisticated king of England, possesses the rare quality to manipulate his audience as a hero and a good leader. For the sake of England’s stability, he betrayed his friend Falstaff and killed Scrope and punished Bardolph thereby delivering the vital message that a genuine king should subdue and sacrifice his personal feelings, desires, likes and dislikes. While romanticizing his love for Katherine, daughter of King Charles VI of France, King Henry V uses metaphors of ‘sun’ and ‘moon’ with considerable astrological implications. With his deep psychological insight into the niceties of different parts of the ephemeral human body- good leg, straight back, black beard, fair face etc- the romantic king holds heart, the seat of pure love, in high esteem. While subscribing to the Elizabethan astrological norms which is strongly reminiscent of the Vedic astrology as well, in the mouth of the king, Shakespeare holds that both ‘moon’

and 'sun' stand for 'pure heart'- one symbolizes 'emotion'(moon) and the other symbolizing illumination(sun). King Henry observes:

A good leg will fall, a straight back will stoop, a black beard
will turn white, a curled pate will grow bald, a
fair face will wither, a full eye will wax hollow,
but a good heart, Kate, is the sun and the
moon; or, rather, the sun, and not the moon;
for it shines bright and never changes, but keeps
his course truly. (*Henry V* 5.2. 166-173)

Shakespeare correlates the human world with astrology and environment by emphasizing the importance of 'sun' and 'moon' as the embodiment of illumination, emotion and romantic imagination/feeling. And being the champion of romantic imagination, Shakespeare wholeheartedly recognizes the 'unseen hands' of 'moon' and 'sun' in fomenting the 'sea' and the human heart. And while so doing, that the fickle moon plays a powerful part in creating commotion in sea and wild passion in lovers is justified from moon's nature of fickleness and change from one zodiac sign to another, whereas the sun stands unchanged and keeps its 'course truly'. That Shakespeare's imagination is inextricably associated with moon is also recognized in the very opening scene of *A MidSummer Night's Dream*: "how slow/ This old man wanes" (1.1.3-4). And subsequently Duke Theseus designates the planet as "cold fruitless moon" (1.1.73) which can be correlated with the 'aggressive femininity' of Hippolyta. Here it is important to note that love and marriage hardly get fruition during the phase of waning moon that brings about frustration, melancholy and break in love/marriage. It is this astrological belief that prompted Shakespeare's Theseus and Hippolyta to make delay in their marriage by four days till the waning moon is replaced by the 'new moon'. The Duke admires the new moon and compares it to 'a silver bow/ new- bent in heaven" (1.1.9-10). The new moon

too exhilarated Hippolyta whose pale ‘lunar melancholy’ was transformed into happiness. The new moon also gave Theseus absolute confidence and as such he confessed that he “wooed her with (his) sword/And won (her) love doing (her) injuries (1.1.16-17). Astrological metaphors abound in Shakespeare’s plays and tend to vindicate the fact that the Renaissance imagination was foregrounded upon star’s inevitable influence that governs human destiny on the one hand, and the environmental condition on the other. In his Sonnet no. 15, the Renaissance poet acknowledges the stormy influence on man and nature:

Whereon the stars in secret influence comment

When I perceive that men as planets increase

Vaunt in their youthful sap, at height decrease (4-7).

Similarly in Sonnet no 26, the poet regrets the inferiority of his art, and strongly hopes that his stars will shine more favorably in future to make him worthy as a writer (10-12). Whereas Parolles is mocked at by Helena for being born under the war-planet Mars in *All is Well that Ends Well* (1.1.197-207), the roguish thief Autolycus in *The Winter’s Tale* informs the audience that he was under the impact of Mercury (4.2.24-26). And in *King Lear*, Edmund holds:

My father compounded with my mother under

the dragon’s tail, and my nativity was under

ursa major; so that it follows I am rough

and lecherous (1.2.139-142).

Edmund further laments that “I should have been that I am, had the maidenliest star in the firmament twinkled in my bastarding” (1.2.143-144). Here, it is important to note that the Elizabethans believed in the Ptolemaic notion that the position of Stars during conception determines one’s character. In Edmund’s case the conception occurred under the impact of Dragon’s Tail (Ketu in Indian Astrology) and *ursa major*, (*Saptarsi*), a con-

stellation dominated by Mars. Dragon's Tail is an "ominous spot on the moon's orbital path" and the 'maidenliest star' (Venus) made Edmund lecherous. Interestingly, in *Henry IV Part 2*, the Saturn and Venus odd combination/conjunction facilitated the kiss between Falstaff and the prostitute, Doll Tearsheet. Whereas Falstaff stands for old age (Saturn), Doll epitomizes youth (Venus). Elsewhere, in the play, 'human face' is deserted through astrological metaphor and Poins describes his friend Bardolph's red face in terms of the influence of triple conjunction of fiery signs- Aries, Leo and Sagittarius. In *Hamlet*, Horatio represents the Renaissance men's concern about celestial disturbances and the ghost of the king Hamlet is viewed as an ominous sign which is likened to the significance of "stars with trains of fire and dews of blood" (1.1.117). Shakespeare's preference for Elizabethan world picture, of order and harmony against chaos and disintegration is shown through astrological allusion in *Troilus and Cressida*. For instance, Achilles refuses to fight or to acknowledge Agamemnon's superior social status which warranted chaos for the Greeks. This fact is brilliantly articulated by Ulysses in astrological terms:

The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre/Observe
degree, priority and place/Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office, and custom, in all line of order/And therefore is the glorious planet Sol
In noble eminence enthron'd and spher'd/ Amidst the other;
whose medi'cinable eye/Corrects the ill aspects of planets evil,
And posts, like the commandment of a king/ Sans check, to good and bad
but when the planets/In evil mixture to disorder wander/ What plagues of the
sea, shaking of earth/Commotion in the winds, frights, changes, horrors,
Divert and crack, rend and deracinate/The unity and married calm of states
Quite from their fixure! (*Troilus and Cressida* 1.3.85-102)

Shakespeare's environmental imagination was also shaped by changes in climate/weather pattern and raging of storm in the sea-coast together with thunder and lightning. He was increasingly aware of the facts that like the tide in sea, weather and climate did durably influence/affect the nature of the Renaissance men and their four humors which were modified by climate and environment. At the same time, weather condition too affected human behaviour. The interaction/interconnection between weather and Elizabethan people can be located in Shakespeare's *A MidSummer Night's Dream*, *Romeo and Juliet* and *King Lear*. *A MidSummer Night's Dream* begins with the waning moon otherwise described as "cold fruitless moon" (1.1.73) and its influence on the weather of the earth is incontrovertible. Shakespeare's romantic imagination envisages how the moon goddess discharges the task of "decking with liquid pearls the bladed grass" (1.1.211), and also spreads humidity in Athens and its sylvan surroundings. Since moon as a planet epitomizes 'mind' and is associated with brightness of shining pearl as an astrologically recommended gemstone, the influence of moon is evident on human mind as well as nature. As a planet associated with love /romance, marriage, chastity, dream and sensuous perception, the moon fulfills the dreams of lovers and the action of the play occurs mostly at night.

Even as the dream of 'noble wedding' is fulfilled in the play, Shakespeare's 'cosmographic imagination' (John Gillies 2014, 70), was always preoccupied with the spell of bad weather which might affect his performance in Globe and the Fortune Theatre. It is this eco-anxiety fuelled by bad weather that propels Shakespeare to depict nightmarish meteorological conditions, 'rain and 'cold temperature were two other factors of concern in the last part of 16th Century, especially in the 1590s and also the period between 1680 and 1730 (Brian Fagan 2001, 90). Titania's famous monologue in *A MidSummer Night's Dream* in the poor climate and unnatural catastrophe is really contextual in this respect. In the mouth of Titania, the queen of Fairies, Shakespeare expresses the topical eco-anxiety through a catalogue of disasters such as fog, flooding, failed crops, miserable flocks, polluted air, bad temperatures, rheumatic diseases- all these being the result/effect of wet climate. Shakespeare writes:

Therefore the winds, piping to us in vain,
 As in revenge, have suck'd up from the sea
 Contagious fogs; which, falling in the land
 Have every pelting river made so proud
 That they have over borne their continents:
 The ox hath therefore stretch'd his yoke in vain,
 The ploughman lost his sweat, and the green corn
 Hath rotted ere his youth attain'd a beard
 (*A MidSummer Night's Dream* 2.1.88-95).

Titania offers a brilliant picture of the cataclysmic weather that evokes world-wide inundation reminiscent of the Great Flood in the Bible. Shakespeare firmly believes that 'angry moon' as 'the governess of floods' washes all the air and whips up the disease of rheumatism. Under the impact of the belligerent moon and the unfavourable weather and the seasons- spring, summer, autumn and winter undergo drastic changes (2.1.106-117). Significantly, Titania claims joint responsibility with her husband Oberon for the disruption of the natural circles. Love in *A MidSummer Night's Dream* suffers and harmony is disrupted precisely because of the way Puck, the mischievous embodiment of Cupid in the woods, fails to materialize harmony in love because of the unstable environment and unpredictable weather. He rather weakens the couples who inevitably commit errors in the forest of Athens. Viewed through ecocritical lens, humidity, and coldness characterize the weather and environment in the play and it is applicable not only for the Athenian woods, but also for the environmental condition of the Elizabethan period at large.

In the West, there was a flood that 'filled up with mud' (2.1.99). And in the East, the motherland of the stolen Indian child, the 'Wanton wind' (2.2.29) keeps blowing and

the sea becomes instrumental in making the entire environment of the play boisterous that exercises considerable influence on the characters of the play and in an extended sense, the Renaissance environmental mind at large. For instance, the most gallant lover Pyramus kills himself (1.2.20) and Bottom is found influenced by the sad news. Similarly, Hermia had the “tempest of her eyes” (1.1.129) on her being saddened by her father’s hostile relationship with Lysander, whereas Helena tends to lament the behaviour of her beloved Demetrius (1.1.245-46). On the whole, Titania’s surprisingly human behaviour accounts for the harshness of the climate, and nature, as essentially a feminine destructive force in the play, vindicates the rule of the ‘cruel moon’ and frustrates the summer night’s ‘dream’. Disorder is linked to women’s rule. And under the rule of maddening and boisterous lunar psychology, women bereft of reason, embody the destructive side of weak moon, and viewed from astrological angle under her cruel direction; women overpowered with passion tend to suppress man. For instance, Hiems, the masculine winter king, epitomizing old age is not only mocked at but also vanquished by Nature: “And on old Hiem’s thin and icy crown/An odorous chaplet of sweet summerbuds /Is, as in mockery, set (2.1.110-11). If *The MidSummer Night’s Dream* is dominated by climatology, *Romeo and Juliet* is associated with seasons. The setting of this romantic tragedy is located in the stand still and sterility of summer, and yet the ‘cold climate’ embodying the ‘angry moon’ persists and lovesick Romeo feels much depressed to waterway “like snow in the sun’s and this controlling attitude between ‘summer’ and ‘cold’(winter) characterizes Shakespeare’s environmental imagination. If comedy is dominated by ‘cold’ and ‘angry’, and ‘fruitless moon’, tragedy in Shakespeare is overpowered with the ‘heat’ and dryness of fire and in *Romeo and Juliet*, love is essentially a burning pain, Benvolio aptly puts it before Romeo: “Tut, man one fire fireburns out another burning/ One pain is lessened by another’s anguish (*Romeo and Juliet* 1.2.45-46). If love is ‘inborn suffering’ and ‘burning’ in the fire, out of the four humours, ‘fire’ dominates the play and is signified by “burn daylight”(1.1.41) and sun’s ‘burning eye’(2.1.42). In Shakespeare’s environmental thinking, climatology and astrology are combined; summer imagery is taken in conjunction with ‘heat’, ‘burning’

and ‘fire’ of the sun and the ‘dogdays’ of summer stretching from mid July to mid September plague the city of Verona under the dictates of the rising of Sirius- the chief star of the constellation “Laelaps” or “Canis Major” associated “with a descent into jaws or mouth of death” (Berry 2012, 37). The life and behaviour of the star-crossed Romeo and Juliet is strongly controlled by Sirius, and consequently the lover and the beloved reached angrily and passionately against their parents. This is precisely because of the hot temperature ‘caused by an increase in the choleric humour and controlled by the rising Sirius. Needless to say, winter stifles anger, whereas summer symbolizing ‘heat’ triggers man’s choler. Romeo is rightly characterized by Friar Lawrence as a “distempered head” that experiences “an imbalance in the bodily ‘humours’ of blood, phlegm, choler and melancholy (2.2.30). One can now satisfactorily feel convinced that Shakespeare’s environmental imagination successfully combines astrology with climatology, and the climatic myths and astrological metaphors/allusions discussed above vindicate this fact.

What is true of Romeo is also true of King Lear who, dominated by choler possesses a ‘distempered head’ and tempestuous passion. Cataclysmic weather, combined with violent storm, thunder, incessant rain and lightning create a horrible world of climatic chaos and dislocation that arouses ecophobia in *King Lear*. In Greek meteorology, thunder is caused by ‘collision’ between dry and moist exhalations, and natural calamities are thought to be the reactions of the angry God (Aristotle, *Meteorologica* II.ix.231). In *Meteorology* (Book IV, Chapter 7), Aristotle discusses atmospheric phenomena which appealed to the Renaissance mind of the Elizabethan and also Jacobean England. In Greek thought, meteorological phenomena are generally explained as natural processes, and significantly, Aristotle talks about four elements- fire, air, water and earth of which fire and air come closer where as water and earth stay together(339a.16-19). To Aristotle, all terrestrial matters consists of these four elements that embody four primary contrary qualities- heat, cold, dryness and moisture (*Meteorology*, Book IV, Chapter 7). Meteorology deals primarily with air, water and earth and this is evident from the creation of ‘cloud’ which is composed of air, water and

earth. Within the meteorological phenomena, ‘sun’ and ‘air’ are movers, while ‘water’ and ‘earth’ are moved and act as ‘matter’. And together with geology, geography, hydrology, weather and water vapour too constitutes subjects of discussion in Aristotle, both dew and hoar-frost are found when the sky is clear and when there is no wind. At the same time, the Greek philosopher holds that vapour can be raised only when the sky becomes clear, and that vapour cannot be condensed when the wind is in blow. In this connection, Gwilym Jones in his seminal book *Shakespeare’s Storm* (2015) assertively maintains that “meteorological principles in early modern England were largely derived from the works of classical philosophers” (4). These classical philosophers include Aristotle, and the Roman Plutarch, Seneca and also Pliny, The Elder. Jones further observes:

Aristotle explains atmospheric phenomena in a way which is recognizable to any reader of similar texts from Elizabethan and Jacobean England: a system of ‘exhalations and vapours’ which are together best understood as ‘evaporations’. Aristotle’s theory states that the sun draws these evaporations upwards, potentially through three regions of the air, during which process, the account for all various types of weather.... From vapours come rain, snow, clouds, hail, frost and mist, whilst exhalations produce thunder and lightning, winds, comets and earthquakes as well as the occasional air –borne fireball”(2015, 25-26)

Jones’ firm assertion that Shakespeare and the Jacobean writers were profoundly influenced by the Classical meteorology with special reference to Aristotle tends to vindicate the fact that the Renaissance environmental imagination was not only enriched with astrology/climatology/four humours, but also fortified with the classical meteorological principles. Back to *King Lear* again, there is a dislocation in weather and

Elizabethan world order, and surprisingly, there is no God behind the storm. However, thunder that created ecophobia cause both physical and psychological suffering thereby taking the old king to illumination and a new level of understanding reality around him. He is virtually enlightened by the flashes of lightning when the sun had always blinded him. Since sea and maritime activities were a part and parcel of Elizabethan environmental consciousness, the various reactions of nature at sea/ocean in form of thunder, lightning, storm, incessant rain and unpredictable weather constitute the core of Shakespeare's environmental imagination. Tempest/storm as reaction of nature in Shakespearean drama is not only external and internal, but also functional in the sense that it primarily stands for 'separation among characters' (Jones 2). For instance, in *The Comedy of Errors*, *Twelfth Night*, *Pericles* and *The Tempest*, storm is characterized by the qualities of split. In *The Tempest*, in the very opening scene how King of Naples sinks under the influence of storm. Shakespeare writes:

We split, we split! – 'Farewell, my wife and children!'

'Farewell, brother!' - 'we split, we split, we split!' (2.1.62-64).

The human world is decidedly influenced by the world of nature with considerable ecophobia reaction. Antonio, loses all hope about king's return to life and Sebastian is inclined to bid 'goodbye to him'. More Significantly, Antonio offers for mass sacrifice: Let's all sink wi'the King" (1.1.68). Be it moments of pleasure or hours of pain, what is imperative to notice here is that the human and the natural worlds are inevitably connected with each other in terms of life and death of separation and union. This is strongly reminiscent of what Lawrence Buell observes about 'Environmental Imagination'. Buell in his *Environmental Imagination* (1996) proposes better ways of imagining man- nature relationship to deprecate anthropocentrism and argues that the non-human element (environment) should have a powerful presence in an environmental text. This is fairly applicable in case of *The Tempest* wherein the sea plays a powerful part in splitting and finally uniting Prospero and his brother Antonio and Alonso, the King of Naples with the bond of love, peace and forgiveness.

Another notable instance of the powerful presence of the non-human element negotiating the human world can be found in *King Lear* wherein 'storm' is staged not as a background, but as a person. And the storm scenes embodying Nature's rage and fury and Lear's reaction and chastisement in the hands of Nature have all been brilliantly interwoven so as to vindicate the fact that the 'non-human world' has a powerful presence in the text. The 'storm within' carrying Lear's internal agony/despair has been brilliantly correlated with the 'storm without' on the heath. This has prompted several Shakespeare critics like George W. Williams, E. Catherine Dunn and J. W. Bennet to concede that the storm in *King Lear* is an 'external symbol of Lear's internal distress' (Jones 61). Gwilym Jones argues that the storm not only negotiates between the human and the non-human but also sustains the play both 'aesthetically' and 'structurally' (2015, 59) and his observation once again vindicates Buell's viewpoint that in an ideal environment text, nature should not be treated as a mere background/settings.

In much the same way, storm constitutes an obviously powerful and spectacular element in *Julius Caesar* and Jones goes to the extent of saying that *Julius Caesar* is 'Shakespeare's first staged storm' in the context of theatrical competition (2015, 36). This is precisely because of the visual appeal and theatrical effect that the play exerted on the Elizabethan mind/people and the Renaissance stage. In the execution of stage canons, the play exercised massive impact on the Elizabethan audience through staging of fire, violent, sound and storm in order to leave a 'tangible station of fear in the audience' (Jones 37). An ecophobic situation alarms the audience as much as it disturbs Casca in *Julius Caesar* to wonder at the unruly 'tempests' and the 'scolding winds', 'dropping fire' and the rage and foam of the 'ambitious ocean' (1.3.7). Casca's narration before Cicero not only establishes the 'storm' as an extremely fearful agent of nature on the stage, but more significantly stimulates the premonition for future- murder of Caesar which is psychological trespassing and ecophobically more tormenting indeed.

The storm in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* (1609) is more visually appealing to the Elizabethan audience in that Pericles, the Greek Prince is encountered by a dreadful

storm and enters the stage on ship board whereas the sea-storm is just narrated in *The Comedy of Errors* (1594) and illustrated in *Twelfth Night* (1602), Shakespeare concretizes it with utmost visual appeal in *Pericles* for the excitement and aesthetic pleasure of the Elizabethan audience. Whereas all others on board perished, Pericles had a providential escape even as he was cast by the sea- waves naked on an unknown shore in the kingdom of one good king called Simonides. The shipwreck was no misfortune as Pericles won the love of Thaisa, the daughter of Simonides, by vanquishing many brave knights. But the sea was not a potential friend of the prince of Tyre either as another dreadful storm arose when he was returning to Tyre to occupy the vacant throne following the death of Antiochus and terrified by the storm, his beloved wife Thaisa fell ill and died while giving birth to the child Marina. The storm still continues to rage with fury and force and Shakespeare tends to combine the supernaturally obsessed Elizabethan imagination with the superstitious belief of the Renaissance people. The sailors of the ship are under the superstitious belief that the storm would never subside as long as the dead body of Thaisa remains in the ship. They demanded that the dead Queen be thrown into the sea. Pericles admits that the storm has done a lot of harm to him and yet for the sake of his daughter, he surrenders to the demand of the sailors and threw his queen overboard. Here, it is important to note that despite his awareness of the unfounded logic of superstition, Pericles respected the Elizabethan sentiment and belief and surprisingly the storm subsided after the dead body of the queen was cleared. More significantly, the sea is by nature apparently cruel in the play, but fundamentally benign and benevolent as the Queen was finally not dead, but fallen into a deep swollen following the terrible storm and the birth of her little baby. But one thing is here certain that the sea and storm are veritable chastizers that dramatically split and separate human beings and finally facilitate their union too, and therein lies the belief of the Elizabethans in the unseen hand.

Thus, a detailed analysis of England's socio-political, cultural, spiritual, economic, superstitious and supernatural connection with sea/ocean with special emphasis on marine ecology, climate, weather reactions of environment/nature through thunder, storm

lightning, rough wind and incessant rain by analyzing texts like *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *The Tempest*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *A MidSummer Night's Dream*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Hamlet* reveals that sea and maritime activities do constitute the core of Elizabethan environmental consciousness. With his engaging interest in sea and treasures of sea, sea-adventures and England's maritime commercial success through ships and navigation, Shakespeare's environmental imagination is inextricably intertwined to unbridled Renaissance urge for boundless freedom, vaulting ambition for power and pleasure, wealth and climate, political gain and economic growth through natural/environmental resources- of both land and sea –caught his keen attention. At the same time, knowing it fairly well that science and scientific inquiry were more often than not on the sights and sounds of nature-sun and moon, stars and seas, flowers and foundations and scenic beauty of pastoral landscape- with a proto-romantic interest besides bringing to the fore the astrological, superstitious beliefs and supernatural interests of the Elizabethan audience that enriched to a large extent, the Renaissance environment imagination/consciousness.

Works Cited

- Aristotle, *Meteorologica*, Translated by E.W.Webster. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, vol 1, Princeton UP, 1984.
- Armstrong, Edward A. *Shakespeare's Imagination*. Lincoln: Nebraska. 1963.
- Berry, Philippa. *Shakespeare's Feminine Endings: Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies*. Routledge, 2012.
- Brayton, Dan. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. U of Virginia P, 2018.
- Buell, Lawrence. *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*. Willey, 2009.
- Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Harvard UP, 1995.
- Capp, Bernard. *English Almanac 1500-1800: Astrology and the Popular Press*. Cornell UP, 1979.
- Charlton, H.B. *Shakespearean Comedy*. Methuen, 1969.
- Donaldson, James Woman: *Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and Among the Early Christians*. Longman, 1907.
- Egan, Gabriel. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2006.
- Estok, Simon C. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Evans, J. Claude. *With Respect for Nature: Living as Part of the Natural World*. State U of New York P, 2005.
- Fagan, Briar. *The Little Ice: How Climate Made History, 1300-1850*. Basic Books, 2000.

Fromm, Harold. *The Nature of Being Human: From Environmentalism to Consciousness*. The Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.

Gillies, John. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, Cambridge UP, 1994.

Graubard, Mark. *Astrology and Alchemy: Two Fossil Sciences*. Philosophical Library, 1953.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge UP, 1996.

Hakluyt, Richard. *Voyages*. Edited by Edmund Goldsmid. British Library Historical Print Editions. 2011

Harrison, Robert Pogue. *Forests: The Shadow of Civilization*. U of Chicago P, 1992.

Hiltner, Ken. *What Else is Pastoral?: Renaissance Literature and the Environment*. Cornell UP, 2011.

Jones, Gwilym. *Shakespeare's Storm*. Manchester UP, 2016.

Lorenzi, Rosella. "Oysters and Crabs, the Popcorn of Shakespearean Theatergoers". *London Times*. 12 February. 2010, <http://news.discovery.com/history/oysters-and-crabs-the-popcorn-of-shakespearean-theatergoers.html>.

Mandel, Jerome. "Dream and Imagination in Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1, Oxford UP, 1973, pp. 61-68, *JSTOR*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2868739>.

Meadows, A. J. *The High Firmament: A Survey of Astronomy in English Literature*. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1969.

Plato. *Symposium*. Translated by Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff, Indianapolis, 1989.

Shakespeare, William. *Shakespeare's Sonnets & Poem*. Edited by Dr Barbara A.Mowat and Paul Werstine. Simon and Schuster, 2015.

Sillars, Stuart. *Shakespeare and the Visual Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015.

Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Vintage Books. 1943.

Watson, Robert N. *Back to Nature: The Green and the real in the Late Renaissance*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.

Yaeger, Patricia S. "Editor's Column: Sea Trash, Dark Pools, and the Tragedy of the Commons". *PMLA*, vol.125, no. 3, Modern Language Association May. 2010, pp.523-545. *JSTOR* <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25704454>. PDF download.

Chapter III

Deconstructive Ecology, Culture and Colonial Hegemony

Ecocriticism/Ecological criticism has emerged as a seminal critical theory in postcolonial discourse in the backdrop of an anthropocentric vision and a ruthlessly unkind attitude shown to nature/environment warranting eco-destruction and grave environmental crisis. Etymologically associated with the German word 'Oecologie' ('Okios' meaning 'household' and 'logos', signifying 'knowledge'), the term 'Ecology' was first used by the German Biologist/Zoologist Ernst Haeckel in 1866 to deal with specifically how organisms relate to their external world in order to set everything in order. Barry Commoner in his book *The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology* (1971) has thrown sufficient light on environmental crisis caused by mushroom population growth, urge for materialistic accomplishment, technological progress, and Industrialization, consumer's demand, capitalist politics, anthropocentric attitude and violation of ethics of naturalness following the post Enlightened period. As a counter hegemonic move, Commoner formulates 'Four Laws of Ecology'.

The first law entails that 'everything is connected to everything else' and that this interconnectedness is decidedly complex because under the pressure and stress, it may break leading thereby to catastrophe, environmental crisis and eco-disaster. The second law holds that 'everything must go somewhere' which is rather a continuation of the basic law of thermodynamics that entails that in nature's kingdom, there is no waste because 'matter' and 'energy' are preserved through transformation into various forms. The third law recommends that 'Nature' knows best', and that this is a powerful lesson pertaining to environmental ethics. This law demands that any major man-made change in a natural system is likely to be detrimental to the eco-system. The fourth law prescribes that 'there is no such thing called free lunch', and this law by Commoner is a direct attack on anthropocentrism and the anthropocentric/homocentric man who exploits, hegemonizes and notoriously utilizes nature and natural resources as 'free lunch'-as a

consumer rather than a producer and protector of environment(29-42). Hence, a counter hegemonic attitude/outlook is the imperative need of the hour to contest the barbaric assault on nature and environment inflicted in form of deforestation, desertification, environmental pollution and eco-destruction as a whole. The concepts of 'Destructive/Deconstructive ecology, hegemony and culture need a detailed deliberation for situating the anthropocentric angle of Renaissance environmental imagination as adumbrated in Shakespeare's plays with special emphasis on *The Tempest* and *As You Like It*.

The theoretical basis of 'Deconstructive ecology' is formulated after Jacques Derrida's 'theory of Deconstruction', which is essentially grounded upon the epistemological question of the 'presence' and 'absence' of meaning' in a text. Deconstruction is usually defined as the act of 'dismantling' an already 'constructed thing' (*The Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989). In Western philosophy as well as literary theory, it signifies 'unquestioned metaphysical assumptions' and 'internal contradictions' in philosophical and literary language. Nicholas Royle in his article 'What is Deconstruction' (2000) observes that Deconstruction entails logic of 'destabilization' and an 'experience of the impossible' (2000, 11). In the words of Derrida, it is 'desedimentation' and a force of 'dislocation' that disorganizes the entire inherited order' (56). To Derrida, deconstruction is grounded upon the idea of 'destabilization' and difference. It points to the fact that 'everything is divisible' and that 'unity, coherence and univocality are effects produced out of division and divisibility' (Royle 26).

The term 'deconstruction' is originally a translation of 'destruktion' a concept derived from the work of Martin Heidegger. To Heidegger, destruction points to the process of hermeneutical and critical dismantling of philosophical concepts and Derrida tended to apply it to textual reading. Heidegger's term points to a process of exploring the categories and concepts that tradition has imposed on a 'word'. Heidegger's destruction of metaphysics-ancient ontology is grounded upon the idea that one should return to truth/disclosure of truth not in terms of transcendental metaphysical form, but in terms of ontology-the study of being and existential phenomenology. In his treatise *Being and*

Times (1927), he attempted to interpret 'being' (Sein) by means of phenomenological analysis of human existence (Dasein) (21-13). His contribution to existential phenomenology consists in turning the phenomenological method towards the existential or lived experience or human existence. To come to Derrida, Deconstruction tends to destroy logocentrism that patronizes centre- margin relationship and nature-culture binary. His fundamental work *Of Grammatology* (1974) associated with the concept of 'deconstructive ecology' in so far as it rejects the structuralists' idea of 'logocentrism'(logos)-the belief that there is an ultimate reality/centre of truth and that logos is epistemologically superior. The 'logos' is the ideal representation of the Platonic Ideal, and the term 'logocentrism' was first coined by the German philosopher Ludwig Klages in the early 1900s (Jason 221). In Linguistics, logos represent unity but the structure of the logos is dissected further to establish the sound and sense of the word (vac+artha). In other words, logocentric linguistics is based on the unity of 'sound' and 'sense' within the phonic (Derrida, 29). But, it holds that on the basis of semiotic phonology, speech becomes obviously superior and primary form of language, whereas the 'writing' is secondary. In this connection, Jonathan Culler in his book *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*(1997) observes that speech "seemed the immediate manifestation or presence of thought, while writing which operates in the absence of the speaker has been treated as an artificial and derivative representation of speech, a potentially misleading sign of a sign" (11). Structuralists like Ferdinand de Saussure and Levis Strauss argue in favour of the binary opposition like 'White' and 'black' and by the same logic show the opposition between 'Nature' and 'Culture'. But, in his thought-provoking essay, "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences", Derrida debunks the Nature/Culture binary and deconstructs logocentrism. Derrida's Contention is that the process of signification never leads to a transcendental signified as 'final meaning'.

While rejecting the binary opposition between Nature and culture as propounded by Levis Strauss, Derrida maintains that Nature and culture are inseparable, and this constitutes the focal point of the theory of deconstructive ecology. Derrida would argue

that the co-existence of Nature and Culture leads to a sound ecosystem and separation of culture from Nature leads to a deconstructive ecosystem. In the chapter 'The End of the Book and the Beginning of Writing' of his book *Of Grammatology*, Derrida discusses Nature and writing-eternal writing in the metaphoric sense and finite writing in the liberal sense (15). His difference between 'reading' and 'writing', which is further reminiscent of the binary relationship of 'speech' as superior form of language and 'writing' as inferior. Derrida's deliberation on speech and writing gives a new turn to deconstructive ecocriticism. To him, writing precedes speech, and by the same logic, writing by virtue of its silence is associated with culture. And nature is more vital than culture, which is born only because of Nature. While hailing nature in high esteem in terms of sublimity, Derrida draws reference to Rousseau's *Emile* and makes the following significant observation:

It was as if nature had spread out all her magnificence in front
of our eyes to offer its text for our consideration. I have therefore
closed all the books. Only one is open to all eyes. It is the book of
Nature. In this great and sublime book I learn to serve and adore its author
(*Of Grammatology*, 18).

Derrida's position in the lines quoted above is that Nature and Culture are inseparable, and that Nature is sublime in that it is prior to culture. At the same time, Derrida rejects logocentrism characteristic of grand narrative on the ground that there is no single signified (transcendental), but multiple ones that vindicate the unending significant process. In *Of Grammatology*, he judiciously recognizes the amicable relationship between 'living' and 'non-living things' so as to transgress the 'frontiers of anthropocentrism'. Derrida's eco-consciousness comes to the fore in a slightly different way as he is deeply concerned with healthy working of ecosystem together with natural waste management, maintenance of a sound ecosystem and the inviolable relationship between Nature and Culture with emphasis on cultural products. His important essay

“Biodegradables: Seven Diary Fragments” (1989) investigates ecological/environmental issues. Meliz Ergin in her book *The Eco poetics of Entanglement in Contemporary Turkish and American Literature* (2017) revisits Derrida’s concept of ‘entanglement’ to problematize the idea of ‘book of nature’ and ‘ecological text’. To Ergin, Derrida’s replacement of “the book” with “the text” can be taken as replacement of the “book of nature” with “ecological text”. Ergin aptly argues:

If the book of nature suggests a transcendent notion of nature by setting distance as the guiding principle of idealization, the ecological text highlights the tangle of nature and society by replacing, the illusion of distance with an intimidating sense of intimacy or inextricable interwovenness. If the book of nature is a revelation of God’s language and of an absolute or inherent truth, the ecological text is neither divine nor anthropocentric. If the former is a vessel for the communication of pure meaning and arrests the movement of signification, the ecological text practices its infinite deferral, embodying a nonteleological view of ecology, whose meaning is never entirely revealed. Whereas the book of nature presents nature as a precritical category independent of culture, the ecological text contests these orders of subordination and stresses both the positive and negative implications of nature-culture entanglements(8).

Ergin argues that ‘the ecological text is neither pure nor absolutely legible, but radically changes our conceptions of being and ontology’ (8). While saying so, she tends to foreground ‘nature-culture’ entanglement as a cardinal principle in Derridean ecological thought. In other words, Ergin introduces the notion of ‘ecological text’ to

emphasize textuality as a form of 'entanglement of nature' and culture though romantics like Rousseau consider 'culture' as detrimental to the development of the concepts of 'wilderness ethics', 'noble savage' and 'natural man'. To Ergin, Derrida believes that the book of Nature embodying the language of God (Absolute) signifies the grand narrative of Nature- an anthropocentric construct-which needs deconstruction. Derrida's ontological viewpoint is that an ecological text is neither the language God nor the anthropocentric/homocentric vision of the 'Economic man' and 'Technical man'. Ecological texts than obviously debunk the concept of grand narrative- nature as the language of God. To Derrida, though Nature is the manifestation of God, she is also the friend of society and hence the relationship between Nature and Culture is incontrovertible.

To be precise, Derrida's position is that an ecological text should not show differentiation between Nature and Culture, and that it should encompass both the positive and negative nuances of Nature-Culture 'Entanglement'. Viewed from an impartial perspective, an ideal ecological text, reminiscent of Buell's ideal environmental text, should be bereft of the controversial conceptions of 'hegemony' and 'subordination'. Neither 'Nature' nor 'Man' should consider himself/ herself 'superior'/ inferior to the other. What is required is the 'desiccation of self', and as such an ecological text asserts the impossibility of 'self-presence' or 'self-dominance' which constitutes the hallmark of deconstructive ecocriticism. Once the spirit of Entanglement or 'interwovenness' is realized understood, the question of binary relationship between Nature and Culture doesn't arise at all. While rejecting Nature- Culture binary, Derrida maintains, there should be an ideal coexistence of Nature and Culture for establishing a sound ecosystem.

And Ecocritical studies make an absolute link between the humans or the cultural world on one hand and the non-human or environmental world on the other thereby providing an important fact that it constitutes a dominant path to examine the connections between the two in order to build a sound ecological community. In this connection, Glen Love states that literary studies have disregarded the significant role and the broadening

scope of ecocriticism to a larger extent. Love even clamors for a change in the ‘anthropocentric’ outlook to a more ‘ecocentric’ one (10). However, Ecocriticism has become an important label for a discussion of writing that points to the natural world. Of late a remarkable move has been made by the Ecocritics to reevaluate the field of ecocriticism, widening it to involve more than nature writing.

Serpil Opperman advocated that the second wave of ecocriticism encompasses diverse literature, professional types of research, multiplicity of methods, and manifold theoretical approaches, and maintain that the growing of, engagement of ecocriticism with cultural issues such as identity, ethnicity, race , gender, caste and the other social issues such as global systems of hegemonic power, cultural imperialism, oppression of nonhuman animals and of marginalized sexualities and genders, social injustice and its engagements with environmental justice movement and queer theory as well as its new translocal and transnational approaches to the concept of place and of human experience, points to the field’s expansion on many fronts. This has led to the emergence of postcolonial ecocriticism, environmental justice, urban ecocriticism and the new feminist ecocritical studies as the new entryways (18-19).

Environmental crisis has undoubtedly become a threat to the human existence precisely because and it is due to the abuse of the environment by humankind. The ecosystem is exposed to destruction due to lack of rational resource development and utilization. Development and application of sustainable resources surpassed the limit of growth rate of resources, with increasing utilization of non-renewable resources. Even owing to poor awareness of ecological environment protection and pursuit of economic interest maximization, low-cost production methods that are damaging were adopted for practice, regardless of pollution-free technologies and scientific environmental resource management. Such development pattern has led to acute environmental problems worldwide. As Friedrich Engels highlighted in *Dialectics of Nature*, “Let us not, however, flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our human victories over nature. For each such conquest takes its revenge on us. Each of them, it is true, has in the first place

the consequences on which we counted, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel out the first.”(1925, 10).

Even ecological socialists state that capitalism is the fundamental cause for global ecological crisis and environmental problems. With the expansion of capitalism, the tendency of infinite accumulation of capital and the controlling logic of maximization of added value tends to the consumption of earth's resources and destruction of ecosystem. The Western cultural tradition of utilizing nature by human was put forward through imperialism. The entire blame falls on the West as it is a crisis arising from the western principle which disconnects the human and the non-human and this further led to an examination of ecological concepts in literature from postcolonial perspective too. The widening horizon of ecocriticism has expanded its potentiality by its 'cross-pollination with postcolonial studies' (Buell 75) and this has provided an in-depth analysis of the issue of environmental degradation in present scenario.

Postcolonial scholars such as Bill Ashcroft, Gareth and Tiffins in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*(1995) maintains that has broadened in terms of its impact and importance infields as varied as globalization, environmentalism, transnationalism and neo-liberalism. Relevant topical issues such as ecofeminism, ecological imperialism, environmental justice etc have played remarkable role in post-colonial thought. It is therefore obvious that there exists a connection between colonialist treatment of indigenous flora and fauna and treatment of colonized and otherwise dominated subjects and societies. The destruction of colonized place paved the way for the destruction of societies. Until now the destruction of the physical and human environments have become the same thing (2006, vii-viii). The crossway of postcolonialism with ecocriticism is vindicated from the very point that colonial exploitation of nature was inspired by European Philosophy of Enlightenment philosophy, knowledge of nature, conservation policy etc, and therefore to refuse colonial environmental histories as mutually constitutive misses the role, the exploitation of natural resources plays in any imperial project (DeLoughrey 15).

Postcolonial ecocriticism, different from the dominant European ecocritical paradigms, aims at dealing with multicultural and cross cultural discourses and therefore strives for resisting and critiquing the homogenisation of spaces, a product of colonialism in addition to global capitalism. Nevertheless, postcolonial criticism has been anthropocentric from the beginning. The damaging impact of neocolonialism over the ecosystem of non-European nations has made postcolonial studies understand its commitment to the environment, renewing its stance on the inseparability of current crisis of ecological mismanagement from historical legacies of imperialistic exploitation and authoritarian abuse. Hence, ecocriticism without postcolonial outlook would eventually mean to float on the surface level while the genesis of the problem remains hidden within the history of colonialism. (Huggan 702)

Ursula K. Heise asserts that “Unlike feminism or postcolonialism, ecocriticism did not even emerge gradually as the academic wing of an influential political movement” (“Science and Ecocriticism”, 506). The late emergence ecocriticism in the 1990s has resulted into a divergent set of theoretical approaches even as its practitioners share a “common political project” (506) of thinking and writing toward a more sustainable world. These particular projects need degrees of emphasis on the material conditions that shape both biophysical and cultural worlds. Ecocriticism varies from postcolonialism in its application of nonanthropocentric models such as ecocentricism, posthumanism and biocentricism that establishes the human as crucial part of, the biophysical environment. This non-anthropocentric focus can draw charges that ecocritics care more about trees and endangered species. Besides putting emphasis on how the biophysical environment is represented with reference to the human, ecocriticism interrogates numerous hypotheses that the humanist tradition supports and preserves, especially well established anthropocentric viewpoints that isolate nature from human culture.

Therefore, ecocriticism’s contemplation of the (organic and inorganic) nonhuman reexamines what it means to be human and the ethics that support or refuse such reconsideration. All these ethical concerns enlarge human rights discourse, explicitly in a

bid to reunite environmental justice and environmentalist movements. Rob Nixon in his essay “Environmentalism and Postcolonialism” (2005) asserts that the division between the two literary fields exists for four reasons. Firstly, postcolonial scholars have tended to foreground hybridity and cross-culturation, whereas the Ecocritics have been drawn more to discourses of pristine purity: virgin wilderness and the preservation of “uncorrupted” in recent times. Secondly, postcolonial writing and criticism cover themselves with displacement, while environmental literary studies give priority to the literature of place/landscape. Thirdly, postcolonial studies have tended to support the cosmopolitan and the transnational. Postcolonial scholars are critical of nationalism, whereas the canons of environmental literature and criticism have developed within a national scheme. Fourthly, postcolonialism has provided attention to excavating or reimagining the marginalized past: history from below and along borders, such as transnational axes of migrant memory. Within the field of environmental literature and criticism, by contrast, history is repressed or subordinated in the quest of timeless, solitary moments of communion with nature (Nixon 235). Nixon’s article was able to coordinate many of disconnection that those in postcolonial ecocriticism were already echoing. Cheryl Lousley(2001) has also voiced her voice that if nature writers understand that “ the solution to ecological crisis involves ‘coming home’ to nature (56), then what solutions could be found in the postcolonial context, where home was often a contested, or even unlocatable place?

Moreover, Postcolonial studies gave more emphasis on the effects of colonialism on individuals, while paying no heed to the environmental consequences, Huggan and Tiffin contend that, in the context of colonialism, the land is supposed to be an object at the disposal of the colonizer: thus there is a parallel between the subjugation of native populations and that of the territory. For this reason, ecocriticism and postcolonialism are intertwined and cannot be considered separately (2010, 12). Colonialism as defined by Ronald Horvath “refers to that form of inter-group domination in which settlers in significant number migrate permanently to the colony from the colonizing power.” (“A Definition of Colonialism”, 47).

In the era of Colonialism, which lasted over the centuries, no continent was left untouched by the British empire. The British colonizers maintained their colonial hegemony by occupying foreign lands and ruling over their inhabitants. With the beginning of the process of decolonisation in the twentieth century, the outcome of colonial empire had already left footprints not only physically, but also in the collective memory of both Western and non-Western individuals. Huggan & Tiffin classifies British colonialism into two types of colonies: settler colonies and occupation colonies (2010, 7). The Occupation colonies include the sites which were politically under the hegemony of British individuals, although the colonists had a certain amount of respect for the local culture and they did not consider the land empty, whereas in settler colonies, inversely, inhabitants were considered undeserving, and belittled; therefore they could be discarded, forced to embrace the hegemony or silenced forever.

Derivative from the Greek word “hegemonia”, the word hegemony means authority and rule-“hegemon” (leader) and “eghesthai” (to lead). In common parlance, hegemony itself implies such notions as influence, patronage, or leadership. It is defined as the exercise of absolute control either by a state or by an individual. As elucidated from his prison notes, Antonio Gramsci has tried to explain that how hegemony describes domination of one social group over another so as to perpetuate the power of the dominant group and to convince the subordinated to accept, adopt and internalize their value and norms in the society not by using armed force but primarily through coercion and consensus. The concept of hegemony as a cultural method started developing through the writings of Matthew Arnold. Even Terry Eagleton discovered in Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy* “a drive to deepen the spiritual hegemony of the middle class” and to “convert the Philistines into a truly hegemonic class” (Eagleton 1978, 104). Edward W. Said, whose concept of culture was deeply influenced by that of Arnold, maintained that any aspect that has to do with human history has its roots in the earth (Said 1993, 247). This implies that the home is not the only unique focus of concern. That is why there are people, who plan to own more territory and recognise the need to do something with the

native residents who inhabit that home. Their cultural imperialism necessitates building their presence in and controlling the lands that they do not possess. Further, they are occupied and belong to others. As a result, this situation causes a double feeling, which is not only contradictory, but also antagonistic. This situation however, envisages how some people waken their colonialist vocation as well as carries an infinite source of suffering for the colonized. As Said has argued in his book *Orientalism*, the suffering of the people is the direct effect of cultural exchange between partners who are aware of the inequality of this exchange (Said 1978, 95).

Even the realistic picture of island colonies was certainly not an idyllic one. It has been quite a beguiling site for ecological exploration even though they provide engrossing patterns of colonization, biological evolution and modification. As a matter of fact, Islands have been subjected to violence for centuries, because of their status of strategic places for trades (Meeker 2011:200). The small islands, in fact, have been colonized not only by military forces but by commercial ones as well. The ecosystem has been altered on one hand, by taking forests and minerals elsewhere, on the other, by introducing new species of plants and animals (Meeker 2011, 201).

Heidi C. M. Scott in her article “Havens and Horrors: The Island Landscape”(2004) mentions that, Darwin throughout his studies observed the uncanny biology of island species, in contrast with continental ones, deducing that on islands, evolution takes an alternative path (638). This eccentricity has been threatened by colonialism and, as a consequence, the biology of many islands has been changed by European exploitation in diverse ways. Islands were utilized for various experiments, intrusive species and rigorous cultivation of native species. Hence, agriculture is the appropriate representation of human desire of conquering nature so as to occupy it. The island can be bountiful and resourceful habitats with a low competition as a result of desolation. No doubt, there can also be places pushed to the limit by weather condition of human engagement. Peter Hay observes that, “Most of the world’s island, who did not

experience huge population alters, subsequently by European intervention, have been made particularly and often in unique ways by European politics” (2002, 203-204). Thus, colonialism had a severe impact on islands, which have been affected and shaped by European politics. Nevertheless, the dichotomy that the islands consolidate in collective imagination is exactly what makes them interesting as settings for play or any literary work. A vital element that adds to the idea of island duplicity is the unearthly nature of its species: island’s flora and fauna are not unknown to the individual, who come from the mainland still; it is not the same. In the context of a literary work, the island as a setting has been a significant motif. The archaic legend of “Island of the Blessed” and other numerous islands have so far nurtured the collective imagination of the Western minds and in Dante Alighieri’s *Divine Comedy* and William Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, island settings have paved the path for the later texts. Dante visualized the Mountain of Purgatory as an island, which connects this physical site to spiritual growth, whereas Shakespeare opts for a strange island as a site for magic and illusion. Furthermore, Glen Love suggests that island ecology constitutes a significant angle of *The Tempest* that amplifies Shakespeare’s pastoral range. The distinctiveness and experimentalism of an island setting for human interconnections becomes a key factor conforming to his island-ecology analysis (2003, 44)

In connection to island colonies in *The Tempest*, Le Juez and Springer contends that “The shipwreck and island motifs are atemporal and universal” (2015, 2). On the one hand, examining the metaphor of life as a ship voyage, the shipwreck is often linked to a symbolic derangement which threatens the stability of the individual. On the other, the island depicts an interesting location for a story to be set, because of the dichotomy it has come to represent in Western collective imagination across the ages. As expected the islands may be earthly heavens where individuals welcome a serene, contemplative and uncontaminated life, while abandoning the superficial polluted reality of city. In doing so, what at first appears as a utopia, immediately changes into a heterotopia where characters have to face chaos, disruption, disorder and fight with each other. While analysed eco-

logically, even settler colonialism works strategically to underestimate the indigenous people's social resilience as self determining collectives. Graham Huggan (2004) in his essay "Greening Postcolonialism: Ecocritical Perspectives" maintains how "ecological disruption is coextensive with damage to the social fabric and that environmental issues cannot be separated from questions of social justice and human rights" (704).

In the book *Varieties of Environmentalism* (1997), Ramachandra Guha and J. Martinez-Alier segregate people into three groups in line with their relation to the environment. Firstly, the "ecosystem people" (12) are those communities who depend heavily on the natural resources of their own locality. Secondly, these communities experience a struggle with another category of people called "omnivores", namely the "individuals and groups with social power to capture, transform, and use natural resources from a much wider catchment area, sometimes, indeed the whole world"(12). The third ecological class includes the "ecological refugees" who are the "peasants turned slum dwellers, making out a living in the cities on the livings of omnivore prosperity" (Guha and Martinez-Alier 12). In *The Tempest*, Prospero attempts to wield his power and black magic to exercise control over the weather and the native people into behaving a certain way he wants to. Following Guha's classification, Prospero belongs to the "omnivores" who are the "individuals and groups with social power to capture, transform, and use natural resources from a much wider catchment area, sometimes, indeed the whole world" (Guha & Martinez-Alier 12). He willingly controls the climate mainly the weather of the sea and the island to serve anthropogenic interest and by doing so, he alters the fundamental features of the earth and the ecosystem.

While following Dipesh Chakrabarty's arguments, it may be contended that Prospero also represents the emerging human transformations into "geological force" as he claims in his essay, "The Climate of History: Four Theses" (2018) that "humans now wield a geological force" changing the most basic physical processes of the earth (78). Prospero's hegemonic attitude highlights the manifold ways of manipulation done incon-

sistently by the omnivores or the privileged humans on the environment as well as the underprivileged aboriginals too. The privileged or colonial mind has always considered the natural resources and other humans as their slaves which is reflected as Prospero addresses Ariel, the paradigm of air and water, as “Thou my slave”(1.2.270) and effectively compels him to act according to, his command. Simultaneously, Prospero even introduces Caliban, the native, as his slave, who is presumed to rigorously follow his orders.

PROSPERO: We'll visit Caliban, my slave, who never

Yields us kind answer. (1.2.308-09)

Prospero's hostile behavior is reflective of Eurocentric attitude towards the natives, the underprivileged who are taken for granted as slaves. This act is resemblance of a certain hegemonic outlook which is quite similar to the action of English Colonizers. Shakespeare has managed to represent Prospero as a stereotypical figure, while differentiating the indigenous character by “type” showing Ariel as an emblem of indigenous people and Caliban as a more resistant native. This perspective shown towards the natives showcases Prospero's dominance and how he with his magical power usurps the mind of the colonized natives thereby shattering the original social relations. In this connection, Derek Cohen aptly comments in *Searching Shakespeare*, “the construction of Caliban as a colonized native has become a truism of contemporary criticism of *The Tempest*” and Prospero is habitually regarded as “the embodiment of European, Old World, cultural domination” (*Searching Shakespeare*, 41). *The Tempest* renders a social representation of colonialism, oppression over the indigenous group and elucidates the concept of hegemony in terms of exploitation of natural world and its resources too. Prospero as a domineering man, emphasizes his agenda of colonizing the island and Caliban along with his mother Sycorax who represents the native people. According to Martinez-Alier, Caliban represents the “ecosystem people” who depend heavily on the natural resources of their locality for their livelihood (12). The belligerent

conduct of Prospero, as responded by Caliban, highlights how the native people across the globe have responded to the aggressive acts of domination and manipulation by the geological agents aggravating climate change as well. At the master-like command of Prospero, Caliban counters against the injustice meted out to him, asserting himself for his own identity as his right and this act of resistance can be seen in the following powerful lines:

I must eat my dinner.
 This island's mine by Sycorax, my mother,
 Which thou tak'st from me. When thou cam'st first
 Thou strok'st me and made much of me; wouldst give me
 Water with berries in't, and teach me how
 To name the bigger light and how the less. (1.2. 331-36)

To this, Prospero swiftly dismisses Caliban's claim of inheritance over the island on the ground of illegitimacy thereby declaring that Caliban is Sycorax's bastard son "got by the devil himself/Upon thy wicked dam" (319-20). In this regard, Stephen Orgel(1987) points out that although the authenticity of Prospero's declaration could be contested, the issues of inheritance of power and illegitimacy are closely interconnected with the cultural history of the play (1987, 55). Prospero illustrates that power is relatively exercised when it is accomplished through an individual's competence, rather than inheritance. It projects that Prospero's supreme magic has never been his real devotion rather it lingers on as a crucial means to cultivate his megalomaniac nature.

PROSPERO: Thou most lying slave,
 Whom stripes may move, not kindness; I have used thee
 (Filth as thou art) with human care and lodged thee. (1.2. 345-47)

CALIBAN: For I am all the subjects that you have,
 Which first was mine own king; and here you sty me

In this hard rock, whiles you do keep from me
The rest o'th' island. (1.2. 341-44)

Caliban stands as an epitome of indigenous people whose identity, history, and culture are distorted by the white colonization. Even, the island's setting, where Caliban and his mother reside takes place somewhere in the Mediterranean. But the non-specificity of the location caters to the endless possibilities for the readers. This island can be anywhere in the world, taken over and ruled by the colonial masters and the indigenous of any island, having been carried off by the white colonizing forces, are just like leftovers forced to serve their colonizers as slaves. This island is used as an instrument consciously to expose the imperialistic attitude of colonialism thereby focusing the importance of colonialism and its impact on the indigenous people on the earth.

Scholars have grappled with the definition of slavery that had varied across time and space. Slavery in general, encompasses certain characteristics: Firstly, the slaves were mostly outsiders, native neither to the environment nor the community where they served out their bondage. Secondly, the slaves were regarded as property, as individuals who were owned by another and could not claim anything as their own. Thirdly, slavery was usually perpetual and inheritable. Fourthly, slaves were frequently obtained by force or were kept in slavery through a long regime of physical and psychological violence. Fifthly, they were dishonored or dehumanized in some fashion; and sixthly, they were units of hard labor or, at the minimum compelled to perform whatever work, their owner required of them (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2018)

Cultural Sociologist Orlando Patterson defines, slavery as "the permanent, violent domination of natively alienated and generally dishonored persons" (1982, 1). The slave's "social death" becomes a substitution for a commuted physical death from war, execution, starvation or exposure. Even, to summarize slavery with a perfect definition requires a widespread acceptance of the fact, that it can be defined in such a way that literally surpasses divergent historical experiences. But what is important is that how else one can distinguish slavery from other forms of human bondage? If seen from an Ameri-

can point of view, with the history characterized by fundamental status, distinction between the free and enslaved and racialized discord among Europeans, Africans and Indian, the contrast between slavery and every social, legal and laboring category was and is significant. As a basis, the definition of slavery in America constitutes the American experience of racial slavery that reached its zenith in the 18th and 19th centuries. Unlike the Americans, the Englishmen also acquired a concept of slavery that was ductile and utilitarian, so much so that maximum of them could even think themselves as victims. The nagging vestiges of personal subjection in the form of villeinage, experiments with penal slavery and the enslavement of Englishmen in foreign lands helped building an early modern English genesis of slavery that was coated and multidimensional. In Tudor and early Stuart England, a great deal of the Tudor opposition to villeinage was based on the emerging consensus that the institution was a form of domestic slavery as Thomas Hedley in 1610, maintains that slavery was “repugnant to the nature of an Englishman”. (4)

According to Kimberly Smith(2007) slaves were referred to as savages, uncivilized and more animal-like than human by the white men and they justified their enslavement with the perception that slaves were in need of “civilization” as with the wilderness, white culture saw it as their duty to tame them and make them useful (2007, 155). Slavery, as colonization is not a legal form of progeny which gives to an owner certain rights over the person of a human subject. But this form and these rights only exist within a distinct form of state or community" (25). Prospero has, in these terms, imported the ideology of the ownership of a human subject to the island he calls his own, but not the institutional structures by which it is controlled. The slave, as Hindess and Hirst maintains, "is neither a subject nor a subordinate, he is a form of property; the master is his *owner*" (6). In connection with Prospero's ideology of owning human subjects in the island, A.E. Voss lists some essential features of slavery, such as "power, property, deracination, non-personhood, dependent labour, physical suffering and psychological damage, prejudice."(6).

Eradication of the human subject and non-personhood constitutes the two major features of slavery which distinguishes it from colonialism with its concomitant missionary project which implies the (inferior, but real) "personhood" or humanity of its subject/people. Yet on Prospero's island, we note the presence of forms of slavery which are differentiated by the unequal and different treatment of Caliban and Ariel, and the difference of the origins of their enslavement. Ariel is enslaved by Prospero from the moment he is released from his bondage in the cloven pine. Caliban, on the other hand, moves from a position of servitude (to an apparently benign master) to one of absolute slavery enforced by violence.

Of late, scholars like Meredith Skura and Virginia Vaughan navigated the history of Caliban and the diverse ways in which he has been constructed from monster to villain and then to victim. How he has become a cultural icon, and touchstone of the culture from which he derives and of those cultures which have appropriated him? Skura maintains that new historicism is one element of that large body of work which tries to account for the exploitation of the New World by the project of economic adventurism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (1). And Prospero, conforming to this view, far from being the divine order of more traditional interpretations, is the embodiment of European, Old World cultural domination. Power over the New World Other, not the rehabilitation of Italian (or, of course, English) political turbulence, is observed as the essential part of his political mandate within the play. The disastrous past events such as the concussion of the Western civilization and the "bestial" world becomes apparent through an exploration of the inner dynamics of the play in terms of its psychological, cultural and linguistic constructions. The relationship of Prospero to his two servants, Caliban and Ariel slips into the pattern of traditional master-slave relations. Prospero's so-called "servants" are more properly described as his slaves, complete with the connotations, both old and modern, which the term carries. Servants are waged labourers with rights, sometimes those of citizenship and sometimes of access to the legal system. The institution of slavery has always been sustained by the fact and the omnipresent threat of violence.

Even though, the concept of patriarchy also tends to strengthen an already entrenched system of exploitation and subordination in which gender equations accomplish threatening dimensions within the framework of patriarchal dominance. Applying the yardstick to the masculine against which the deviant called feminine is measured and analyzed, thereby creating a negating effect on feminine identity. This process is intensified by the hegemonic pursuits of the different societal institutions. Miranda's chastity becomes Prospero's prize possession and he safeguards it with paranoid anxiety. The intention of handing over Miranda from Prospero to Ferdinand (4.1.31-32) is filled with disturbing thought lying beneath a patriarchal reciprocity. Prospero's apprehension for his daughter's sexuality reflects patriarchal mindset to dominate women on the whole. Although, the depiction of women in Shakespearean plays, has been criticized as misogynist by attributing propagation of this misogynist attitude with this effect on the collective unconscious. Even in an established hierarchical order of western civilization, nature is viewed both as an object of domination and exploitation, and as a nurturing maternal place. Within this structure, women's place in the natural order is the one that is nearest to nature. From a patriarchal viewpoint then, women exist at the bottom of the hierarchal pyramid. The social construction gives power to men to dominate women and nature. This becomes the point of intersection where nature and woman are identified as similar entities that should be tamed on behalf of patriarchy, colonizer, reason, and civilization.

An in-depth analysis of Shakespeare's placement of 'woman' and 'nature' in *The Tempest* illuminates the concerns of ecofeminism. The play is significant in the sense that it reflects this "control" of nature in terms of colonialist ambitions. As Simon Estok puts it in *The Tempest*, "it is a space whose Otherness, difference, exoticism, and promise of wealth make it very fertile ground for the seeds of colonialist ambitions and fantasies" (2011,114). The new-comers of the island are similar to the intruders of nature in the play. This colonialist invasion is given by the words of Caliban, the native resident of the island, to Prospero, the main invader who is the representative of western civilization. As Prospero takes the island from Caliban's mother, a sorcerer like him, he becomes the

“master” of all the living and non-living things on the island. In this process, as his name suggests, Prospero justifies his colonialist deeds by picturing both nature and Caliban as wild entities that should be tamed. In this connection, Vera L. Norwood suggests, “survival in a hostile natural environment is an ego-gratifying achievement and feeds the achievement-oriented male psyche, enabling men to return to civilization and improve their culture” (1996, 323). Similarly, in the name of civilization and culture, Prospero tries to shape Caliban as a “civilized” being in return for learning about the “qualities” of the island to exercise power over it later on. The power relations established in the master/slave dichotomy are prevalent in *The Tempest* and it operates parallel to the dichotomy of civilized/primitive. At this point, the master’s attitude towards nature conceived as female and woman is based on the dialectic of civilization and primitiveness.

Prospero’s approach towards the first inhabitant of the island that is Sycorax, the mother of Caliban, reflects the political manipulations of the master both on nature and woman. The civilized colonizer Prospero justifies his deeds against Sycorax, whom he calls “the foul Witch,” and Caliban, whom he designates as native, born in nature, so uncivilized. The real owners of the island are pictured as uncivilized animals by civilized westerners. Prospero’s daughter Miranda calls Caliban as “abhorred slave” and she states that he didn’t know a word but “wouldst gabble, like / A thing most brutish” (1.2.357-8) until she taught him the language. The criterion of civilization that is designated by the power holder is imposed on the other; in the play both on nature and its components. In this respect, the colonizer’s control and domination operates on nature in general and on “lower” beings in particular.

As Plumwood maintains, “key aspects of environmental critiques are centered on the way that control over and exploitation of nature contributes to, or is even more strongly linked to, control over and exploitation of human beings” (1993, 13). While observed through an ecofeminist point of view, the control by both Prospero and the other representatives of western society of the island and Caliban clearly shows civilized

colonizer posing nature against reason. This ideology conceives nature as stated by Plumwood that “Nature, as the excluded and devalued contrast of reason, includes the emotions, the body, the passions, animality, the primitive or uncivilized, the non-human world, matter, physicality and sense experience, as well as the sphere of irrationality, of faith and of madness. In other words, nature includes everything that reason excludes” (1993, 19-20). Although a literary work can either strengthen the ruthlessness of colonialism or endure the belief system or cultural changes that the colonizers attempts to fix into the indigenous people. The latter concentrates on the affliction of the colonizers, and the maltreatment and subjugation brought to the colonized by the colonizer or the natives. Shakespeare powerfully legitimates Prospero’s sovereignty as the European colonial mindset who is reared to hegemonize or otherize not only the native inhabitants but also exploit the natural resources, local landscapes by imposing culture from outside as an intruding force thereby portraying the negative impact of oppression which affects not only the oppressed but the oppressors too. A presiding section of humans equates colonialism of natives and of newly explored lands/ natural resources and underestimates them for service and enslavement. The series of actions carried out by Prospero, by exerting his supernatural power on the natives and to the ecosystem such as deforestation and colonization eventually leads to the ecological crisis and imbalance to the island in the play. Historians have lately embarked the post-Industrial and post-Enlightenment era as the genesis of the Anthropocene. But Shakespeare’s play in the Tudor England had foregrounded the possibility of an impending apocalyptic dystopia when humans would no longer remain biological agents; preferably they, by virtue of their capacity to cause massive ecological changes, would soon turn into geological force.

Written at the intersection of pastoral tradition and the forthcoming technological prospects, Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* elucidates the amalgamated relationship between climate change and indigenous culture and values. Through the intricate web of myth, magic, symbols and motifs, Shakespeare showcases how indigenous culture, language,

and history across the world are driven apart and marginalized to the point of extinction together with ignorant manipulation and exploitation of environmental resources. However, the indigenous values are devoted to the nurturing of the environment and eco-friendly consciousness with the planetary system, it is the aboriginal people who are most affected by the human induced climatic disasters. Scholars like Dan Brayton and Lynne Bruckner in their edited book *"Ecocritical Shakespeare"*(2011) make use of the playwright's exceptional creativity and cultural reach to question practices and attitudes that have degraded organic life and environments, and to foster debate about sustainability, conservation, biodiversity, animal welfare, and other ecological goals in personal and public life." (25).

A crisper picture of the ecological history of the early modern world has emerged in recent scholarship; it has become evident that people in sixteenth century thought about various issues that continue to galvanize the environmental movement four hundred years later. The most predominant would be widespread deforestation that provoked anxieties about a looming energy crisis. But still individuals living in early modern England had no regard for the fate of trees. Given the fact, the Tudor monarch passed several laws regulating heavy industry such as iron works, so that it can restrict the degradation of environment. As the price of timber grew by leaps and bound, people started destruction of trees and burn sea-coal in unprecedented quantities (Borlik 3). Michael Drayton addresses the issue of deforestation directly and "with both wistfulness and concern" (*Environmental Degradation*, 17). Likewise, Arthur Standish in his book *The Common Complaint of the Generall Destruction of the Waste of Woods in this Kingdom* envisages a "dire eco-political collapse" for England (no wood no Kingdome") (Nardizzi 113) and he was apprehensive of the fact that "England will suffer an unbearable catastrophe without an intensive program of planting trees" (Nardizzi 113).

He shows concern on the deplorable scarcity of firewood eventually urging people to burn straw (which he says would better feed cattle) and cow dung (which would better fertilize fields). Standish argues that due to excessive burning of these materials depletes the strength of livestock and soils, and it increases the danger of fires. This shows how

the sense of imminent deforestation and calamitous resulted from dearth to fire to military invasion made the forested lands of England a national concern and the focus of a number of proposals, Standish's among them, to preserve the kingdom's forests.

John Manwood's *A Treatise of the Lawes of the Forest* (1598) is yet another work that puts emphasis on the problem of England's forests which purports to collect and communicate to errant readers the ancient laws of royal forests. The control over forests meant presiding over a landscape which is related socially and culturally with nobility and prestige. Forests were traditionally noble and held great sway as a possession and a symbol, and the act of using their resources (such as game and timber) and shaping their borders was a claim to that power and prestige. For, common forest dwellers were associated with the wildness of an uncivilized space; those who owned woodlands used the forest's mythic, archetypal associations of power and privilege to construct their social superiority.

Keith Thomas believes that those centuries of enclosing chases, dismantling parks, and generally neglecting forest administration meant the felling of woods and a vast reduction in the forest land Elizabeth inherited. In his book "Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800" he puts it bluntly: "It was not on Tower Hill that the axe made its most important contribution to English history" (193). The pressures of industry and war created more demand for resources from Elizabeth's administration, and deforestation continued under Tudor and Stuart reigns for the purposes of grazing, cultivation, building materials (especially ship building), and industries such as glassmaking and ironworks (Thomas 193). The forest and its trees had a particular significance for authors in the Renaissance, as suggested in the title of Ben Jonson's *Timber, or Discoveries* (1640). Before Shakespeare wandered through the Forest of Arden, the woods were being reduced by the demand for timber in building new houses', writes Shakespeare biographer Peter Ackroyd, as he cites the historian-cartographer John Speed, who registered 'great and notable destruction of wood' in the region, in 1611(53). Prominent ecocritic Vin Nardizzi maintains that even King James I addressed a timber crisis in a speech addressed to Parliament, whereas Arthur Standish responded to the

King's speech in a pamphlet complaining about 'the general destruction and waste of wood made within this your Kingdome, more within twenty or thirty last year than in any hundred years before' ('Shakespeare's Globe', 58-59). In the play *The Tempest*, the first line spoken by Trinculo, indicates an observation on the lack of vegetation or barrenness in Prospero's island kingdom: 'Here's neither bush nor shrub to bear off any weather at all' (2.2.18-19). Gonzalo appears to have been granted some kind of foresight when, in the middle of the storm, when it looked like everyone might end up at the bottom of the sea, he exclaimed: 'Now would I give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of *barren ground*' (2.1.56-57). In the first go, Prospero's kingdom appears barren, without woodland. To be fair, it is not uncommon for islands situated in weather-beaten places to be somewhat bare of trees, and besides, there *are* some fertile places on Prospero's island, such as those Caliban promises to bring Trinculo and Stephano to: 'I'll show thee every fertile inch o' th' island' (2.2.145), but these are very little that they need him as a guide to find them: 'I'll show thee the best springs; I'll pluck thee berries; | I'll fish for thee, and get thee wood enough' (2.2.157-58). And in this treeless setting, we observe that Caliban is furiously collecting wood, and he is terrified of not doing it quickly enough, as ordered by Prospero because he needs wood for survival on the island. Whereas, Prospero's power over nature is never truly up for debate; even Miranda's requesting her father to give up his magical manipulation of the forces of nature puts the matter in perspective: "If by your art, my dearest father, you have/put the wild waters in this roar, allay them" (1.2.1-2). The important description, we observe in Prospero, informs us that this is a man who apparently controls nature. Contrary to the airy spirit Ariel, Caliban is not too good for "earthy...commands" (1.2.275):

PROSPERO: But, as 'tis,

We cannot miss him; he does make our fire

Fetch in our wood and serves in offices

That profit us. What, ho! Slave! Caliban!

Thou earth, thou! Speak.

CALIBAN: [Within] There's wood enough within.

PROSPERO: Come forth, I say! (I.II.313-19)

If trees are the island's natural resource, then perhaps Caliban's response is obviously conservationist in nature; he understands the importance of wood and informs Prospero that they have enough wood and should prevent slaying the trees for nothing. It is through Caliban that Shakespeare strongly proposes his plea to save the environment from massive damage and eco-destruction. The obvious difference in how Caliban and Prospero treat the land is that Caliban as a native views the island's forests as something to preserve for future generations, whereas Prospero as a colonial being transplants and transient observes natural resources as something to exploit and gain maximum in the short term. Caliban truly understands the island's beauty and derives happiness and delight from berries and spring, and even values those magical noises such as instruments and voices that Prospero has a large hand in generating. Julia Reinhard Lupton says that Caliban is "unique in his ability to apprehend the island's beauties" and is therefore "at one with the island" (20) but Prospero takes advantage of his goodness and confines him to a "hard rock" while reaping the benefits of bounty on the "rest of the island".

The plundering of nature, takes away from its inhabitants, their role as guardians of their natural possession which leaves a deep psychological agitation in their minds and affects their outlook towards life on earth. He even more takes an aggressive approach by deforesting the island in order to clear away all competition for the position of Monarch Tree, so that his own 'princely trunk' is the only one standing. That is the reason why he is violently uprooting trees, and putting others to work, collecting it in for burning. It might also justify his anger and consequent wooden enslavement of Ferdinand, whom he accuses of having 'put thyself / Upon this island as a spy, to win it / From me, the lord on't' (1.2.452-54). By carrying thousands of logs of wood makes perfect sense as a punishment on those suspected of planning to supplant the royal tree. In Act 3, Sc 1, "*Enter FERDINAND, bearing a log*", and in the following scene with Miranda, he also

complains about his 'wooden slavery' (3.1.62), and that he 'must remove/ some *thousands* of these logs and pile them up' (3.1.9-10). These are few references that seem like an obsession or exploitation on Prospero's intention with collecting woods, cutting down, or making others collect it. David Lindley observes; "Prospero's unwillingness "to fetch his own wood" (7) and this leads us to question the deeper significance of wooden slavery in the play.

Critics such as the Arden editors regarded the 'wooden slavery' as to represent any kind of manual labour or slave work. Manual labour throughout the human existence has involved a spectrum of variants ranging from slavery, to caste or caste-like systems to subtler forms of inequality. But the question arises regarding why it has to be huge amount of wood and what is the purpose of Prospero of not getting his slaves to collect stone, gather food or to build something useful like a hut or a raft instead. In connection to this question, Gabriel Egan examines profoundly of what Prospero plans to use all the woods for. He lives in a cave, still after twelve years on the island (1.2.53-55), why does he not build his house? Stranded on an island against his will, why does he not use the wood to build a raft of some sort? Having access to Ariel, who can help him perform magic and control the weather; it hardly seems necessary to collect wooden material for use in any kind of manual labour. Might he not have acquired everything he yearned for by magic, the kind of magic with which he brags, he 'rifted Jove's stout oak/ With his own bolt' (5.1.45-46), and 'by the spurs plucked up/ The pine and cedar' (5.1.47-48). His bragging about his destruction of oaks, pines and cedars implies the fact that the island was forested before he arrived. Destruction of the natural environment in *The Tempest* moves along with the degrading situations confronted by the characters in the play. Egan emphasizes that the point about the 'recurrent arboreal imagery' in *The Tempest* is that 'Prospero's main activity since his arrival on the island has been its deforestation' (Egan, 155).

However, Prospero's exploitation and obsession with wood can be understood from the fact that wood is used as a link that connects Caliban and Ferdinand, the two

people on Prospero's island that pose the serious threat to the chastity of his daughter, Miranda. Caliban is being penalized by Prospero for having sought 'to violate/ The honour of my child' (I.2.348-49), and therefore, writes David Lindley, when Prospero wreaks on Ferdinand 'the punishment of bearing logs', he is 'identifying him with Miranda's other would be violator, Caliban, and in this way, Prospero, as father, gains a 'symbolic victory over the younger man's confident sexuality' (Lindley 68). Prospero's potentiality is exemplified in his position as the sole vertical Monarch Tree on the island, but just as serious as a threat to the island's natural resources, destroyed by him, just to get rid of rivals and secure his own power.

With regards to the destruction of forests, it is quite obvious from the fact that the sixteenth century saw an increase in the size of houses in Shakespeare's own Stratford-upon-Avon, writes Randall Martin that 'Multiple fireplaces were rebuilt and expanded houses used greater quantities of wood', and together with the use of enormous quantities of wood in glass- and iron making at the time, there emerged a problem of overconsumption (Martin 16). 'Overconsumption', he concludes, 'created early modern England's most urgent environmental problem: deforestation'. Regardless of what he needs the wood for, Prospero's obsession with wood certainly borders on overconsumption. From ecological point of view, there is a rapid ecological disturbance caused as a result of the destruction of the forest, exploitation of natural landscapes and culture as well. These references help us to unveil Shakespeare's environment-friendly outlook that anticipate a world exploited by human greed and colonial hegemony on the marginalized. According to Robert J. Brulle: "Questions about preservation of the natural environment are not just technical questions; they are also about what defines the good and moral life and about the essence and the meaning of our existence..." (Clark 1). Therefore, it is a fundamental and an ethical responsibility of human beings to respect, conserve and protect environment/nature, its resources and life supporting system too.

Professor Campbell maintains that “in most indigenous societies, the difference between nature and culture is imaginary or the two overlap. Conservation is usually engendered through cultural discourses like oral narratives in forms of myths and folklore, rituals, customs and conventions, which promote a symbiotic relationship between man and nature. The indigenous communities have their own belief system which governs their access and use of the forests. Conservation is engendered by sanctifying nature and simultaneously imbuing it with horror-inducing characteristics. Caliban’s act of conserving nature stands in contrast with Prospero’s imposing attitude to establish New World which has resulted in habitat damage, deforestation, climatic change and biodiversity loss respectively.

Through this viewpoint, it would be anachronistic to project early modern writers as modern ecologists, and it would be equally erroneous to assume that they were oblivious or indifferent to the environmental developments unfolding around them. As Randall Martin rightly observes, “Shakespeare was writing when early capitalism, globalized trade and colonialism were beginning to extend western and masculine ideals of conquering nature around the world. Shakespeare’s response was imaginative towards the limits nature imposes on human exploitation, the necessity of conserving the bio-integrity of ecosystems for human and non-human benefit and the earth’s absolute power to overrule human attempts at domination” (45).

Ecocritic Lynn White proposes that, in the Christian tradition, man has since its inception asserted ownership over animals, plants, and all things natural on this earth (1967, 12). The conviction that all things are submissive and docile to him has given Christian man free hand to do with the natural world as he intends to, above all everything in nature was made entirely for his rapture. In other words, man has justified polluting the earth, conquering ecosystems and decimating natural diversity. So it is vital in keeping the human community from destroying the non-human community thus maintaining the ecological balance of the world. When Shakespeare was writing, the term “ecologist” did not exist, and even though the interconnectivity between man and

nature was commonplace, the Christian worldview that claimed man's dominion over all things natural just prevailed. The Forest of Arden in *As You Like It* is depicted not only as a kind of wilderness manipulated and exploited and dominated by human beings but also becomes an ambivalent epitome of the natural world, idealized and romanticized in pastoral terms, where most of the characters take refuge in. Hence, it becomes a metaphorical amalgamation of the pastoral, on the one hand, as a stylized and literary environment and the wild on the other as a biotic formation of the physical environment.

The ecological world of the forest, in which they reside in, becomes a school for their moral education as well as the new environment in which their survival depends on their efforts to come to terms with its geographical and climatic circumstances. Therefore, they must exclude their urban manners and etiquette and nurture a harmonious relationship with nature by undergoing a process of adaptation which needs a new environmental awareness. To put it another way, their anthropocentric perception of the environment as a natural resource for exploitation and manipulation must be replaced by an ecological perception that, to quote Joseph Meeker, in it "plants, animals, mountains, seas, and sky [... are] components of a complete and integrated system in which human beings find or create their proper places"(41). No doubt, the Duke Senior and his courtiers exhibit an anthropocentric attitude towards the natural world by maintaining their courtly habits such as hunting, feasting, and revelling, but they soon adapt themselves to their new environment and learn how to cope with it. However, it is the Duke's old councilor, Jaques who is portrayed as ecologically, the most sensitive character in the play, who out of his environmental concern, strongly oppose the Duke's idea of hunting, which he metaphorically regards as man's ecological subversion of nature.

Through the character of Jaques, Shakespeare seems to challenge this point of view in *As You Like It*, a play concerned not only with human nature but also with man's relationship to the natural world. Shakespeare makes use of the natural environment in

his play in order to survey the inner-workings of human nature. So, he prognosticates the issues that worry the twenty first-century ecocritic, who seeks to shed light on how we think about, write about and experience the natural world. In *As You Like It*, Jaques manifests a nascent ecologically sound view of the world illustrated by his interactions with the ecosystem surrounding him. The first introduction of Jacques in the play, highlights not only his melancholic nature, but also his close relationship to the natural world. Carol Falvo Heffernan argues that “Jaques seems to be melancholy because of the adustion of phlegm” (105), and those suffering from this type of melancholy are said to be attracted to water. As the humoral state of phlegmatic adustion is parched, so as to recapture a humoral balance, the sufferer requires taking in, or at the minimum being in the vicinity to, the element of water. Even in the first glimpse we observe “the melancholy Jaques,/ stood on the extremest verge of the swift *brook*/ Augmenting it with *tears*” (2.1.41-43). The images of water continue merging, since Jaques finds himself weeping near a body of water because of the weeping deer, who is described as “weeping into a needless stream” (2.2.56). In addition to this overwhelming attraction to water, Jaques is also drawn to other aspects of nature, including flora and fauna and it is evident from the first description of Jaques, described by the lords as being:

...under an oak whose antic root peeps out
 Upon the brook that brawls along this wood
 To which place a poor sequestered stag
 That from the hunter's aim had taken hurt
 Did come to languish. (2.1.31-34)

As the play progresses, Duke Senior says of Jaques, “I think he be transformed into a beast, /For I can nowhere find him like a man” (2.7.1-2). Duke Senior relates Jaques closely and innately with the natural world as he contemplates in his mind that Jaques's concern for the natural world (the trees, the water, the deer) has caused him to absorb himself into the environment. Jaques's “weeping and commenting/upon the sobbing deer” (2.1.65-66), eventually speaks volume about his melancholy that is the state of his

humors, causing him to weep, getting attracted towards water and from an ecological point of view, he sympathizes and identifies with a wounded deer. Even his lament on the dying deer in his melancholic state, further exhibits his deep connection with the natural world. In Act 2, Scene 1, we observe that the lords report to Duke Senior that they left Jaques.

...swearing that [they]
 Are mere usurpers, tyrants, and what's worse
 To fright the animals and to kill them up
 In their assigned and native dwelling place. (2.1.60-63)

In the lines quoted above, Jaques recognizes the unchallengeable right that the deer have to live in their native habitat, free from the encroachment and rampage of mankind. His reaction to the deer's predicament mirrors his outlook that all God's creatures possess equal right to existence, a way of thinking that does not discriminate between humans and other forms of nature. The displacement of the deer, the rightful citizens of the forest, upsets Jaques, and seeing the deer with a lethal wound perpetrated by a man profoundly affects Jaques, causing him not only to shed tears but also abhor man's incursion and protest strongly against the infringement forced on nature by mankind. Bennett Simon puts forward a blistering critique of Jaques's reaction to the deer's death:

[T]he deer do not possess moral reason and free will as man does;
 hence, Jaques mistakes their nature when he measures their actions
 by a standard of responsibility that is properly demanded only of humans...
 The absurdity of holding that man should obey in his relationship with
 animals the same laws that bind him with members of his own kind
 becomes clear... we must...discard the less obvious but equally

distorted notion that men can tyrannize deer. (196)

Ecologically speaking, Jaques's reaction is far from absurd. Although Bennett's label of absurdity proceeds logically from a traditional standpoint, what one should tag as absurd is the viciously anthropocentric view that sees man as somehow superior and dominant over all areas of nature. Even this way of observing the world, however, has dominated human history and can be traced back to Genesis. In this regard, Lynn White (1967) clarifies this ill-founded view:

Man named all the animals, thus establishing his dominance over them.
God planned all of this explicitly for man's benefit and rule:
no item in physical creation had any purpose save to
serve man's purpose...Christianity made it possible to exploit
nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects (9-10).

Jaques's conception of the deer and their place in nature diametrically contradicts this viewpoint embraced by Bennett and explicated by White. Instead of oppression and dominion, Jaques provide a view in which deer, and by extension other living creatures, receive respect from humans and this perspective maintains that humans have the same responsibilities to other living creatures (not to tyrannize, usurp, or frighten) as they have toward other humans. His explication on the deer maintains that other living creatures have rights to life and existence, the same as man.

Whereas, Bennett's speciest point of view, highlights a way of thinking that has eventually led to the tyrannizing of not only the deer, but the entire ecosystem in the Forest of Arden. Men tyrannize deer for much the same reason, rulers tyrannize their subjects: they see themselves as supremely powerful with absolute power. Just as a tyrant feels justified killing anyone for no reason with having no sense of repercussions, so a man can enter into the forest and kill any animal for any reason, again, with no sense of

backlash. Duke Senior who rules generously and treats those “lower” on the socio-political hierarchy with respect is physically threatened by Orlando, barging in, with sword drawn to demand food, Duke Senior orders his men not to kill Orlando, but rather offers him “Sit down and feed/ Welcome to our table” (2.7.104). The act of Duke Senior contrasts starkly with the tyranny practiced by his younger brother. Duke Frederick who arbitrarily banishes his niece, Rosalind, because she is “thy father’s daughter” (1.3.52), and other than that, threatens to have her killed if she is found within twenty miles of court. While trying to locate his daughter, who has fled as a consequence of this despotism, he believes Orlando is somehow involved in it. Duke Frederick threatens more ferocity and intensity into challenging that Oliver produce Orlando “dead or living” (3.2.6). He also whimsically seizes “all things that thou dost call thine” (3.2.9) until he produces Orlando. The absolutism and rough nature of Duke Frederick, thus, projects the savage nature of hunters, who arbitrarily inflict violence on the deer and stake claim on the land that once belonged to the deer. Renaissance thinkers understood that hunting is a detrimental pursuit of dubious ethics.

In Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516), the Utopians regard hunting “as a thyng unworthy to be used of free men”, relegating the revolting activity to butchers, who happen to be slaves in their society (Berry 25). More further writes, “if the hope of slaughter and the expectation of tearing the victim in pieces please you, you should rather be moved with pity to see an innocent hare murdered by a dog – the weak by the strong, the fearful by the fierce, the innocent by the cruel and pitiless. There this exercise of hunting...the Utopians have rejected” (Book II). Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa launches the most scathing humanist critique of hunting in the sixteenth century in *Of the Vanitie and Uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences* (1530) where he deems hunting a “detestable” and “cruell Arte” that leads men to set “all humanities apart” and “become salvage beastes” (Berry 25). The subtle implication is that man can and should rise above animals in terms of moral duties given his higher intellectual capabilities.

Hunting in early modern England was an activity significant not only to the construction of aristocratic masculine identity but also to built number of structures which both imbued it with a uniquely prestigious status. Suzanne Walker has attributed this to the underlying vulnerabilities in the categories of “human” and “animal” laid here: “the identity of the prey swings between passive object and active subject, just as in the course of the hunt the living animal is itself transformed into a collected of dead body parts. An illustration of the complexity of early modern definitions of the animal, the hunting is also a meditation on the nature of the limits and dangers of subjectivity” (4). Walker says that the dichotomy between wildness and civilization inhering in hunting is troubled by the rites of seigneurial hunting which elaborates and amplify the savagery of the kill and therefore stabilize the boundary between “human” adversary and “bestial” hunter. (7). In the book “The Booke Named the Gouvernour” Thomas Elyot notes that:

Kylling of dere with bowes or greyhoundes, serueth well for the pot [...] and therefore it must of necessitie be some tyme vsed. But it conteynethe therin on commendable solace or exercise, in comparison to the other fourme of hunting (5).

It is clear that the desired evocation of social prestige rests upon a crucial iteration that nobles do not hunt for sustenance. For Jacques, the ritual of hunting animals is essentially an act of exploitation and, hence, his usurpation of the animals’ habitat. Jacques brands the Duke of inflicting violence on the animals quite the same, his younger brother committed in toppling and exiling him. He therefore calls the Duke Senior and his hunting nobles “mere usurpers [and] tyrants” (2.1.61) and further protests that ecologically it is unacceptable “to fright the animals and to kill them up/In their assign’d and native dwelling-place” (2.1.62). His speech inveighs against absolutism, explicitly comparing human subjugation of nature to an act of imperialism. Just as Keith Thomas has clearly pointed out, “in Tudor and Stuart England the traditional view was that the world had been created for man’s sake and that other species were meant to be subordinate to his wishes and needs,” (1984:56) and Shakespeare’s ecological discourse

as such, which is strongly asserted through his character Jacques in the play, certainly signifies a sensitivity somewhat unusual for his time.

This sensitivity is apparent when Jacques pleads to Orlando who has been engraving affectionate poems in the barks of trees in the forest. "I pray you mar no more trees with writing love songs in their barks" (3.2.277-278). Here, Jacques has severely voiced about the scarring of trees, echoing his concern for the ecological and environmental nature of the Forest of Arden. From an environmental point of view, his ultimate adoption of ascetic way of life in the natural setting of the forest can be looked on as a graphic indication of Shakespeare's own ecological sensitivity which advocates for harmonic balance between human subjects and natural world being instead of an anthropocentric hierarchy of human and nature. But it is extremely crucial in keeping the human community from destroying the non-human community thus maintaining the ecological balance of the world. The reigning philosophy and religion of western civilization were anthropocentric; that is, they viewed human beings as superior to animals and so as free to exploit them to meet their own needs. If one may recall God's declaration in the first twenty-six verses of the Genesis that man must have dominion over everything on earth. This particular view in Christianity gave rise to humanism of the eighteenth-century England. In this connection, Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin said:

While the Enlightenment trajectory of humanist essentialism demanded the repression of the animal and animalistic in all its latent and recrudescant forms, it is not until our own century, in the urgent contexts of eco-catastrophe and the extinction of many non-human species, that a radical re-drawing of this foundational relationship [between human and non-human species] has occurred. (*Postcolonial Ecocriticism*, 134).

Hence, a radical shift in the conception of the wilderness or the animalistic is found in European history and culture shift from the Puritan concept of it as a dark and evil thing. The Romantic Period is the turning point in the long Western tradition of human transcendence and domination over nature and the central view in Romantic literature and philosophy, in England and Germany, is that the root of the modern human malaise, is in its separation from its original unity with nature, and the absolute cure for this disease of civilization lies in a reunion between humanity and nature that will restore concreteness and values to a natural world in which one can once more feel thoroughly at home, in consonance and reciprocity with all living things (*A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 155).

The domination over the non-human species by man had started since the Neolithic Revolution and in Shakespeare's times, changes in man's relationship with animals were quite visible. Control of animals as a God-gifted right of man became obvious in this time. Shakespeare was much concerned about this anthropocentric attitude which needs to be replaced by a biocentric worldview- the view that all living things and their earthly environment possess value, significance and even social and political rights. As a concept, biocentrism outlines the conviction that "humans are neither better nor worse than other creatures (animals, plants, bacteria, rocks, rivers) but simply equal to everything else in the natural world" (*The Ecocriticism Reader*, 1996, 128). In fact, the play conveys the message that man and non-human animals should live in amity and that the two communities -the human and the animal-should 'coexist, cooperate and flourish in the biosphere' (*The Ecocriticism Reader*, 107). Otherwise, the ecological balance of the whole world will be disturbed, thus endangering human survival on earth. For instance, the 'poor sequester'd stag' (2.1. 33) in the Forest of Arden is symbolic of animal community recklessly destroyed by human beings.

Shakespeare opposes the Christian philosophy of anthropocentrism and the long Western tradition of human dominion over non-human animals and voices his ecological wisdom in *As You Like It* which clearly illustrates his biocentric world

view. The old Duke exiled in the Forest of Arden and Jaques constitutes the prominent mouthpieces of the dramatist, advocating for an ecocentric philosophy of life. In doing so, Shakespeare has emphasized here the ecocentric values of collective ethical responsibility and the claims of the animal community beyond us. Quite akin to *As You Like It*, Shakespeare's dichotomic depiction of the natural environment not only as an ecologically pristine harmony but also the subversion of this harmony through human manipulation and colonial hegemony can also be seen in *The Tempest*, set in an environment which is ecologically most attractive, but is dangerously vulnerable to human manipulation and exploitation. Prospero resides in the distant tropical island that has a natural setting. It has a "subtle, tender, and delicate temperance" (43) and "the air breathes upon us here most sweetly" (49) and as the old councilor Gonzalo puts it, "here is everything advantageous to life" (52).

However, this ecological environment is undermined by a fierce storm which Prospero artificially creates through his magical power in order to take his revenge on his enemies, Alonso and his company. The storm and its violent effects on humans and nature can be regarded as a graphic representation of the kind of fears and anxieties that we today face through the destruction of the environment and Prospero's manipulation and exploitation of the forces of nature for a destructive purpose poses an apocalyptic threat to the life and environment on the island in the play. Man's harmonious relationship with the natural environment is persistently sabotaged and could be lost irrevocably. Hence, it would be unjustifiable to view Shakespeare of not being an environmentalist as such. He seems to have understood the constant need for the nurturing and enhancement of environmental awareness, which ecocriticism strives for, so that a harmonious equilibrium between human- nonhuman relationships can be achieved.

Works Cited

Ackroyd, Peter, *Shakespeare: The Biography*. Vintage, 2006

Agrippa, Heinrich Cornelius. *Of the Vanitie and Uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences*. 1530

Ashcroft, Bill, et al., *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. Routledge, 2006.

Barry, John. *Environment and Social Theory*. Routledge, 2007.

Bate, Jonathan. *The Song of Earth*. Harvard UP, 2000.

Bruckner, Lynne, and Dan Brayton, editors, *Ecocritical Shakespeare*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*. Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Brayton, Daniel. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. The U of Virginia Press, 2012

Borlik, Todd. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature: Green Pastures*. Routledge, 2010.

Campbell, SueEllen. "The Land and Language of Desire: Where Deep Ecology and Post-Structuralism Meet." *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Ed. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. U of Georgia P, 1996.

Clark, Timothy, *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and the Environment*, Cambridge UP, 2011

Cohen, Derek. "Searching Shakespeare: Studies in Culture and Authority". U of Toronto P, 2003.

Cohen, Michael P. "Blues in the Green: Ecocriticism under Critique." *Environmental History*, vol.9, no.1 Jan.2004, Chicago UP, pp.9-36, <http://doi.org/10.2307/3985943>.

Dean, Thomas K. "What is Ecocriticism"? *Association for the Study of Literature and Environment*. U of IOWA.1994.

<http://www.asle.org/site/resources/ecocritical-library/intro/defining/Dean>

DeLoughrey. et al., *Introduction, Postcolonial Ecologies: Literature of the Environment*. Oxford UP, 2011.

Egan, Gabriel. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2006.

Estok, Simon C. "Doing Ecocriticism with Shakespeare: An Introduction" in *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. Macmillan, 2011.

Guha, Ramachandra and Joan Martinez- Alier. *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*. Earthscan, 1997.

Harding, Juliet, Online Interviews with Gary Synder: Modern American Poetry. *Northern Lights*. (Winter-Spring 2000).

http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/s_z/synder/interviews.htm.

Hay, Peter. *Main Currents in Western Environmental Thought*. Bloomington, Indiana UP, 2002.

Heise, Ursula K. "Science and Ecocriticism". *American Book Review* 18, 1997.

Huggan Graham, "Greening Postcolonialism: Ecocritical Perspectives". *Modern Fiction Studies*. vol.5, no.3, 2004.

Hulse, S. Clark. "Wresting the Alphabet: Oratory and Action in *Titus Andronicus*". *Criticism* 21, 1979.

Lindley, David, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge UP, 2002.

__ Shakespeare and Music: Arden Critical Companions. Thompson Learning, 2006.

Love, Glen A., *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment* London: U of Virginia P, 2003.

Meeker, Joseph M. *The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology and A Play Ethic*. 3rd ed. Tucson, U of Arizona P, 1997.

Morton, Timothy. *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Harvard UP, 2007.

Nardizzi, Vin, 'Felling Falstaff in Windsor Park', in *Ecocritical Shakespeare*, ed. by Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton. Ashgate, 2011, pp. 123-38.

— 'Shakespeare's Globe and England's Woods', *Shakespeare Studies*, 39, 2011, pp. 54-63

Nixon, Rob. "Environmentalism and Postcolonialism". *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*. Edited by Ania Loomba and Suvir Kaul. Duke UP, 2005.

Oppermann, Serpil. "Theorizing Ecocriticism: Toward a Postmodern Ecocritical Practice." *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 13.2 Summer. 2006, pp.103–28.

Orgel, Stephen. "Introduction" *The Tempest*. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford UP, 1987. 1-87.

--- "Prospero's Wife." *Representations* 8 (1984): 1-13. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Aug. 2014.

Selvanomy, Nirmal, "Chennai. International Institute of Tamil Studies", 2003. *Essays in Ecocriticism*. Sarup & Sons, 2003.

Smith, Kimberley. *African American Environmental Thought*. Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 2007.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Penguin Books, 1984.

Rueckert, William. *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*, U of Georgia P, 1996.

Scott.C.M.Heidi, "Haven and Horrors: The Island Landscape", *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 21, no.3, Oxford UP, 2014.

Alden T. Vaughan. et al. Introduction. *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare, The Arden Shakespeare, Thomson Learning, 2006, pp. 1-123.

Watson, Robert N. *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.

White, Lynn, Jr. "The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 March.10, 1967, vol.155.Issue. 3767, pp.1203-1207, [DOI:10.1126/science.155.3767.1203](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.155.3767.1203).

CHAPTER-IV

Romantic Ecology, Environmental Culture and Environmental Ethics

Ecology as such entails a healthy relationship between biotic and abiotic elements and a congenial relationship of the human world with the world(s) of animals, trees, plants and birds. P.R. McIntosh in his book *The Background of Ecology: Concepts and Theory* (1985) cogently argues in support of this interconnectedness among various organic and inorganic aspects of environment with emphasis on what Richard Kerridge calls ‘natural interdependencies of life forms as they relate to each other in their shared environment’(1998, 45). Obviously then, ecological discourse is inevitably associated with study of literature in relation to ecology and environment. In this connection, Rueckert (1978) aptly observes that application of ecological concepts to the study of literature has become inevitable keeping in view the ideas of climate changes, biodiversity, a sound ecosystem and interaction between two species otherwise called ‘commensalism’ and ‘mutualism’(84).

These two terms were coined by Belgian Zoologist Pierre Joseph Van Beneden, who initially used these terms to describe the activities of carcass-eating animals that followed predators to eat their waste food. Derived from the Latin root ‘commensalis’ which means ‘sharing a table’, it is more often than not used in Biology and Ecology to discuss symbiotic relationship among different species. Commensalism is usually defined as a type of symbiotic relationship between two different organisms in which one benefits from the other, but the other gets neither profit nor loss from such a relationship. In such an associative relationship, the species that gets benefit is called the ‘commensal’, whereas the unaffected other is called the ‘host species’. In Biology, in this symbiotic relationship, one benefits by getting food and shelter from the other, whereas the latter gets neither any benefit nor any harm from the former. Significantly, Commensalis has a broader canvass in the sense that it ranges from brief interaction between two species to lifelong symbiosis also.

Mutualism on the other hand points to a symbiotic relationship between individuals of two different species that result in beneficial effects on per capita reproduction and survival of the interacting populations. In terms of a mutual relationship, two different species develop a sense of togetherness through their relationship and gain benefit from one another. In such a relationship, the two different species not only interact with each other, but also sometimes rely on one another for their survival in totality. Besides Commensalism and Mutualism, there is yet another kind of relationship which is called Parasitism in which one species benefits at the cost of the other. The onus therefore lies in the fact that organisms should live in harmonious mutual relationship for satisfying their need for shelter, protection, nutrition and reproduction as well. In view of the idea of 'interconnectedness' between man and nature/environment and between two species, ecologists/ecocritics have formulated such theoretical concepts as 'Green Studies' and Romantic ecology.

The fundamental ecological demand is that the earth must be protected from anthropocentric aggrandizement on nature, landscape/environment, and from all kinds of eco-destruction. In this connection, 'Deep Ecology' is a term postulated by Gary Sander and Arne Naess which tends to emphasize intrinsic value of human and non-human life on earth, respect for diversity in Nature, condemnation of human exploitation of the natural world, decreasing human population, reducing human interference in the non-human world, change in economic, technological and ideological policies, appreciation of the natural way of life, and above all an ecocentric vision of life and approach to nature/environment (Naess 49-50). Precisely speaking, Deep Ecology demands recognition of the intrinsic value in nature, and then obviously protection and preservation of natural resources, not simply for the sake of human beings, but on the philosophical basis that elements/objects of nature have their own value, as nothing is without a purpose (telos) in this cosmos. While achieving communion of poetry and ecology, Jonathan Bate in his brilliant book *Songs of the Earth*(2000) not only celebrated the poetry of the earth, but also developed the theory of 'ecopoetics' which is grounded upon the concept of climax in scientific ecology. Bate draws upon the eco-conscious modern poet Gary Sander's analogy between 'poetry' and 'climax' and argues that the subliminal intensity of poetry liberates energy which is recycled back into the cultural environment, and rich

thoughts and feelings of a community. Likewise ‘climax’ in scientific ecology points to a ‘high’ proportioned ‘stage’ of energy in which the communities of creatures in forests, ponds, oceans, or grasslands experience a climax in ecosystem involving enormous energy that come from the recycling of dead biomass (2000, 246). The poetry of the 19th century English Romantic poets provides a fertile field for ‘ecopoetic’ discourse wherein the human is taken in close communion with what Wordsworth calls ‘the beautiful and permanent forms of nature’ (*Preface to Lyrical Ballads* 1800, 124).

In *The Song of the Earth*, Bate dives deep into the close connection between poetry and ecology, and uses the term ‘ecopoetics’ to strengthen his seminal argument that romantic literary production has a strong ecological base. While so doing, he pleads in favour of celebration of pastoral landscape which obviously facilitates poetic feelings and emotions thereby augmenting cordial/endearing relationship between man and nature. Bate emphatically argues that the relationship between human world and the natural world is “infact, the only theme, that is poetry itself” (2000, 74). Bate’s ecocritical stance can be further elaborated through an indepth analysis of three other ecocentric concepts such as ‘Romantic Ecology’, ‘Environmental Culture’ and ‘Environmental Ethics’. In his book *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991), Jonathan Bate defines Romantic Ecology not simply as an ideology of imaginative system or romanticization, but more predominantly in terms of glorification of ‘pastoral landscape’ and ‘natural goodness’, geographical and climatic condition and interconnectedness between human and non-human world. To him, it entails “a theory of ecosystems and an alienated labour embodied in such self consciously pragmatic and populist texts” (1991, 10). The first point that strikes us most about Bate’s theory is the ecological consciousness taken in conjunction with ‘pastoral language’ which, in fact, springs from pastoral romantic poetry of Wordsworth and others. Bate examines the importance of pastoral imagination in Wordsworth’s poetry, and particularly in his use of pastoral characters and their natural behaviour and use of rustic language which is strongly reminiscent of Wordsworth’s own theory of poetry that the language of poetry is ‘the language of the common man’ (141) so as to make poetry more natural and hence spontaneous and ‘powerful’. It is the use of pastoral

language, metaphors, symbols and myths that fulfils the demand of Romantic Ecology. Pastoral myths and metaphors used in poetry make the endearing relationship between man and nature more ineffable. In his *The Song of the Earth* (2000) Bate observes that “myths are necessary imaginings, exemplary stories which help our species to make sense of the world” (24-25). Bate recalls Rousseau’s use of the myth of the ‘Golden Age’ in his famous *Origin of Inequality* (1754), which points to the French philosopher’s emphasis on the efficacy of Man in natural goodness, primeval innocence and a state of nature/return to nature (Bate 2000,42). Love of the pastoral is therefore an essential feature of Romantic Ecology which is used in Romantic poetry of Wordsworth as an effective literary device so as to vindicate the point that both romantic poetry and ecology are rooted in the earth-the right place for love (Frost’s ‘Birches’).

While elaborating the concept of romantic ecology, Bate has tended to recognise Rousseau’s proof and influence on Wordsworth and his contribution to modern ecology consists in his adumbration of the concepts of constitutional goodness and naturalness, Noble savage/Natural man, myth of Golden Ages and the state of Nature. As regards, natural goodness, Rousseau’s contention is that man is by nature good and innocent but it is the complex and complicated society of anthropocentric outlook that injects wickedness and vile thoughts into his mind and heart. By emphasizing natural innocence and goodness, Rousseau firmly contests the age old Christian view that man is an unfortunate offspring of the Adamic sin otherwise called ‘original sin’. In his *Second Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1754) and also in his novel *Emile*, Rousseau has adumbrated the efficacy of the myth of ‘Golden Age’ and ‘the State of Nature’ as interconnected concepts. Both are mythic symbols or literary archetypes that signify a world of Innocence, goodness, purity and close communion between man and nature that facilitates the concept of romantic ecology, Bate in his *The Song of the Earth* states that in the ancient Golden Age, the primordial man imbibed primeval innocence and natural goodness in the lap of pastoral landscape and bucolic setting. At the same time, in the Golden Age, all beasts had horizontal backbones and a “gaze that looked down towards the earth” (2000, 26). The Earth became vulnerable when Prometheus widened his outlook vertically looking at heaven, and his desire for

higher realms not only served the bond with earth, but also broke the harmony between man and nature thereby causing the loss of Golden Age which is analogous to the loss of the 'state of nature' and the notion of 'natural man/noble savage'. The warning of the Golden Age, and the emergence of the Silver, Bronze and finally the Iron Age in modern times archetypally indicates the loss of innocence and naturalness, peace and harmony between man and nature which finally resulted in the anthropocentric assault on nature/environment and eco-disasters, eco-destruction. Following Rousseau, Bate tends to celebrate the pristine purity and primeval glory of the earth, and the bond of harmony and peace as realized in the state of Nature (*The Song of the Earth* 26-27).

While conceptualizing 'Ecopoetics' and 'Romantic Ecology', Bate firmly believes that the ancient myth can play a big role in dissolving eco-disasters and ecological crisis that confront the modern/post-modern men in the backdrop of scientific and technological progress. In fact, both the concepts, Bate argues, attempt to effect an "imaginative reunification of mind and Nature" (Bate 2000,245), and tend to evoke in man an intensity of feeling, and endearing intimacy, proto romantic interest and kindred sympathy for nature/environment and the various biotic and abiotic objects/elements of the ecosystem. This zest for communion with nature constitutes the core of romantic ecology/ecopoetics. In this connection, Jonathan Bate writes:

It proposes that when we commune with those forms we
live with a peculiar intensity, and conversely that our lives
are diminished when technology and industrialization alienate us
from those forms. It regards poetic language as a special kind
of expression which may effect an "imaginative reunification of
mind and nature (245).

Poetic language, and for that matter, pastoral language embellishes the concept of 'Romantic Ecology' and this is evident from the very title of the opening chapter of

Bate's *Romantic Ecology*. In the opening chapter titled 'A Language that is Green', Bate cites several instances from Wordsworth's poetry such as 'The Ruined Cottage', 'Lucy Poems', 'The Solitary Reaper', 'Home At Grasmere' and 'The Prelude' to highlight the miraculous magic of poetic language used to depict environment/ecological condition with proto romantic interest. Poetry begets purity and subliminal beatitude, inner peace and a sense of calm. For instance, in the poem 'The Ruined Cottage', after the death of Margaret and fall of her family, Nature occupies the ruined cottage which provides consolation, tranquillity and inner peace to the pedlar as well. Wordsworth offers a perfect instance of romantic ecology in 'The Ruined Cottage':

That secret spirit of humanity
Which, 'mid the calm oblivious tendencies
Of Nature, 'mid her plants, her weeds and flowers,
And silent overgrowings, still survived. ('The Ruined Cottage' 112-115)

It is in a state of perfect calm and inner peace in the lap of nature that Wordsworth's pedlar gains consolation and becomes wiser enough to embrace 'the still sad music of humanity'. A calm and peaceful environment makes the viewer/onlooker wise and cheerful, and a romantic ecological condition becomes conducive to open his 'third eye' to look into the life of natural forms and to realize how silence speaks volumes in the lap of nature:

She sleeps in the calm earth, and peace is here.
I well remember that those very plumes,
Those weeds, and the high spear-grass on that wall,
By mist and silent rain-drops silvered o'er,
As once I passed, into my heart conveyed
So still an image of tranquillity,

So calm and still, and looked so beautiful. ('The Ruined Cottage' 10-18)

It is by virtue of the magic of his pastoral language, that Wordsworth transforms the solitary reaper, the Golden Daffodils and the country girl Lucy into wondrous creations of beauty. Needless to say, among all the romantic poets, Wordsworth and his friend Coleridge knew how to create 'Renaissance of Wonder' and what Walter Pater aptly calls, 'strangeness added to beauty'. Poetic language becomes therapeutic through romantic imagination and metaphors drawn from the world of nature. Thus, the 'golden daffodils' become dancers tossing their heads with 'sprightly dance'. Lucy becomes a 'violet by a mossy stone', a 'sportive fawn', the 'breathing balm' only in communion with the natural elements 'rock' and 'plain,' 'glad and power', 'mountain springs' and 'floating clouds' and 'stars of midnight'. In a romantic ecological condition, Nature nourishes and nurtures Lucy as a kind mother and a tender teacher, and she grows, far away from the complexities of the madding crowd, with lessons of tranquility and peace, 'vital feelings' of sympathy, love and delight that constitute the essence of romantic ecology. It is now evident that for Wordsworth, pastoral life, rural landscape and pastoral language together with celebration of song/glory of the earth, cult of innocence/noble savage and 'return to nature' enrich the periphery of romantic poetics and romantic ecology as well. The romantic ecologist, according to Bate, not only celebrates a 'language that is evergreen'(12-13) but also admires the users of that language –the peasant and rustics living in mountains and foot hills-because they are humble, natural and bereft of complexity, artificiality and pretension. In his *Preface to Lyrical Ballads*, Wordsworth, the eco conscious romantic poet, holds that humble and rustic life was chosen for poetry by him precisely because the essential passions of the human heart find an effective expression in their own language. A romantic ecologist then, like Wordsworth, tends to celebrate the natural go of life as experienced by Wordsworth's leech gatherer, solitary reaper, idiot boy, Cumberland beggar and the little girl in the poem 'We are Seven'.

At the same time, a romantic ecologist locates through the smiles and tears, trials and tribulations of Michael in "Michael, a pastoral poem", how, despite the technological invasion made by industrialization and modernization, the eighty years

old inhabitant of the Grasmere Valley sings the song of the earth, adulates pastoral landscape and is deeply rooted to his landscape/soil, and more predominantly leads a contented life of peace and happiness bereft of ambition and vaulting desires. Wordsworth's silken sympathy for rustics and peasants, and Michael's bond with nature, his tenacious toiling in his paternal land for more than seventy years and also his tending of sheep- all these signify the native's love for his 'land' and the pastoral landscape/environment. In Bate's opinion, the 'pastoral' constitutes a significant factor in Romantic Ecology, and more significantly, pastoral poetry dealing with 'simplest hearts' of shepherds and rustics has a 'permanent and enduring power' and aesthetic appeal as well. It is in this sense that Bate calls pastoral 'an evergreen language' (Bate 1991, 18-19). Bate believes that like pastoral poetry and language, a romantic ecological condition based on harmonious relationship between man and nature, between biotic and abiotic elements can also create a therapeutic effect where in Nature becomes a veritable healing force besides being a kind mother, a nurse, a guide and a moral teacher of our body, mind, heart and soul. The universal feeling of love and harmony can be realized through the waves of the vast sea and soothing balm of moonlight, a pleasant climate and favourable weather, gentle breeze and green leaves, tender creepers and rustic colour and aroma of fountains and birds, and also the beauty of flowers and fruits. Bate observes: "In Romantic Poetics, poetry is to be found not only in language but in nature; it is not only a means of verbal expression, it is also a means of emotional communications between man and the natural world"(1991, 17).

Like poetry, Romantic ecologists believe, love of the rural world and pastoral landscape acts as a veritable panacea to mitigate eco-despair and eco depression, and the 'Poetry of Nature' possesses a miraculous power to heal all ills and wounds of body and mind. John Stuart Mill, in his *Autobiography* (1874) candidly confesses how in his moments of deep depression, Wordsworth's 'poetry of nature' had a therapeutic effect on his depressed mind. Mill observes:

What made Wordsworth's poems a medicine for my state of mind,

was that they expressed not mere outward beauty, but states of feeling

and of thought coloured by feeling, under the excitement of beauty.

They seemed to be the very culture of the feelings, which I was in quest of.

In them I seemed to draw from a source of inward joy, of sympathetic and imaginative pleasure, which can be shared in by all human beings...

The result was that I gradually, but completely, emerged from my habitual depression and was never again subject to it (25-26) (quoted by Jonathan Bate 1991, 14)

Wordsworth's 'poetry of nature' is akin to the aesthetics of Romantic ecology in that a delightful ecological condition becomes the fountain source of 'imaginative pleasure', excitement of/for beauty, 'culture of feeling' and above all a 'permanent happiness in tranquil contemplation' (*Autobiography*, 126). It is now evident that Romantic ecology can't be separated from celebration of Nature which provides permanent happiness to the ailing humanity and elevates man from the mire of suffering to a state of 'elevated thought' in tranquil contemplation. 'Ecological nature' becomes the symbol of transcendent nature. Romantic ecology too points to the transcendental state of joy and excitement of beauty realised in an ecologically balanced environmental landscape. In this connection, McGann maintains that Wordsworth, like Coleridge, "translates those ecological forms into theological realities: Natural as Nature, the Active Universe and manifest form of the One Life" (*The Beauty of Inflections* 1985, 300). McGann's emphasis on 'One Life' in fact points to an integrated vision of 'Oneness' that binds the whole cosmos through the bond of 'spiritual love' and ecological vision of life in terms of 'interconnectedness'.

Viewed from this perspective, Romantic Ideology and Romantic ecology do sail in the same boat. While adulating the inviolable relationship between man and environment, the Romantic Ecologist not only emphasizes 'reverence for nature', but also shows how nature/environment and for that matter, the eco-system as whole, offer their guardianship/guidance to man so that he/she would respect the integrated

ecosystem rather than nourishing anthropocentric vision of exploitation and assault on nature/environment. Bate elaborates this point by drawing reference from Wordsworth's 'Lucy Poems' and 'Home at Grasmere'. The romantic Poet's integrated eco-centric vision encompasses both human and non human aspects of the valley of Grasmere and in the pastoral settings of the valley; the poet offers an unconditional eulogy of the 'serene environment' which acts as the guardian of his pure heart. He sanctifies the valley in its entirety- its hills and lakes, island, icy brooks, naked trees and cottage-with a sense of complete unity and 'perfect contentment' (Jonathan Bate 1991, 102). Wordsworth sings:

Embrace me then, ye Hills and close me in,

Now in the clear and open day I feel

Your guardianship; I take it to my heart:

Tis like the solemn shelter of the night ('Lucy Poems', 129-32)

Wordsworth's concern with the relationship between the village of Grasmere and its surrounding environment and peaceful coexistence of the villagers with mutual familial friendship is further extended beyond the human world to animal world. And this ethics of peaceful co existence of man, animals, birds and the world of nature, "One Family...human and brute" ('Home at Grasmere', 619-622) reminds us of the epic ecology on one hand, and Garrad's contention that animal studies constitutes an unavoidable aspect ecocritical studies on the other. (*Ecocriticism*, 146). Wordsworth laments the disappearance of "a lonely pair/of milk white swans" (1801, 322) and he regrets that "the Dalesmen may have aimed the deadly tube (1352) to kill the innocent swans. Like a romantic ecologist, the poet suggests that the only way of healing the animosity between the human community and the wild creatures is to offer "overflowing love/not for the creatures only but for all" (1800, 286-7). It is here that that Romantic ecology works in tandem with biophilia which should be extended beyond the bounds of human beings to all living and non-living things that enrich the entire regional ecosystem. This is not the ideal goal of romantic ecology alone, but the cardinal principle of Environmental ethics on one hand and Wordsworth's Pantheistic vision of divinity in all-both big and small-on the other.

In this connection, J.C. McKusick in his seminal book *Green Writing: Romanticism and Ecology* (2000) highlights the instinctive relationship between the human and animal world among the villagers of Grasmere and also Wordsworth's allegiance to spiritual ecology based on pantheism and Environmental Ethics based on the principle of love for all in the poem 'Home at Grasmere' (2000, 70-72). Romantic ecology is grounded upon the French philosopher Rousseau's ideal that man is by nature 'born free' and that in course of his growth in a society dominated by political and religious institutions, hierarchies and taxing traditional laws, his freedom is largely curtailed. That is precisely the reason why Rousseau talked about 'Return to Nature' and a 'State of Nature' which embody perfection and freedom from the fetters of the complex society. In his *Second discourse*, Rousseau defines 'State of Nature' as an ideal mode of existence in the lap of Nature in which the 'natural man' (noble savage) develops pristine purity, primeval innocence and nobility (*Second discourse*, 38) or noble savagery which is contrasted with the nature of the 'social man', 'economic man', 'technical man'-all epitomizing scientific progress, mechanical mind, commercial attitude of profit and utility and more predominantly an anthropocentric vision of life and attitude to nature/environment. To Rousseau, life in the 'state of nature' is one of 'peace' and 'freedom' in the lap of natural solitude and as such, the understanding corresponds to the silent language of Nature (*Second Discourse*, 49). Bereft of home, standard human relationship, memory, formal education and language, 'the natural man' remained in perfect communion with virgin environment. It was colonization that introduced exploitation of nature's virginity, and natural resources, and robbed the natural man of his innocence in the state of nature and finally imposed deforestation, consumption of meat by killing innocent animals/beautiful birds, colonizer's language and manners, idea of property, bifurcation and possession of land/landscape. All these anthropocentric exploits/steps accentuated man's fall from the state of nature thereby effecting a transformation of the 'natural man' ('noble savage') into 'economic and social man'. (Bate 2000, 42). Rousseau strongly argues that it is the naturalness of Nature that sustains ecosystem and Romantic ecologists/Deep ecologists faithfully subscribed to Rousseau's environmental philosophy, ethics and culture which is primarily grounded upon a ho-

listic approach to environment. Environment is, holistically speaking, an interlocked concept constituted by the interaction of physical (abiotic), biological (biotic) and cultural elements that are interlinked individually as well as collectively. It is the interaction among the three components of environmental conditions that produces a 'physical man', a 'social man' and an 'economic man'. Whereas the 'physical man' bent on air, water, land and food releases waste into the eco system, the 'social man' is politically engaged to form social institutions/organizations and to formulate principles. And the 'economic man' bent on utilitarian and anthropocentric principles attempts to utilize the environmental resources with his skills and technologies-the reason why, he is called 'technical man' in environmental discourse. Environmental ethics necessitates that utilization of natural resources should be in harmony with the natural environment so that ecosystem continues normally.

According to Rousseau, the 'primitive man' uncontaminated by colonialism and anthropocentrism, was guided by 'wilderness Ethics' –ethics of preservation rather than destruction –that encompasses natural and free growth of nature and environment without anthropogenic eco-destruction. Environmental ethics developed as a philosophy in 1970s to pose a challenge to traditional anthropocentrism and interrogated the moral superiority of human beings to members of other species on Earth. Emphasis is laid on assigning intrinsic value rather than 'instrumental value' to the natural environment. Rousseau was primarily a naturalist who reposed full faith in the elemental simplicities a life and was obviously critical of the artificial sophistication of civilization and culture which curbed the goodness of the natural man. In this connection, George H.Sabine (1973) argues that as a strong believer in the concept of man's 'natural goodness' as opposed to the puritanic view of man as a potential sinner begotten by 'Original Sin', Rousseau developed the cult of/ naturalness as a primordial feature of environmental ethics, and also patronized the cult of the 'noble savage' on the ground of his sentimental belief in the essential goodness of the natural man and his pristine simplicity (529). Rousseau's primary objective was how to secure perfectibility of man and his freedom and happiness which depend on a clear understanding of the laws of Nature. The French Philosopher envisages an ideal society/social order, not on the basis of the principles of anthropocentrism, but in harmony with the fundamental laws of Nature-simple way of

living, patience, tolerance, pity and love, kindness and natural goodness (*Second discourse* 53-55). And under the influence of Rousseau's *Emile*, Wordsworth in his 'Lucy Poems' imparts the most valuable environmental ethical lesson that human beings should accept Nature as the best teacher from whom Lucy learns lessons of simplicity and patience, tolerance and goodness, kindness and forgiveness, peace and happiness. While supporting the cause of animal protection/ welfare, Rousseau argues in form of vegetarianism (*Homo Sapiens*) and regrets that by becoming omnivorous, human beings are transformed from peace loving creatures of vegetarian diet to blood thirsty monsters inclined to war. To him, in the 'state of Nature', the natural man remains self reliant, self sufficient and self content and lives in peace by realizing the amicable harmony between his internal nature and external environment(*Second Discourse* 53). Therefore, far away from artificiality, pretension, greed for power, pleasure and materialistic accomplishment, the natural man deprecates destructive passions such as jealousy, malice, war and revenge. In his two Discourses, Rousseau castigates 'natural inequality' which leads to the rule of the 'physically strong' (Bate 2000, 30) and also accuses 'civilization' and established culture and 'society' that are detrimental to preservation of Nature and the 'State of Nature'. Jonathan Bate observes:

Society is the negation of nature. The work of the thinker is to
negate the negation, to accuse Civilization, which is characterized by
its negativity with respect to nature. In so far as he held such beliefs,
Rousseau may be characterized as a proto-Green thinker (*The Song of the
Earth* 2000, 32).

With his primary emphasis on natural goodness of the 'noble savage', primitive simplicity and pristine innocence, faith in pastoral glory and agrarian charm, Rousseau's environmental ethics regards nature, not society, as the best teacher in *Emile*, and endorses equal rights for all creatures in the eco system. In the light of aforesaid analysis on Romantic ecology and Environmental ethics, it would be interesting and profitable to analyse Shakespeare's romantic comedy *As You Like It*

and his dramatic romance *The Winter's Tale* on the basis of the theoretical formulations of Jonathan Bate even though romantic ecological consciousness was fairly applied to the 19th Century romantics with special reference to Wordsworth, Keats and Coleridge.

There is no denying the fact that the Renaissance man was primarily a free and dynamic being goaded by illimitable passion and vaulting ambition, boundless imagination and love for the sea /ocean and maritime ecology, as has been brilliantly brought to the fore by Dan Brayton in his masterpiece *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration* (2018). Needless to say , the Elizabethan Age was a 'Golden Age' of pleasure and prosperity, of free thinking and a fertile and conducive period of poetic, dramatic, musical and other artistic/ imaginative/creative activities which prompted Emile Legouis to call it 'a nest of singing birds'(1929, 45). In the hands of Renaissance lyricists and sonneteers, particularly Spenser, Sidney and Shakespeare, nature was no more viewed in terms 'culture of plunder' (Brayton, xii). Trees and flowers, forests and gardens, niceties of ocean and the mesmerising beauty of the sea shores – like the shores of Illyria by Adriatic Sea in *Twelfth Night*, the Mediterranean sea in *The Tempest* and *The Merchant of Venice* and the maritime environment as a whole prompted the Elizabethans to develop a romantic zest for love of life and love for sights and sounds, weather and wind, birds and animals, flowers and creepers with considerable visual and imaginative appeal that characterizes the Renaissance romantic imagination. A great critic like Samuel Johnson unabashedly acclaimed Shakespeare in his *Preface to Shakespeare* (1765) as a poet of nature evoking passions, emotions and feelings of readers/audience with a permanent/timeless appeal. Johnson writes:

Nothing can please many, and please long, but just for
representations of general nature, Shakespeare is above all writers,
at least, above all modern writers, and the poet of nature...
His persons act and speak by the influence of those general
passions and principles by which all minds are agitated, and the

whole system of life is continued in nation (34).

Johnson has made a significant point to show here how human nature works in tandem, with nature thereby facilitating the whole system of life to go on with nature. Johnson's observation has strong ecological connotations as ecology is grounded upon the system of healthy working of biotic and abiotic elements, and of man and nature to allow a balanced eco-system to continue. Shakespeare's Age experienced an idyllic time that came under the profound influence of the pastoral tradition of the Greek Moschus, Bion and Theocritus, Roman Virgil and the romantic tradition of Petrarch whose pastoral poems, eclogues and love lyrics/sonnets shaped the romantic imagination of Edmund Spenser (*The Shepherd's Calender* and *The Faerie Queene*), Thomas Watson (*The Ekatompathia or Passionate Centurie of Love*), Philip Sidney (*The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia & Astrophel and Stella*) and finally Shakespeare. The exhilarating Elizabethan mind and spirit is brilliantly shown by G.M Trevelyan in his *English Social History* (2011). Trevelyan writes:

Shakespeare's countrymen, not yet cramped to the service
of machines, were craftsmen and creators at will. Their minds,
set free from medieval trammels, were not yet caught by puritan
and other modern fanaticisms. The Elizabethan English were in love
with life, not with some theoretic shadow of life. Lured classes,
forced as never before from poverty, felt the uprising of the spirit
and expressed it in wit, music and song (140).

Even though Shakespeare was decidedly aware of the anthropocentric outlook of the Renaissance man capitalizing the fall of Adam and Eve from the garden of innocence, his Renaissance environmental imagination was enriched with profound influence of the Greek and Roman pastoral poetry and medieval romantic view of nature as well. This is evident from *King Lear* in which despite his ecophobic despair/anxiety, the old king eulogizes Nature as divine minister and a dear goddess ("Hear, nature hear, dear goddess hear"). Lear's realization can be further correlated with

Senior Duke's realization in the pastoral comedy *As You Like It* that Adam's offence to nature can be compensated only by loving nature with purity and repentance. He has, therefore left the 'painted pomp' of the complex court in favour of a life of peace and tranquillity in the Forest of Arden. Romantic ecology necessitates what Rousseau calls the idea of 'Return to Nature'. The Sons and daughters of Adam and Eve should redeem themselves by returning to nature with repentance. Arden is imagined by the Duke as Eden before fall where he can live a life of peace, purity and innocent pleasure. The self content Duke observes: "Here feel we not the penalty of Adam" (*As You Like It* 2.1.5).

Shakespeare subscribes to the tenets of Romantic ecology in that the Forest of Arden epitomizes an ideal world wherein biotic and abiotic elements, rustics and natural environment work in unison. The ecological condition of the forest is conducive in that "the wind is not chiding" and that it has no 'fang' to 'bite' with. And there is no anthropocentric attempt of satanic persuasion/temptation, exploitation or imposition.(2.1.6-11).The Forest witnesses an agreeable affinity between biotic and abiotic elements and there has been a sacred sense of 'inter connectedness' between human and 'animal world'. This is aptly evident from a beautiful co-existence of tropical snakes and hungry lionesses without the slightest feeling of fear, suppression and oppression. Modelled after the forest of Warwick in England, the Forest of Arden represents 'ideal space' and an 'imaginary' landscape representing innocence and peace, idyllic charm and perennial happiness. Here it is pertinent to mention that the Forest of Arden occupies a permanently secured seat in the environmental imagination of Shakespeare right from his very childhood. His mother Mary Arden was a descendent of Arden family deeply attached to the forest which stretches from river Avon to Thames. Shakespeare's treatment of the Forest of Arden was also influenced by Thomas Lodge's prose romance *Rosalynde* and unfortunately the real Forest of Arden has been subjected to deforestation, enclosure and embankment as a part of the aristocratic fashion following the Civil War of 1642-1651, the Battle of Camp Hill and also the Puritan rule.

The characters in *As You Like It* inhale pure air and time ('hours') and the words are measured by no human clocks. Unlike the world of complexity and artificiality re-

presented by the court of Duke Frederick and the urban space experienced by Oliver, life in the pastoral setting of the forest is not regulated by the prosaic routine of mundane life. Here, one is reminded of Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), where the inhabitants enjoyed an air of freedom. Bereft of the concept of private wealth, More's Utopians knew no exploitation and no wars of aggression. Moreover, the Utopians had no necessity of lawyers and artificial laws; and the only law they respected is 'law of nature' and Divine justice. At the same time, the Utopians glorified, like the Greeks, the efficacy of physical culture on the ground that perfect health is the "greatest of all bodily pleasures". While subscribing to the aesthetics of 'naturalness', they tended carefully to preserve their 'natural beauty' by downplaying 'artificiality' and use of 'paint' which is strongly reminiscent of Shakespeare's glorification of the dark lady's natural beauty and his condemnation of artificial painting and use of cosmetics.

While deriving his inspiration from Plato's *Republic* and St. Augustine's *The City of God* for his imaginary kingdom (*Utopia*), as Compton Rickett aptly puts it, More conceived of a 'people's state' embodying the ethics of democracy, republicanism and religious tolerance. There is no denying the fact that originally written in Latin and subsequently translated into Italian, French and English. *Utopia* exercised tremendous influence in shaping the Renaissance environmental Imagination including that of Shakespeare. The 'pastoral space' of the forest in *As You Like it* has exercised many sided influence on the human world. Far away from the 'fever and the fret' of the life of court, the Senior Duke lives in communion with nature, and like the ancient Indian preceptor (Guru) delivering lessons to his disciples under the tree by the river, the Duke is surrounded by many 'young gentleman' perhaps learning lessons of patience, peace, happiness, unalloyed love, friendship and naturalness -the cardinal principles of Environmental ethics. In the mouth of Charles, Shakespeare states about the Duke "They say much young gentleman flock to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly as they did in the golden world" (1.1.110). These people 'live like the old Robinhood of England' signifying nobility, peace, loyalty, revolt against tyranny and fight of righteousness-the qualities that are characteristic of Robinhood, the highly skilled archer and swordsman of medieval folklore. The Forest of Arden is not imaginary at all; rather it is built upon the

rudiments of a mixed fabric in which life and death, pleasure and pain, spring and winter have all been accepted as aesthetically satisfying. The niceties of spring and the joys of spring time love under the greenwood tree are taken in conjunction with the rough weather and the blow of wintry wind ('Blow Blow thy Winter Wind'). What is emphasized here is the acceptance of both the facets of life with peace, patience and fortitude without any detrimental approach to human and environmental landscape. The Duke seems to be a professed follower of 'Ecosophy/ Ecophilosophy'- a term coined by Arne Naess, the Norwegian father of deep ecology that emphasizes ecological equilibrium and harmony in life as against imbalanced disorder and disintegration. No doubt, the Forest of Arden is visited by death and dangers that are part and parcel of life. To the Duke, the dangers are real but 'natural' rather than 'artificial', and hence dangers in the woods are preferable to those in the court: "The Churlish chiding of the winter's wind....Even till I shrink with cold, I smile and say- There is no flattery" (2.1.7-10). In the Duke's vision of life in the forest, hypocrisy and pretention, artificiality and flattery are sacrificed in favour of 'naturalness'. And in the forest, people are found both honest and natural.

The Duke candidly recognizes the fact that the pastoral environment of the forest has exercised profound influence on him and that he has learnt very many lessons of Environmental ethics from the objects of nature such as birds and trees, flowers and seasons, murmuring brooks and pebbles. Above all, the greatest lesson he has learnt in the lap of nature is 'goodness in everything', which can be aptly contrasted with the so called greatness and dynamics of power in court. With the help of personification/pathetic fallacy, Shakespeare brilliantly brings out, like a romantic ecologist and a custodian of Environmental ethics, the Duke has close communion with nature: "tongues in trees, brooks in the murmuring brooks, sermons in stones, And good in everything"(2.1.16-17). Long before Rousseau's postulation of environmental Ethics/culture in his *Discourses* and the novel *Emile* proclaiming Nature as the best teacher, Shakespeare has taught to the audience in *As You Like It* how to learn lessons of 'goodness' and 'naturalness' from Nature. Not only has that, in the mouth of Touchstone, the dramatist addressed the 'audience' as 'trees' and the forest as the judge: "(L) et the forest judge" (3.2.119). Even in a serious tragedy like *Macbeth*,

human qualities have been attributed to the objects of nature, and the audience is told that “stones have trees been known to move and to speak” (3.4.121).

There is no denial of the fact that Shakespeare was influenced by classical pastoral poets and more predominantly he was influenced by the Latin poet Ovid’s art of transformation as detailed in *Metamorphosis*. Accordingly, with the help of pathetic fallacy and personification, the Renaissance dramatist tended to link literary trees with living beings by virtue of the art of transformation. At the same time, Ovid also talked about tree-spirits and his direct impact is located in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* wherein Ariel is found to be more akin to the tree-spirits than to the elemental spirit of air and fire (*The Tempest* 11.1).

Viewed from ecocritical perspective, it may be argued that despite his admitted awareness of anthropocentrism nourished by Renaissance humanism, Shakespeare offered a holistic approach and an integrated vision of ‘interconnectedness’ in the lap of nature by virtue of which he birds the ‘literary trees’ with tress in the forest on one hand and with the audience representing human world on the other (Juliet Dusinberre, 2006, 50).

Pastoral ecology in *As You Like it* becomes all the more aesthetically invigorating when Romantic love based on courtship occupies the centre-stage under favourable environmental Condition. The love between Rosalind and Orlando is modelled after the French concept of Courtly love (amour curtois) which Shakespeare imbibed from the medieval tradition of romance. In his connection, H.B.Charlton in his famous book *Shakespearean Comedy* (1969) aptly observes that Shakespeare and his followers “clamoured for fuller draughts of that spirit of romanticism which the Middle Ages have first discovered and revealed in their tales of chivalry” (201). In the ritual of courtly love, Orlando is described by Celia as a ‘wounded knight’ respecting chivalric ethics of cortezia (courtesy), humility and surrender to the beloved goddess. She is imagined as a ‘huntress’; She is glorified as ‘Diana in the fountain’ (3.2.410), and Orlando’s poetic power is at its best when he praises Rosalind with a number of comparisons. Thus Rosalind, the pure rose, like Śakuntalā the pristine creeper in Kalidasa’s *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* is described as:

Helen's cheek, but not (her) heart,
 Cleopatra's majesty
 Altanta's better part,
 Sad Lucretia's modesty.
 Thus, Rosalind of many parts,
 By heavenly Synod, was devis'd
 Of many faces, eyes, and hearts,
 To have the touches dearest priz'd (3.2.145-52)

Obsessed with love, Orlando writes love lyrics on the bark of trees, and touchstone is critical about Orlando's verses hanging in the forest when we observe that "the tree yields bad fruit"(111.ii.126).The beloved is imagined here as "furnished like a hunter" ready to hunt the "beloved's heart (3.2.245-46) with the arrows of Cupid (4.1.213-15). Robert.N.Watson highlights how Shakespeare has tended to "tie the story of hunting in the forest closely to the story of loving in the forest" (2006, 89).

Strongly reminiscent of the ritual of courtly love, Orlando loves Rosalind like a courtly lover of 'humility' and 'gentlemanliness'. More than that, Shakespeare combines love and ecology, by emphasizing the fact that Romantic love is inseparable from the benign influence of seasons, weather, animals, birds and months:

men are April when they woo, December when they wed;
 Maids are May when they are maids, but the sky changes when
 they are wives. I will be more jealous of thee than a
 Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen, more clamorous than
 a parrot against rain.. giddy in my desires that a monkey.
 I will weep for nothing, like Diana in the fountain, and I will do that

when you are dispos'd to be merry. I will laugh like a hyena,
and that when thou art inclined to Sleep (4.1.147-56)

Through the ecological condition offered by different month, the lover becomes wiser enough to face life and its hard realities behind the 'time-denying love game' played by him (Watson 2006, 103). Pastoral environment in *As You Like It* not only stimulates romantic love, but also brings in maturity to friendship between Rosalind and Celia, the devotion of Adam for Orlando, and also love of the faithful rustics for the Senior Duke. Even under the benign blessings of a conducive ecological condition, the old Shepherd Corin goes ecstatic in his love of life and nature while recalling his own youthful love of romantic exuberance. The rustics glorify environmental culture- sing songs, observe their rituals and more significantly glorify months, seasons, trees, air and weather. Unlike the anthropocentric 'economic man' who makes rough use of nature and natural resources for utilitarian purpose, the rustics in the forest of Arden constructively utilize 'Nature's economy' and for them nature is never a 'free lunch'.

And that is precisely the reason why in the mouth of melancholic Jaques, Shakespeare criticizes Senior Duke, originally a man of urban ecology, for mercilessly killing forest deer for consumption: "To frighten the animals, and to kill them up/ In their assigned and native dwelling place" (2.1.61-63). Jaques represents Shakespeare's romantic ecological consciousness by emphasizing the fact that killing of forest deers in their 'Native dwelling place' is nothing but 'a barbaric past time' (Todd. A. Borlik 2011, 179-184). Reminiscent of Greg Garrad's contention that animal study constitutes an important feature of eco-critical discourse, Shakespeare's demand for freedom of animals in their dwelling place may be conceded as a powerful plea for animal justice, an effective lesson in Environmental ethics and what T.A.Borlik calls a powerful, move towards 'Ecological Republicanism' (168).

Greg Garrad in his book *Ecocriticism* (2004) analyzes the concept of the pastoral in symbolic terms through three literary genres: 'elegy', 'idyll' and 'utopia'. Whereas the elegiac self of the pastoral points to nostalgic longing for the lost glory of the past, its idyllic self celebrates with proto romantic zest the efficacy of the bountiful present.

On the other hand, pastoral as utopia signifies the vision for a redeemed future thereby completing the three segments of time-past, present and future. Of these three, *As You Like It*, viewed from the stand point of romantic ecology, can be designated as a pastoral idyll celebrating the song of the earth and love of life with many sided ramifications (Garrad 37). What is significant to note in this connection is that the pastoral landscape/Forest of Arden not only provides an idyllic background to the plot, and action/art of characterization of the play, but also provides a congenial 'natural' environment where the characters can develop their free identity which is altogether different from the dull, hectic and complicated form of identity at court.

In the forest environment, the characters feel free, like air, water and fire, and exercise their innate potential to fulfil their desires. For instance, the Senior Duke goes for hunting to arrange their food, where as Audrey is able to manage all her needs by tending goats. Silvius, the young shepherd celebrates his romantic love for the rustic girl Phoebe, commits many follies, and even threatens to commit suicide if phoebe does not return his love. This love-sick lover is however a simpleton, a symbol of naturalness, constantly exploited, rebuked and insulted by Phoebe, but he never demands self respect, except the love of Phoebe. Rosalind has all sympathy for him and also scolds him having unconditionally surrendered himself to phoebe as a 'tame snake'. Similarly, Audrey is a homely ignorant shepherd girl who is attracted by the courtly behaviour and intelligence of Touchstone. Ignorance is blessing for her in the lap of nature, as she is richer, though ugly, in her honesty, innocence and rustic simplicity. This is evident from the way Touchstone introduces her to the Senior Duke as 'a poor virgin sir, an ill-favoured thing sir, but mine own'. Corin, the old shepherd, is characterised as a simple human being bereft of pretence, jealousy and envy for other's happiness. Self content as he is, he eats what he earns, and his happiness consists in his innocence, humanitarian sympathy for others and simple way of looking at things in life-the reason why Touchstone calls him a 'natural Philosopher'. Whether it is the patience and wisdom of the Duke, the wit of Rosalind, the love sickness of Orlando and Silvius or the rustic simplicity of Audrey, and the plain living and humanitarian sympathy of Corin-the natural philosopher – life in the lap of Nature in *As You Like It* is full of mirth and jollity, unpretentious love and free exercise of innocence and naturalness. The highest lesson of naturalness, plain living

and life of innocence and simplicity embodying the essence of Romantic ecology and environment ethics is delivered by Shakespeare in the mouth of Lord Amiens, one of the faithful followers of the Duke Senior. Lord Amiens sings a song that celebrates the charms of pastoral setting/landscape represented by the Forest of Arden which stands as a foil to the din and bustle of the world of court. He calls upon the people of the complex and complicated world to shun power, wealth and fame to embrace a life of peace, happiness, freedom and naturalness in the forest bereft of jealousy, fear, ambition and enmity:

Under the greenwood tree,
 Who loves to lie with me
 And tune his merry note
 Unto the sweet bird's throat,
 Come lither, come hither, come hither
 Here shall he see
 No enemy
 But winter and rough weather (2.5.1-8)

The forest possesses therapeutic power to heal worldly wounds, anxiety and suffering. This is further evident from the miraculous metamorphosis undergone by Duke Frederick and wicked Oliver, who came down to the forest to kill his brother Orlando. Under the blessings of Nature, Oliver is saved from the clutches of a lioness and a snake by his own brother whom he wanted to kill and a dramatic change looms large and transformed him. Duke Frederick is converted by an Old religious man and feels guilty as well as repentant. Oliver who was once tortured under the bondage of his brother's tyranny was finally transformed into a free man and a seasoned romantic lover endowed with poetic sensibility. The forest finds in him a renewed romantic lover nourished with freedom, elated joy and an air of naturalness. Nature opened the 'third eye' of Oliver and Duke Frederick to cast off their jealousy and rivalry towards their brothers.

The forest also facilitated Celia to explore and utilize her potential to become a successful maker of home nourishing the divinely gifted qualities of love, sympathy and compassion rather than greed and power. Under the influence of the Forest of Arden, the Duke Frederick realises the meaninglessness of worldly power, wealth and pleasure and is inclined to retire from the worldly life as a whole by restoring all his power and wealth to Duke Senior. Significantly, many characters in the play leave the forest except melancholic Jaques, who refuses to leave the forest. This shows that he is the true lover of nature in original sense and as such A.W.Verity rightly locates the ecocentric voice of Shakespeare in him (Verity, xxix).

The contrast between ‘urban space’ (court) and ‘idyllic space’ (forest of Arden) in *As You Like It* can be satisfactorily correlated with the dichotomy between ‘royal space’ and ‘pastoral space’ in Shakespeare’s dramatic romance *The Winter’s Tale*. The artificiality and complexity of courtly Culture is common to both the plays. Like Duke Frederick, King Leontes of Sicily epitomizes audacity and arrogance, jealousy and wrongful exercise of power. Banishment being a common feature of Shakespearean plays, King Leontes banishes his small child- daughter Perdita “to some remote and Desert place” (2.3.193). Just as King Lear banishes sweet Cordelia, and Duke Frederick banishes his elder brother in *As You Like It*. The play begins with winter’tale of suffering experienced by an innocence child and her parents as well. Like innocent Cordelia, Perdita too becomes a victim of her father’s error of judgement, and viewed from the standpoint of ecocriticism, both the fathers go against the laws of Nature and as such invite nature’s rage and fury for doing harm to ‘Innocence’.

Weather and season play a crucial rule in *The Winter’s Tale*. Though it is a dramatic romance or a pastoral play, its structure is built upon both tragic and comic fabric and the ‘serious’ and ‘romantic’ actions are largely shaped by ‘winter’ and spring respectively. The first part of the play presents the suffocating atmosphere of Leontes’ court where true love between two long term friends-king of Sicily and Polixenes, the king of Bohemia is marred by sudden eruption of unwanted suspicion and jealousy. Leontes suspects, following Hermione’s unabashed appreciation of

Polixenes that his wife has illicit connection with his friend Polixenes, and that Perdita is not his pure product, but an illegal creation of adultery. Like King Lear, Leontes exercises his patriarchal hegemony and tyranny of power to exile Perdita to Bohemian in order to abandon her on a savage and thunderous land. As Lear was chastised by Nature's rage and fury for doing injustice to sweet Cordelia, the new born baby Perdita is punished for no fault of her own. Consequently, Nature comes forward to take revenge and this is signified by the dismal climate in winter in which Antigonus leaves the child "without mercy to her own protection/And favour of the crime" (2.3.193). At the same time, like Lear being threatened by rain, rough weather, thunder and lightning in the storm seen, Antigonus encounters rough and wintry weather and the reactionary sky that "look grimly/And threaten present bluster"(3.3.3-4). More pathetic indeed is the way Antigonus was torn into pieces by a wild bear before he returns to the ship (3.3.11-2). The dismal weather, the grim sky, the thunderous Bohemian sea coast, and the dramatic appearance of the Bear and above all the season of winter-all these exercise their cumulative influence to create a serious situation of eco-phobia in the first half of the play.

The dramatic desertion of Perdita and the pathetic death of Antigonus are followed by the surprising arrival of a fisher man who picks up the child, and Perdita is destined to grow in the forest in the midst of shepherds and rustics living in the pastoral landscape. If the first half of the play is devoted to 'winter' and suffering, separation and misunderstanding, the second half of the play tends towards a 'new life'-of pastoral romance and peace, innocence and inviolable affinity between man and nature in the idyllic Bohemian pastoral landscape which is signified by the spring. Like Kalidas's Śakuntalā in *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*, Perdita is reared as a creeper in the midst of trees, plants, flowers, shepherds and animals. And like Wordsworth's Lucy, she is nature's gifted child endowed with natural beauty, innocence, goodness which characterizes a pure pastoral landscape. Pastoral precepts, environmental ethics and romantic ecology do work in unison to enrich Perdita's romantic mind and heart.

Symbolically speaking, Sicily stands for anthropocentric fallen world-of winter and artificiality, pretension and politics of power. And the shift from the fallen world of Sicily to the Bohemian landscape is an attempt to reclaim the lost Edenic paradise.

The contrast between the pastoral world of ecocentrism and the anthropocentric world of artificiality is symbolically suggested through Hermione's 'enclosed pleasure garden' and Perdita's 'rustic garden'. The former is planted and cultivated, whereas the latter is wild and natural. The landscape is characterized by romantic ecology in the sense that it is transformed from the barren and wintry world of Sicily into the one enriched with flora and fauna embodying fertility. Because of the fertility of the Bohemian landscape, trees, plants, flowers and creepers grow naturally, freely and with a sense of romantic zest/gusto that stands for perennial growth and regeneration.

Accordingly, Autolycus the rogue in the play, celebrates 'daffodils' and also the liberation of 'life' from the perpetual bondage of tyranny and oppression- from Leontes's "red blood (reign) in *The Winter's Tale*" (4.3.4). There is no denying the fact that trees and flowers, birds and beasts, gardens and forests enrich the Renaissance ecology and environmental imagination in a big way. In Renaissance literary representation, pelican birds appear time and again as emblem of parental sacrifice in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1.1.25-28), where as 'oak tree' is used as a veritable symbol embodying both ecocentric and anthropocentric approach to life as source of beauty and sound eco system on the one hand and utilitarian purpose of timber-fuel on the other. In his poetry and plays, Shakespeare has copiously alluded to over fifty types of flowers such as rose, lily, violet, musk roses, eglantine, daisy, woodbin and oxlips. For instance, in *A Midsummer's Night Dream*, Oberon, king of the Fairies talks to puck about the beautiful landscape of flora and fauna where his queen Titania sleeps:

I know a bank where the wild thyme blows,

Where oxlips and the nodding violets grows,

Quite over-canopied with Luscious woodbine,

With sweet musk roses and with eglantine,

There sleeps Titania sometime of the night

Lull'd in these flowers with dances and delight (2.1.249).

This is a brilliant instance of romantic ecology characteristic of pastoral imagination which profusely permeates a good many Shakespeare's plays right from *Romeo and Juliet*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Henry VI*, *Titus Andronicus* and *The Winter's Tale*. Given the Renaissance environmental imagination/condition, whether it is tragedy or comedy, flower symbolism is inseparably tagged to Shakespeare's ecological consciousness. Here, it is strikingly significant to note that Elizabethan people evinced keen interest in the language of flowers which is strongly reminiscent of what Jonathan Bate calls, 'pastoral language'. And a brilliant instance of the powerful pastoral language can be located in *Hamlet* in which Ophelia, Hamlet's beloved, drowned herself surrounded by garlands of wild flowers:

There's rosemary, that's for remembrance,

Pray you, love, remember: and there are pansies;

That's for thoughts/There's fennel for you, and

Here's some for me:/we may call it herb of

Grace o' Sundays: O/ you must wear your rue

With a difference/There's a daisy: I would

Give you some violets, / but they withered all

When my father died (4.5.175)

In the lines quoted above, 'rose merry' is associated with 'remembrance' of the dead and 'pansies' for 'thoughts'; 'fennel' signifies 'marital infidelity, the purplish blue coloured columbine' looks like dove and symbolizes endurance and perseverance in the teeth of adversity. Whereas 'rue', otherwise known as a herb of grace, stands for regret, repentance and sorrow, 'daisies' represent innocence ; and violets point to faithfulness. Significantly, violet flower is frequently alluded to in Shakespeare's poetry and drama, precisely because Warwickshire –the rural England where Shakespeare grew- was then famous for the proliferation of violet in the spring.

Shakespeare loved this humble little flower and more often than not associated it with 'love's Breath' (Sonnet no.99), youth of primly nature and 'fair and unpolluted flesh' (*Hamlet*), 'Love's Wounds' and 'love-in-idleness' (*A MidSummer Night's Dream*) and the 'green lap of the new come spring' (*Richard II*). Just as 'roses' stand for beauty, love and elegance in *Romeo and Juliet*, white lilies associated with Christianity indicate elegance, purity and innocence in *Titus Andronicus*. In Christianity, Mother Mary is often associated with Madonna Lily signifying purity and virginity, and in Renaissance painting, Virgin Mary is often shown holding a Madonna Lily which was then venerated as a sacred flower, whose petals point to a spotless body and the golden anthers suggest a 'soul gleaming with heavenly body'. In *The Winter's Tale*, Perdita is associated with Virgin Mary and obviously with 'lily flower' signifying chastity to nullify her father's suspicion that she was a product of adultery. Perdita's 'rustic garden' symbolizing chastity, innocence and naturalness (1.5.84) can be contrasted with her mother 'Hermione's supposedly polluted garden in Sicily, as her father interrogates the queen's chastity and virtue on the basis of her weakness towards Polixenes. Critics have hardly discussed Hermione's garden, even though many of them have shown a great deal of interest in Perdita's garden including Richard Hillman (1979), Mary L. Livingston (1969), William O. Scott (1963) and James H. Sims (1971) of course with possible exception to A.L.Tigner. A contrast is constituted between Hermione's 'pleasure garden' signifying utilitarian outlook of the Renaissance mind, and Perdita's 'rustic garden' signifying chastity and innocence characteristic of Mother Mary. Significantly Hermione's mention of the garden before Polixenes incurs the jealousy and rage of king Leontes; "if you would seek us /we are yours in' the garden" (1.2.178-79).

In the jealous and suspicious eyes of Leontes, Amy L. Tigner points out; harmony is figuratively situated as a "descendent of Eve, repeating Eve's transgressive actions and causing the ruin of the Edenic kingdom through her perceived desires" (Tigner 114). When Leontes accuses her of infidelity, the paradisaical innocence is lost and Hermione, strongly omniscient of the infidelity of Eve, represents an 'impure body' which can be contrasted with Perdita's 'virginal body' signified by 'lily' flower. Tigner further states: "As the garden comes to represent

Hermione's disputed body, so too in the second half of the Play the garden emblemizes Perdita's virginal body. In Perdita's flower garden the physical properties of the plants, as they are codified with moral or religious meanings, represent the schema by which Perdita's body and her sexual conduct can be read" (114).

Trees, plants and flowers play powerful roles to transform the tragic into the romantic surcharged with pastoral purity and innocence as problematized by Jonathan Bate in his discussion on Romantic ecology. Though initially the play was winter's tale in the second part of play, under the benign influence of Nature/pastoral environment, it became a flowery tale of the leafy spring Autolycus sings in praise of spring time daffodils, and in Act 4, Shakespeare makes use of romantic/pastoral language. Like Rosalind of *As You Like It* embodying the romantic nuances of 'rose' flower, Perdita is identified with 'lily' that signifies purity, innocence, and sublime beatitude that transport the reader/ audience to an ecstatic state of spiritual bliss. The romantic love between Perdita and Florizel adds additional beauty to the pastoral romance, and both of them fell in love with each other at the first sight, which is one of the characteristic features of the medieval concept of courtly love (Fin'amor).

In Act 4, Florizel praises Perdita's dress which is natural. Like Dushyanta, the lover in *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* appreciating the natural beauty and dress of Śākuntalā made of bark, leaves, and flowers, Florizel ecstatically eulogizes Perdita's dress: "These your unusual weeds to each part of you/Does give a life; no shepherds ,but Flora/ Peering in April's front"(4.4.1-3). Like Śākuntalā, the divine damsel born to sage Viśvāmitra and heavenly nymph Menakā, Perdita, though born to Leontes and Hermione is purified by nature and pastoral rearing as a shepherd. But Shakespeare claims through the lover that she has been elevated to the state of a goddess of flowers. There has been a perfect communion between man and nature in an ideal pastoral setting. Śākuntalā is identified with creeper (Vanajyotsnā) in much the same way Perdita is identified with the flowers and the goddess of flower-Flora in Greek mythology.

Perdita is the hostess and mistress of her sheep shearing festival in which she welcomes and distributes flowers to her guests. She greets Camillo and Polixenes, the king of Bohemia with 'rosemary' and 'rue' that symbolizes 'remembrance' and 'repentance'/ grace as the flowers of the winter-a pointer to Leontes injustice to Perdita and her mother Hermione as well(4.4.75-6). Perdita also invokes the memory of her mother Hermione by referring to winter season that stands for suffering. At the same time, her distribution of rue and rosemary too signifies remembrance of a 'fallen world'. The whole scene is transformed into a discourse on flower through the verbal intercourse between Perdita and Polixenes (4.4.78-9). The discussion is extended from the flower of winter-rosemary and rue to carnations and gillyvors-the fairest flowers of the season:

Of trembling winter, the fairest flower O'th season

Are our carnations and streaked gillyvors

Which some call nature's bastards;

of that kind

our rustic garden's barren/and I case not

To get sof them (4.4.79-84).

The Winter's Tale presents in exhaustible treasure house of flowers that enrich and facilitates the free play of romantic ecology, song of the Earth and environmental ethics. Later in the same play, Perdita teases a group of noble man by comparing the middle age to the flowers of midsummer. "Here's flowers for you;/Hot lavender, mints, savoury marjoram;/the marigold, that goes to bed wi'the sun/And with him rises weeping : these are flowers/of middle summer, and I think they are given to men of middle age" (4.4.122). As is characteristic of romantic ecology the human world is romantically negotiated with the pastoral world, as a result of which Florizel becomes "princely blood of noble race", where as Perdita is visualized as 'a gentle scion of the wildest stock' (4.4.92-95), again , Perdita claims not to entertain 'gilly flowers' in her garden as these are associated with "sexual license" and this shows that true love ,

experienced/realized in the bower of Nature and nourished by romantic ecology and environmental ethics, has nothing to do with sex, but with pure passion signified by “lilies of all kinds”(4.4.129).The spiritual implication associated with lilies in fact points to the pastoral world of innocence, purity and natural goodness that constitutes the essence of romantic ecology. Perdita’s goodness and divine qualities are attested by Polixenes and Camillo. Whereas, Polixenes adulates her as ‘too noble’ for the shepherd’s world, Camillo admires her as ‘the very Queen of curds and cream’. And for Florizel, she is “a piece of beauty rarer”, embodiment of virginity and epitomizes goddess of flower (Flora). Perdita too invokes the Ovidian myth of Proserpina, daughter of Zeus in Greek mythology and the goddess of agriculture, and wishes to have in her garden Proserpina’s flowers-such as daffodils, violets, prime roses and lilies; “I would I have some flowers O’th spring that might become of your time of days and yours/That wear upon your virgin branches yet your maiden heads growing...” (4.4.113-8).

The association Perdita with Proserpina with a sincere wish to possess her flowers of ‘virgin branches’ and growing ‘maiden heads’ aptly points to the fact that Perdita wishes to imbibe the eternal nuances of ‘spring and summer’ as contrasted with ‘autumn and winter’ represented by Leontes and Hermione. With emphasis on ‘season’ and month, ecology is taken as the basis for vindicating Perdita’s virginity, nobility and angelic quality which is further evident from her association with Queen Elizabeth. In this connection, Tigner aptly observes:

As with Elizabeth, the virgin Perdita is symbolized by a garden;
this image parallels the aristocratic cultural practice of cultivating
an Elizabethan emblematic garden, a protestant appropriation of

Medieval flower association with the Virgin Mary (121)

Thus, an analysis of *As You Like It* and *The Winter’s Tale* from the standpoint of Romantic Ecology and Environmental ethics reveals the fundamental fact that Nature is by nature therapeutic, and that in the midst of shepherds and rustics, trees and

plants, flowers and forests, conducive climate, seasons and favourable weather, human beings can learn eco-centric lessons of patience and purity, innocence and natural goodness, honesty and kindness, true love and humanitarian sympathy so as to formulate an ecocentric vision as against anthropocentric approach to life and Nature/Environment.

Works Cited

- Augutine, Saint. *City of God*. Edited by G.R.Evans. Penguin Classics. 2003.
- Bate, Jonathan. *The Song of the Earth*. Picador, 2000.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition*. Routledge, 1991.
- Borlik, Todd A. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature: Green Pastures*. Routledge, 2011.
- Bowerbank, Sylvia Lorraine. *Speaking for Nature: Women and Ecologies of Early Modern England*. The Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.
- Brayton, Dan. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. U of Virginia P, 2018.
- Bruckner, L. "Teaching Shakespeare in the Ecotone." *Ecocritical Shakespeare*. Edited by L. Bruckner and Dan Brayton. pp. 223-237. Ashgate, 2011.
- Charlton, H.B. *Shakespearean Comedy*. Methuen, 1969.
- Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2004.
- Kalidasa. *Abhijnana Sakuntala*. Translated by Romila Thapar, Anthem, 2002.
- Kerridge, Richard. *Writing the Environment: Ecocriticism and Literature*. Zed Books, 1998.
- Legouis, Emile and Louis Cazamian. *A History of English Literature*. The Macmillan Co, 1929.
- McGrann, Jerome J. *The Beauty of Inflections: Literary Investigations in Historical Method and Theory*. U of Minnesota Press, 1985.
- McKusick, James.C. *Green Writing: Romanticism and Ecology*. Macmillan, 2000.
- McIntosh, Robert. P. *The Background of Ecology: Concept and Theory*. Cambridge UP, 1985.

Merchant, Carolyn. *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*. Routledge, 2005.

Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*. Henry Holt and Company, 1874.

Milton, Kay. *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory: Exploring the Role of Anthropology in Environmental Discourse*. Routledge, 1996.

Naess, Arne “The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects”, *Ecocriticism: The Essential Reader*. Edited by Ken Hiltner. Routledge, 2015.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by David Raeburn. Penguin Classics, 2004.

Plato. *The Republic of Plato*. 2nd edition. Translated by Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1968.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Emile*. Translated by Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1979.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. Translated by G.D.H.Cole. Everyman, 1993.

Rueckart, William. “Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism”. *IOWA Review* vol.9, no.1, pp.71-86, Winter.1978.

Sabine, George .H. *A History of Political Theory*. Dryden Press, 1973.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Edited by A.W.Verity. Methuen, 1967.

Tigner, Amy L. *Literature and the Renaissance Garden from Elizabeth I to Charles II*. London: Ashgate, 2012.

Trevelyan, G.M. *English Social History*. Orient Black Swan, 2011.

Watson, Robert N. *Back to Nature: The Green and the real in the Late Renaissance*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.

Wordsworth, William. *Preface to Lyrical Ballads*. Edited by Warwick Jack Burgoyne Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1957.

Worster, Donald. *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination*. Oxford UP, 1993.

Chapter V

Song of the Earth: Contesting Ecophobia and Celebrating Gaia Hypothesis

Together with Eco-colonialism and Eco-imperialism, the concepts of Ecophobia, Biophilia and Gaia Hypothesis have gained increasing importance in the postcolonial ecocritical discourse. There is no denying the fact that Ecocriticism is primarily grounded upon a sound ecosystem which thrives through an amicable affinity between biotic and abiotic elements. But in the backdrop of the two devastating World Wars together with the rapid rise in science and technology coupled with mushroom population growth and all devouring materialistic ambitions and desires, the human world has notoriously exploited nature/natural resources for the last several decades. This has resulted in massive deforestation and desertification, global warming and pollution of several types thereby incurring the retaliatory response from nature. Nature's rage and fury have been evidently manifested through unprecedented seasonal and climatic changes, violent storms/cyclones, earthquakes, wild conflagration in the forests, global warming, inundation of vast tracts of land caused by heavy rainfall resulting in flood and creation of drought like situation leading to the loss of vegetation.

The romantic notion of Nature as the source of beauty, bliss and beatitude as expounded by Rousseau, Wordsworth, and Emerson has been proved to be an anathema in the last several decades. Ecologists, Environmentalists and Ecocritics have therefore tended to warn people time and again how to curb their materialistic ambitions and their propensity for exploiting/hegemonizing nature as a commodity. There is therefore an imperative necessity for nourishing an ecocentric perspective towards nature rather than an anthropocentric attitude characteristic of colonialism and imperialism. The ecocritical concepts like 'Ecophobia' and 'Gaia Hypothesis' are as such admittedly significant in postcolonial discourse with a view to celebrating the 'Song of the Earth'. The present chapter is a sincere attempt in this regard to deprecate 'Ecophobia' in favour of 'Gaia

Hypothesis' on the basis of an indepth analysis of Shakespeare's *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest*, *As You Like It*, and *The Winter's Tale*.

The term 'Ecophobia' was coined by David Sobel and Simon C. Estok in 1996 to convey 'climate anxiety' and a sense of helplessness and "dread about future" (1). Its root can be located in the Greek word 'Oikophobia'- 'oiko' meaning 'home' and 'phobia' signifying fear for losing home. Viewed from psychological perspective, 'phobia' points to excessive and unrealistic fear of a specific object or situation, and 'ecophobia' indicates a pervasive worry over environmental disaster. Two significant terms associated with 'ecophobia' are 'eco-anxiety', 'ecodespair' and taken together, these terms signify a feeling of helplessness in the grip of 'ecodisaster', 'ecodepression', climatic anxiety and 'ecodespair'. As a postcolonial ecocritical construct, 'ecophobia' encompasses many sided fears. Firstly, it is associated with fear for loss of serenity and beauty of nature and purity of environment/climate/landscape. Secondly, it is also connected with a deep psychological depression and despair for not being able to compensate the loss/harm that man has done to nature/environment. Thirdly, it also entails fear for nature's repulsive and retaliatory reaction/vengeance against the human world manifested in form of violent storm, torrential rain, and wild wind, tempestuous reaction of sea, unbearable thunder, lightning and volcanic eruption and enveloping darkness. Fourthly, it causes fear for loss of man-nature relationship and the healthy working of the ecosystem based on an inviolable affinity between biotic and abiotic elements. Fifthly, ecophobia also involves moral fear and guilt consciousness. Lastly, ecophobia also ignites in man a propensity for taming and manipulating nature so as to foil her destructive designs.

Keeping in view the aforesaid dimensions of Eco-colonialism and Eco-imperialism, Simon C Estok in his book *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia* (2011) maintains that "ecophobia is a pathological aversion toward nature, an aggravated form of anthropocentrism expressed variously as fear and hatred of or hostility toward nature's imagined unpredictability" (128). Estok's emphasis on environmental unpredictability can be satisfactorily negotiated in Shakespeare's maturest

tragedy *King Lear*. Again, viewed in a larger perspective, the concept of ecophobia involves ‘guilt consciousness’ of having done great injustice to young children and women, who symbolically represent nature from the standpoint of ecofeminism. This is fairly true in case of *King Lear* wherein much injustice is done to Cordelia by Lear. Estok further observes that ecophobia can be understood in an extended perspective in conjunction with such other concepts as Biophilia, Homophobia, Misogyny, Racism and Anti-Semitism. Estok observes:

If ecocriticism is committed to making connections, then it is committed to recognizing that there is a thing called ecophobia and that racism, misogyny, homophobia, and specialism are thoroughly interwoven with it and with each other and must eventually be looked at together (2011, 3).

The reason why Estok emphasizes understanding ecophobia in relation to other related concept is that ‘fear’ constitutes the centre of all these concepts. Whereas ecophobia points to climatic anxiety of losing identity and pure environment as also loathing of environment with cruelty and even revenge, homophobia “denotes fear and loathing of gays, lesbians and bisexuals”(3). In other words, homophobia entails negative attitudes and feelings towards the lesbians and transgenders. What is important to note about homophobia is that it is a type of irrational fear against lesbians, homosexuals and transgenders. But, in ecophobia, this fear is more situational/ circumstantial than irrational. Whereas homophobia is used extensively for LGBTQ people, transphobia is another related term which is used to signify discrimination against transgender people. In all these cases, the onus lies in contempt and prejudice, hostile behaviour and belligerent attitude prompted by an irrational fear and it is in this sense that they come closer to ecophobia (Estok 187-188). Whereas ecophobia and homophobia are grounded upon/in fear and contempt thereby facilitating binary opposition, Biophilia and Gaia

hypothesis are concepts that counter the notion of belligerent relationship between man and environment, between man and woman on the basis of sexuality.

Coined by the Harvard naturalist Dr. Edward O. Wilson, Biophilia lays emphasis on the innate feelings of man to love all other forms of life naturally, to respect the life forces to go on, and by the same logic, to emphasis human's love for nature and natural environment. In other words 'biophilia' points to 'natural feelings' for other forms of life which obviously reinforces our sense of obligation and responsibility to respect other forms of life and to protect nature/environment/landscape thereby formulating an ecocentric vision. The very etymological meaning of the term 'biophilia'- 'bio' meaning 'life' and 'philia' meaning 'love' of 'friendly feeling' was popularized by the German born US psychoanalyst Erich Fromm in the 1960's to establish the biological drive for self preservation- love for life and living things. It was in the late 1970's that American biologist Edward O. Wilson who in his book *Biophilia* added extended meaning to the term and used it for "the rich natural pleasure that comes from being surrounded by living organisms"(1984,1). Both Fromm and Wilson obviously come closer to the ideal ecocritical/ecological perspective that human world should respect the world of nature and that human beings should not destroy or disturb the affinity between biotic and abiotic elements that constitutes a sound ecosystem. The distinction between ecophobia on the one hand, and biophilia and Gaia hypothesis on the other is strongly reminiscent of the dichotomy between Eros (life) and Thanatos (death) in Greek exegesis. David Sobel in his book *Beyond Ecophobia: Reclaiming the Heart in Nature Education* (1996) tends to understand ecophobia not as a mere psychological phenomenon, but as 'a fear of ecological problems and the natural world'. In fact, viewed in an extended perspective, it entails according to Sobel, "fear of oil spills, rainforest destruction, whale hunting, acid rain, the ozone hole, and Lyme disease"(5).

To be precise, it encompasses environmental tragedy in which human beings are pitied against the violent forms of reactions and retaliation from nature that creates ecophobia. In the Elizabethan Age, the Renaissance man's vaulting ambition to ransack nature by exploiting rivers, seas, and ocean and the sylvan forest resources inevitably in-

vites environmental tragedy and Nature's retaliation against and chastisement of man. In Shakespeare's plays like *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, recent Scholars like Simon C. Estok have tended to situate adverse weather/climatic condition, 'environmental unpredictability', 'unpredictable natural space' and 'domestic places' and various indications and premonitions of environmental disaster that intensify ecophobia. In these Shakespearean plays, human tragedy is poignantly presented through ecophobia and environmental disasters that cause 'ecoanxiety' and 'ecodespair'.

To begin with *King Lear*, the play has been variously acclaimed as a tragedy of tempestuous passion, a spiritual, and a moral tragedy, a domestic tragedy, a tragedy of shortsightedness, a comedy of the grotesque, above all, a tragedy caused by 'error of judgment'. But, in post modern/post colonial discourse, ecocritics are inclined to call it an environmental tragedy and a tragedy of displacement. Simon C. Estok would prefer to analyze it in terms of a tragedy of 'environmental fear' of unpredictable 'natural' as well as 'domestic spaces'. Any study of *King Lear* would remain lopsided if it misses the question of ecophobia and environmental disaster experienced by the old *King Lear*. In this connection, Estok observes:

King Lear is vivid in its foregrounding of environmental unpredictability and its dramatization of a fear of nature. The play markets this dramatic ecophobia to an audience very familiar with grain shortages, bad harvests, cold weather, and profound storms(19).

King Lear is a poignantly pathetic tragedy in which patriarchy and colonial hegemony are criticized on one hand, and the ignoble defeat of 'power' and 'authority'- both domestic and political- is brought to the fore on the other. Though the king is pretty old, he commits the hamartia of the 'error of judgement' precisely because he is swayed away in the very opening scene of the play itself by the beguiling sugar-coated words of his eldest daughters Goneril and Regan. Exercise of absolute power and wrongful distribution of property (kingdom), illusion of true love and Lear's dereliction in duty,

both as a king and a father and banishment of Cordelia from the kingdom are the unacceptable deeds that are considered detrimental to the decree of Nature. Both 'royal power' and 'patriarchal power' are wrongly exercised to persecute 'sweet Cordelia'- the Nature's innocent child. Once she is banished from both 'domestic space' and 'royal space' (kingdom), there rises reactions from the 'environmental space'.

Environmental unpredictability looms large and ecophobia creeps in when the so called powerful king becomes powerless before the ruthless powers of nature. Cordelia is Nature's darling child. In this connection, John Danby in his book *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature* (1948) aptly maintains that Cordelia stands 'for nature herself' (20). And from Nature, she had learnt that true love stands for 'service' and 'sacrifice' in silence, and that true heart can't be 'heaved into mouth': 'my love's more richer than my tongue' (*King Lear* 1.1.79-80). Her behaviour towards her old father was characteristic of Environmental ethics. Nature loves spontaneously and showers love and affection upon human beings in silence without pride and without any demand for flattery in return. Unlike the old King Lear, Nature loves naturally with eco-friendly intention, and in Nature's kingdom, true love demands biophilia- natural love for all life forms without favour or discrimination. True love is neither demanded nor commanded. But in Shakespeare's play under question, the tragic hero demands love: "which of you shall we say doth love us most"? (*King Lear* 1.1.53) and commands her and finally banishes her by exercising his dynamics of power in a rash and irrationally outrageous way. Like Macbeth and Coleridge's ancient mariner, Lear too commits an 'innocent murder'. Even though he didn't murder her physically, he murdered Cordelia ethically and caused her unbearable misery and suffering which finally led to her death.

Environmental ethics entails that any injustice to 'natural goodness' invites Nature's rage and fury, and in *King Lear*, the old King deserves it. The postcolonial Ecocritics therefore consider the storm scene in *King Lear* as admittedly significant from the standpoint of ecocriticism and environmental ethics, whereas the traditional critics prefer to call it a 'moral tragedy' with considerable Christian significance. The greatest irony in *King Lear* is that the old father, though matured in age, is immature enough to

distinguish ‘false love’ (illusion) from ‘true love’ and that his demand for flattery blinded him with anger to take a wrong and rash decision to deprive Cordelia, his favourite child, of power, property and his true love. Lear-Cordelia dichotomy can be ecocritically interpreted as the clash between nature and Renaissance culture championed by Renaissance humanism and New Philosophy. The result of this conflict between New Science/New Philosophy and Nature is evident from Francis Bacon’s concept of ‘New Learning’ that advocates man’s divine right and domination over Nature.

In his “Order of Man, Order of Nature” (2013, 1-25) E. Montuschi has brilliantly brought to the fore Bacon’s idea of New Science that facilitates man’s domination over nature. Montuschi also blames Renaissance humanism for its collective ‘narcissism’ without bothering for Nature and the divine world. It is the Renaissance concept of ‘New Science and Advancement of Knowledge’ that made the Renaissance man a ‘subliminal egotist’ and a narcissist rather so as to undermine the divine world and also hegemonize the world of nature. The Renaissance egotism, as evidenced from Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* and Shakespeare’s *King Lear*, is characterized by an arrogant notion that nature is subservient to man, and that nature exist only to serve man’s needs. This is an anthropocentric and utilitarian approach which accounts for ecophobia- the desire to manipulate nature and tame nature’s ferocity and threat to environment. While problematizing Nature-culture dichotomy in *King Lear*, Estok points to Shakespeare’s threefold expression with ‘power’, ‘space’, ‘weather’. In the opening scene, the king exercises his dynamics of supreme power which is manifest through his tempestuous passion of anger and cruelty inflicted upon his ‘sweet Cordelia’. At the same time, Cordelia is deprived of his ‘domestic space’, ‘territorial space’, and paternal space. The problematization of ‘space’ is further extended to ‘environmental space’ in the play and the ‘weather’ plays a pivotal role to exercise environmental control thereby contributing significantly in the Storm Scene to the dynamics of ecophobia. Estok observes:

One of the things an ecocritical reading brings out is that the question

of power in *King Lear* has very broad social and environmental

implications and that the dependence of identity on environmental control is very strongly influenced by weather in this play(20).

The power of ecophobia in *King Lear* starts with Lear's dispossession of land/territory and division or transfer of power. The moment he gives away his 'territorial' and 'political 'space' (power) to Goneril and Regan, his identity is endangered. Once his masculine identity is threatened, in the absence of power and territory, he becomes a voiceless situational subaltern and viewed from ecofeminist perspective, his control over nature symbolized by his earlier control over daughters (particularly Goneril and Regan) is gone once and for all. He is rendered 'homeless' and 'voiceless' and bereft of power and identity, he is overpowered by his daughters- Goneril and Regan- and constantly haunted by ecophobia- fear of loss of land, power, space – those 'shadowy forests', 'champaigns rich'd', 'plenteous rivers and wide-skirted meads'(*King Lear* 1.1.62-64). It is his loss of power, lands and environment space that has reduced the old king to the state of nothingness. Though in his thundering voice, he reduced his sweet daughter Cordelia to a state of 'nothingness' ("Nothing will come of nothing: Speak again" (*King Lear* 1.1.87), nemesis befalls in the Act Two itself. Ironically speaking, the tragedy of *King Lear*, in the grip of ecophobia, is infact a tragedy of 'nothingness' and significantly, the word 'nothing' has been used in the opening scene as many as seven times. First of all, he reduced his most beloved daughter ('sweet Cordelia') to nothing:

Here I disclaim all my paternal care,

Propinquity and property of blood

And as a stranger to my heart and me

Hold thee from this forever" (*King Lear* 1.1.115-118).

King Lear's distribution of lands/property, division of state and delegation of his Divine Rights to the wrong hands of Goneril and Regan and punishment for innocent

Cordelia- the Nature's Lucy – all these taken together can be viewed, from the standpoint of ecocriticism, as an arrogant exercise of the anthropocentric notion of power over 'natural environment' which signifies amicable coexistence of all forms of life in an ecofriendly manner. But that doesn't happen in *King Lear* from the start to the finish and as Hamlet, the prince of Denmark rightly said about the condition of his country, in Lear's Universe, the 'time is out of joint'. Dislocation and division, displacement and dominance of culture over nature finally leads to conspiracy and treachery of daughters, fight for power and property between Edgar and Edmund, sufferings of both Lear and Cordelia, animosity between Goneril and Regan and invasion of the French armies. What is important to note here is that as soon as Lear exercises his anthropocentric propensity to divide the state and lands symbolizing nature, he is rendered to a state of 'nothingness'- at once displaced, dispossessed and "victimized by the weather, "unhoused and alienated" (Estok 21). Bereft of everything, the king becomes finally a poor nothing. His ecophobic state embodying fear for losing everything is poignantly articulated by Lear in a state of eco-anxiety and eco-despair:

Does any here know me? This is not Lear:

Does Lear walk thus? speak thus? Where are his eyes?

Either his notion weakens, his discerning

Are lethargied. Ha! waking? 'tis not so.

Who is it that can tell me who I am? (*King Lear* 1.4. 247 -252).

The old king's loss of 'land' and 'habitat/home' coupled with the sheer ingratitude and cruel hospitality of Goneril and Regan not only aggravated the eco-crisis and threatened his identity, but also more shockingly affected his mental stability finally leading him to the point of madness: "O! let me not be mad" (1.5.51). What is pertinent to observe here is that Ecophobia in *King Lear* eats into the very vitals of the king- both externally and internally. Whereas externally, Nature chastised him through 'violent storm' and 'unpredictable weather' to which he was nakedly exposed in the Storm

Scene, internally, he was masochistically tortured by his self-reflection, self-torture and maddening state of mind. Ecophobia therefore runs in both the levels. The 'nothingness' of mortal life in case of the old king is ironically contrasted with the absolute dominance of natural environment thereby reducing Lear to a state of 'poor nothing'- the reason why *King Lear* is often acclaimed as a moral tragedy- a tragedy of nothingness.

In the Storm Scene, Lear is stricken with fear for belligerent Nature and surrenders before her like a poor and helpless situational subaltern. Lear is no Prospero of *The Tempest* to have full control over the environment- both natural and human. Unlike Prospero who dominates both Caliban and the spirits, Lear is dominated by wicked human world of Goneril and Regan on one hand and the hostile world of natural environment epitomized by 'unpredictable weather' and violent storm on the other. Lear surrenders before Nature out of fear like a situational subaltern: "You owe me no subscription. Here I stand your slave" (3.3.18-19). There is a sudden dramatic change in his identity from 'master to slave'. The King's self proclaimed arrogance that he is "every inch of a King" (4.5.106) is awfully defeated. And viewed from postcolonial ecofeminist perspective, it is a defeat of patriarchy and absolute power and control over land/territory/environmental space. In this connection, Simon.C.Estok rightly observes that Lear's ecophobia is largely associated with socio-political and environmental factors with emphasis on the politics of power- both political and environmental (20).

'Weather' plays a prominent part in *King Lear* in conjunction with the furious manifestation of the primordial agents of nature-wind, storm, thunder, lightning and incessant rain in the Storm Scenes (*King Lear*, Act 3, Scene 1-3). The Storm Scenes constitute the very dramatic core of the play and the storm is extraordinarily mysterious with considerable uncanny implications. The elements of nature roar fretfully; the thunderbolt is terrible; lightening is sulphurous; the wind seems to blow the earth into the sea; at the night is so terrible that even the lions, bears and wolves stay back in their dens out of fear. Here, ecophobia extends from human world to animal world as well.

Blow winds, and crack your cheeks! rage! blow!

You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout

Till you have drench'd out steepless, drown'd the cocks!

You sulphurous and thought-executing fires,

Vaunt-couriers to oak-cleaving thunderbolts,

Sing my white head! (*King Lear* 3.2.1- 6).

It is on such a terrible night that the old and helpless king is turned out of doors by his wicked daughters. Gloucester wonders at the cruelty and inhumanity of the King's daughters and laments that they have exposed their father "whose kind heart gave all in forms of 'power' and 'land' to them (Act 1, Scene 2). Significantly, moral fear for the furious Nature is to manifest through fear for women. Whereas Cordelia epitomizes the pure, benign and serene self of Nature, Goneril and Regan embody her destructive nuances through their inhumanity and ingratitude. Strikingly enough, Lear himself complains in the storm scene that he should have been more kind and lovable to the elements of nature than giving his kingdom to the ungrateful daughters. Traditional Shakespearean criticism regarded the storm, thunder, lightning and rain as agents of 'Spiritual redemption', whereas the ecocritics analyze them as agents of ecophobia embodying several social, political, psychological and moral lessons through the sufferings of Lear. Firstly, the old king realizes that he has passed on his power and the kingdom of Britain into wrong hands and therefore he admits his mistake and surrenders himself before the terrible elements of Nature as a "poor, infirm, weak and despis'd old man"(*King Lear* 3.2.20). Secondly, now that he is punished, Lear calls upon the elements not to leave his 'pernicious daughters' unpunished at all. He blames the furious elements of (3.2.21) nature as 'servile ministers' of the Divine inflicting injury to a weak old man by leaving the stronger ones scot free. While fearlessly saying so, Lear perhaps indicates that all political tyrants, power-mongers and pernicious daughters of the world (including

his own) should also share the intensity of ecophobia like him and justice should prevail equally; though he himself did injustice to Cordelia:

But yet I call you servile ministers,

That have will with two pernicious daughters join'd

You high-engender'd battles 'gainst a head

So old and white as this. O! O! 'tis foul (*King Lear* 3.2.21-24)

Significantly, ecophobia is shared by many in the play though in lesser degree. In Act 3, Scene 1, when the storm starts with thunder and lightning in the heath, Kent wonders at the 'foul weather' and his gentlemen companion is deeply concerned about the old king who helplessly competes with the turbulent weather ("impetuous blasts"). He further informs Kent that the old man 'tears his white hairs' as the violently moving gust of wind catch him with blind vehemence and 'eyeless rage' (8).

In a state of utter helplessness, the king runs bare headed and shouts desperate exclamations. Even in Act 2, Scene 4, Regan, Gloucester, Cornwall and Goneril were afraid of an impending storm and the 'wild night' which corresponds to the inward storm in the old king born out of anger, humiliation, cruel hospitality and injustice meted out to him by his daughters. This is an incurable storm within which leads Lear to a state of madness: "O fool, I shall go mad" (*King Lear* 1.4. 289). In Act 3, Scene 4, Lear himself admits that storm within is more powerful and painful than the storm without because the unexpected 'filial ingratitude' (*King Lear*, 3.4.14) has shattered him to a cipher bereft of identity. Lear also admonishes those criminals and moral offenders of the society ('bloody hands') to tremble- a brilliant testimony to the fact that ecophobia is a universal phenomenon, a moral sentinel that inculcates fear in every human being to respect nature and environment and to allow the ecosystem to work naturally without any disturbance or interference from the human.

Viewed from ecocritical perspective, the storm scene is a parable of ecophobic ethic and Lear is an extended metaphor signifying all offenders of Nature and environment. The same Lear who defied justice and wrongly exercised his power clamours for justice again and again, especially against his pernicious daughters. From the standpoint of psychology, this is Lear's inner- insecurity, loss of power, land, and identity as well. That is why; he calls upon the elements to take revenge upon his daughters. Viewed from ecophobic angle, Lear finds parallel between the violent external storm and the violent pernicious Goneril and Regan. Therefore, he suspects that the 'wind' and the 'storm' are in league with his daughters and act as their agents in tormenting him. This is a brilliant instance of ecophobia. Moreover, Shakespeare has made use of pathetic fallacy to attribute human action and emotions to elements of Nature. The violent reaction and terrific rage and fury of external nature correspond to Lear's rage and fury in mind and to the ruthless cruelty and inhuman treatment of his daughters.

Ecophobia in *King Lear* bears strong moral implications. It is not the fear of Lear for losing land, power, and environment alone; the fear is also experienced by others. While inviting the fury of the storm, the old king warns all criminals and sinners to hide themselves or else they will be destroyed by the rage and fury of nature. Time and again, Lear grumbles that the stormy elements should have chastised his ungrateful daughters who are also no less worried about the storm and the 'wild night'. As regards the political implications, Lear suffers from ecophobia for having wrongly handed over his kingdom to two wicked daughters, for depriving his Nature's Lucy (Cordelia) from power and justice and for exercising his absolute power over human and natural world ('land' and forests) through his principle of 'division of land'. Environmental ethics doesn't approve of anthropocentric outlook of the king to divide and destroy but patronizes ecocentric vision and integrated ecoconsciousness. Moreover, human dominion and division of land/ territory of a kingdom on the basis of purely personal reason/ interest is a sheer injustice to the people and to the sound ecosystem which is based on an amicable affinity between biotic and abiotic elements.

In the Storm Scene, weather is foul; fire, rain, stormy wind, lightning and thunder, all indicate the terrible reaction of elements because of the imbalance in eco-system. Even though Lear is fully aware of the importance of the environment in his kingdom which is enriched with 'shadowy forests', 'plenteous rivers' and wide skirted meads'(1.1.67), he manipulates the 'bounteous land' with his 'anthropocentric arrogance', and as a result, his injustice to environment generates ecophobia in the play. Estok maintains that Lear's utilitarian approach to nature and irrational decision of division of land landed him in a "dangerous space" of chaotic nothingness (26) to be "victimized by the weather" (21).

Ecophobia can be negotiated in quite a good number of plays with emphasis on 'weather' and 'storm'. Apart from *King Lear*, 'foul weather' and 'violent storm' continue to dominate both *Macbeth* and *The Tempest*. *Macbeth* begins with 'foul weather' on a vast heath where three witches appear to invoking fear in the mind of the audience from the very beginning. The witches are inseparable from 'weather' and this is evident from the very opening line itself: "When shall we three meet again? /In thunder, lightning or in rain? (*Macbeth* 1.1.1-2). The three witches come upon the heath with 'thunder' and lightning which is strongly reminiscent of the storm scenes in *King Lear*. Surprisingly enough, they were characterized as capable enough to raise storms. With their peculiar and awful physical features, the witches in *Macbeth* 'look not like th' inhabitants o'th Earth' (1.3.4). More predominantly, they symbolize chaos and disorder in nature as exemplified through 'thunder' and lightning', 'fog and filthy air'. Estok not only calls them 'wild', unearthly beings', but also wonders how the witches "challenge the boundaries of the human through their association with nature" (2011, 12). It is now obvious that the witches are inevitably associated with 'foul weather' and filthy air', and more predominantly with thunder and lightning that cause ecophobia in the audience/reader.

Shakespeare poignantly presents how the unpredictability of the natural world can be located in the sudden and dramatic appearance of the witches in front of Macbeth after he returns from the battle with laurels of victory. Though in *King Lear*, it took some time

to create ecophobia in the minds of the audience, in *Macbeth*. Shakespeare creates a fearful atmosphere in the very beginning itself. Besides ‘fog’ and filthy air’, thunder and lightning, Macbeth’s sudden interface with the three witches on the heath provides a fitting objective correlative to create a startling aesthetic emotion in which ‘fear’ is mixed with wonder’(bhayanaka rasa). The audience is informed that with their ‘transient corporality’ (Estok 102) the witches have capacity to melt into the air “as breath into the wind” (1.2.82). While arousing ‘fear’ and ‘curiosity’, Shakespeare applies with subtlety his supernatural imagination to create ‘ecophobic’ situation for the satisfaction of the curious Renaissance audience that evinces keen interest in the supernatural. These women like weird beings are associated with nature and are mysteriously portrayed as ‘wild and unpredictable as weather’: “The earth has bubbles as the water has, /And these are of them” (1.3.79-80). Ecophobia negotiates with eco-feminism here, as human fear for ‘foul weather’ is combined with fear for woman (witches). In this connection, one is reminded of Emma Griffith’s observation that “human fears of hostile cosmos can be transformed into male fears about women” (2012: 46-47). Macbeth’s human fear of the ‘instruments of darkness’ obviously arouses the fear of the audience for the unpredictable weather and witches/women:

If good, why do I yield to that suggestion
 Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair
 And make my seated heart knock at my ribs,
 Against the use of nature? Present fears
 Are less than horrible imaginings; (1.3.134-137)

Macbeth is torn between ‘physical fear’ and ‘horrible imaginings’ and by using the word ‘horrible’ for his ‘imaginative fear’, Shakespeare puts the audience in deep suspense, as it tacitly points to the ‘murder’ of Duncan which is more horrible indeed. Even though both Macbeth and the audience are involved in the ecophobia aesthetic, Gwilyn Jones in his perceptive analysis of the impact of storm in Shakespeare’s plays

such as *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *The Tempest* holds that ‘storm’ in Shakespeare’s play has both ‘dramatic’ and ‘threatening’ dimensions. It is dramatic because of its nature of ‘unpredictability’ and more importantly, it is ‘threatening’ in its pervasive impact/effect of an appeal to the audience (2015, 3). This is all the more true in case of *Macbeth* in which the audience is deeply overpowered with ecophobia than Macbeth himself. They realize the beauty of the ‘fair’ and the violent damage that the ‘foul’ (evil) causes. The weather was fair and fine when Macbeth came with victory, and suddenly the weather changes and turns violent with the appearance of the witches which signifies that something ominous is going to happen.

From the standpoint of ecophobia, the audience is constantly in the grip of fear-environmental fear in form of thunder, lightning, rain and the three witches. At the same time, they also apprehend ominous and calamitous days in future, if Macbeth becomes the king in place of Duncan to fulfil the third prophecy given by the witches: “that shalt be king hereafter!” (1.3.50). In his introduction to the book *Shakespeare’s Storms*, Gwilym Jones argues that *Macbeth* stages different concepts of weather. “Foul is fair/ Fair is foul” (1.1.11) and that the weather has both distinct ‘natural’ and ‘supernatural’ dimensions (3). Whereas the natural dimension points to peace, happiness and a balanced ecosystem, the supernatural facet embodies fear for the storm, thunder, lightning, and rain signifying chaos, confusion, ominous happenings in the dark like the innocent murder of Duncan, King of Scotland. There is no denying the fact that a darkness characteristic of ecophobia permeates *Macbeth* precisely because the major part of the action takes place in the ‘murk of night’ (Wilson Knight 165). The blood cuddling- fear arouses by darkness is experienced by Lady Macbeth herself:

Come, thick night

And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of Hell

That my keen knife see not the wound it makes,

Nor Heaven peep through the blanket of the dark

To cry, Hold! Hold! (1.5.51-52)

Shakespeare has made use of such evocative metaphor drawn from the world of nature as ‘thick night’, ‘smoke of Hell’, and ‘blanket of the dark’ which is further intensified by the ecophobic psychological condition experienced by Macbeth as well. Macbeth wants that fight should start with fire and that darkness should augment his black and deep desires rather than the disturbing light.

Stars, hide your fires.

Let not light see my black and deep desires;

The eye wink at the hand; yet let that be,

Which the eye fears, when it is done, to see (1.4.50)

In Chapter Six of his seminal book *Shakespeare's Storms* (2016), Gwilyn Jones tends to argue that in *Macbeth*, Shakespeare has tended to exhibit “the familiar and obvious relationship of storms and the supernatural”(86). Whereas thunder and lightning mark the entrance of the witches, Jones argues that a meteorological reading of *Macbeth* signifies supernatural origin of the remarkable weather. This learned critic further points to the distinction between ‘a natural storm’ and ‘a supernatural storm’. Significantly, it may be noted here that magic is applied by Prospero to create the storm in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* and that *Macbeth* stages a storm in the backdrop of the supernatural. This is obvious from the stormy opening of the play:

Thunder and lightning. Enter *three* Witches

When shall we three meet again?

In thunder, lightning, or in rain? (1.1.1-2)

The noise of thunder and storms, the cries of the familiar spirits that attended upon the witches and the fear of lightning have jostled together to create an ecophobic conditions in *Macbeth* wherein the external storm originating from the supernatural is subsequently combined with the internal fear and storm that is experienced by Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. The 'foul' play of Macbeth's 'murderous passion' destabilizes both the 'human' and the absolute power, ignited by the prophecy of the witches and by Lady Macbeth at home, prompted noble Macbeth to change the 'fair' into 'foul'. The fair and noble Macbeth turned into a foul and 'monstrous beast' (1.3.38). The powerful line in the play, "the Fair is foul, and foul is fair" (1.1.12) can be succinctly interpreted in terms of three different worlds- the world of environment, of Macbeth and that of the witches.

In the first place, Macbeth's monstrous deed enraged the natural world which is represented by foul weather with thunder, lightning and rain. It is further indicative of the fact that both the terms 'foul and fair' carry the "pervasive effect of the witches on the climate and of the invisibility inherent in their conjuring" (Jones 89). Interestingly, neither Macbeth nor any other character in the play has seen the invisible working of the witches to condition the climate and the weather. This unpredictability is also characteristic of an ecophobic situation. Ecophobia in Shakespeare is characterized more often than not by unpredictability, and this is fairly true in case of *Macbeth*. Taken together, thunder, storm and lightning in *Macbeth* are found to be unpredictable, precisely because the three witches determine the weather supernaturally thereby making the situation more exciting and unpredictable. The unpredictability of the storm and the thunder has been emphasized by Gwilym Jones time and again (92-93) under the dictates of the supernatural element. Jones observes:

It is crucial to bear in mind the supernatural force of weather
which proves an immediate point of reference. Whatever power
the Witches have, the extensive correlation of their appearance
and the thunder and lightning identifies both them and the storm

as supernatural (90-91).

Jones's observation about unpredictability about weather arousing ecophobia is all the more evident in the following lines from *Macbeth*. The incarnations of the Witches and their relation to the weather dominate the opening and the third scene. On the intermediate scene, however, a different stance is taken:

As whence the sun' gins his reflection
 Shipwrecking storms and direful thunders strike,
 So from that spring whence comfort seemed to come,
 Discomfort swells. (1.2.25-8)

Secondly, the witches, unlike the ghost of King Hamlet, are distanced from human world because they have no human form and have the capacity to vanish. But, at the same time they have the capacity to create chaos by virtue of their supernatural power and prophecy. In this connection, Peter Stallybrass in his brilliant article "Macbeth and Witchcraft": In Focus on Macbeth" (1982), observes that the witches in Macbeth are connected with "disorder in nature"-both internal and external. Whereas chaos and disorder in external nature is signified by thunder, lightning, rain and the foul weather as a whole, that in Macbeth points to his vaulting ambition and destructive passion that led the noble general to murder his innocent king. This 'innocent murder' in the human world creates commotion in the natural world and this is true of *King Lear*, *Macbeth* and *Othello*.

Environmental ethics postulates that any injustice to the 'innocence' in human world- injustice to Cordelia in *King Lear* and Duncan in *Macbeth*- infuriates the world of nature and therefore what is 'fair' becomes 'foul' and revengeful. This revenge is revealed through the violent mental reaction, madness and suffering in *King Lear* and *Macbeth* as well. Significantly, monstrosity, unbridled and unjust passion for power and kingdom ('land') leading to chaos and -disruption of natural order constitute the core of

Shakespearean ecocritical discourse. Macbeth disrupts the social, political and moral order by killing his innocent king in sleep and this is an act against naturalness. Since he has killed his innocent king at night, he committed a sin against nature because sleep is a natural experience at night. Hence in Nature's court, Macbeth has no right to sleep at night, as he has committed double murder against nature- murder of his innocent king and murder of 'sleep' at night too. Therefore, he has to pay heavily for it from the standpoint of ecocriticism and infact; he goes mad and passes sleepless nights as well:

Macbeth does murder sleep, the innocent sleep,

Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care,

The death of each day's life, sore labor's bath

Balm of hurt minds, great

Nature's second course, chief

nourisher in life's feast" (1.2.40)

It is nature's voice that torments Macbeth with the warning that sleep being nature's greatest gift to man at night ('chief nourisher in life's feast'), the murderer of sleep at night will not sleep any more:

Still it cried, 'Sleep no more!' to all the house:

'Glamis hath murdered sleep, and therefore Cawdor

Shall sleep no more. Macbeth shall sleep no more! (2.2.44-45)

With this intense realization that he has committed 'double murder', with his blood-stained daggers in hand, Macbeth physically trembles and morally falters. He is even afraid to wash his 'blood- stained hands'- 'this filthy witness' has no guts to do. This is a brilliant scene of ecophobia –murder at night and injustice to innocent creatures

of Nature- that involves ‘double fear’- of Macbeth on one hand, and of the audience on the other:

I’ll go no more

I am afraid to think what I have done

Look on it again I dare not” (2.2.51-53)

Sleep imagery is common to many Shakespearean plays and it signifies a state of serenity and ‘tranquil silence’. Romantic aesthetics prescribes that nature manifests its full potential in silence from the cacophony of the maddening crowd that stands for the ‘economic man’ in Environmental Ethics. In *Macbeth*, Shakespeare admires ‘sleep’ as ‘chief nourisher of life’, ‘great nature’s second course’ and ‘balm of hurt minds’ (2.2.40). In *Julius Caesar*, Brutus has no sleep, like Macbeth. Cassius instigates him against Caesar, and turbulent Brutus advises Lucius to enjoy ‘the honey- heavy dew of slumber’ in a carefree mind:

Enjoy the honey-heavy dew of slumber:

There hast no figures nor no fantasies

Which busy care draws in the brains of men;

Therefore, thou sleep’st so sound (*Julius Caesar*. 2.1 230-233)

After Caesar’s murder and with the appearance of his ghost, Brutus is in the grip of nightmarish fear, and as such like Macbeth, he is condemned to ‘sleep no more’. More significantly, Brutus’s wife Portia is also concerned for/about his ‘sleeplessness’ (2.1.29). The most terrible punishment for Lady Macbeth is loss of sleep combined with her deranged mental state in the fearful sleep-walking scene. The very fact that Macbeth asks the doctor for some ‘sweet oblivious’ antidote’(4.2.43) to cure her agonized consciousness symbolically points to the fact that ‘sleep’, like Nature’, is therapeutic in nature. G. Wilson Knight in his famous book *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of*

Shakespearean Tragedy (2001) aptly observes that ‘one of the worst terrors of the Macbeth and Brutus experience is imaged as a loss of the sweet curative of sleep’ (145). If Duncan stands for innocence, peace, concord and unity of life signifying ecocentric vision, Macbeth stands for blood, murder, power, and bereft of sleep and hence peace thereby epitomizing the anthropocentric vision of man. Wilson Knight rightly observes that with his love for ‘crown’, ‘country’, ‘family’, ‘kinsmen’ and ‘thanes’, Duncan stands for unity in Macbeth (1.4.35), and that all are ‘bound close together’ by a ‘natural law in proper place and allegiance’(125). This is the call of ecocriticism- respect for a balanced ecosystem- which is violated by Macbeth, King Lear and Lady Macbeth. The ‘evil’ in Macbeth opposes this ‘order’. The ‘metaphysics of evil’, as Wilson Knight names it, is contrasted with the environmentally ecocentric ethics of ‘order’ and ‘innocence’. This duality between good and evil is brilliantly brought out by Shakespearean through his depiction of duality in Nature through ‘storm’ and ‘animal’ imagery. Banquo describes serene and peaceful face of nature before Duncan’s murder in Macbeth’s castle. The King himself is highly pleased with nature’s soothing balm:

This castle hath a pleasant seat. The air

Nimbly and sweetly recommends itself

Unto our gentle senses (1.4.1-3)

The serene face of nature is described by Banquo with a romantic zest and poetic charm:

This quest of summer,

The temple- haunting martlet, does approve

By his loved mansionry that the heaven’s breath

Smells wooingly here. No jutting, frieze

Buttress, nor coign of vantage, but this bird

Hath made his pendant bed and procreant cradle.

Where they most breed and haunt, I have observed

The air is delicate (*Macbeth*, 1.5.3-10)

Wilson Knight brilliantly locates a dichotomy between Banquo's description of the 'delicate air' and 'heaven's breath' of summer which provides a perfect contrast to 'evil' in Macbeth's nature. This 'metaphysics of evil' is manifested through Macbeth's murder of the 'innocent king' and 'innocent sleep' on the one hand, and its external manifestation through the bestiality of animals and rage and fury of nature in the 'murderous night' on the other. On the night of murder, Lennox describes to Macbeth how horrible the ominous night has become:

The night has been unruly: when we lay,
Our chimneys were blown down; and as they say,
Lamentings heard I' the air- strange screams of death;
And, prophesying with accents terrible
Of dire combustion and confus'd events
New-hatch'd to the woeful time, the obscure bird
Clamour'd the live-long night: Some say the earth
Was feverous and did shake (2.3.60)

The unruly night, the outrageous wind that blew away the chimneys, the strange screams of death confused events, clamoring of the obscure bird throughout the long night and above all, the shaking of the feverish earth- all these uncanny happenings of the ominous nights caused ecophobia in the mind of the audience/reader. In this connection, Gwilyn Jones argues that in these lines the weather is conditioned by natural causes without any supernatural intervention. A.C.Bradley in his masterpiece *Shakespearean Tragedy* (2010) emphasizes the ecophobic nature of the situation which is evident from

Bradley's observation that Duncan was murdered in "the frightful hurricane of the night" (337). Wilson Knight locates three most obvious forms of symbolism in *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* that inculcate/evoke ecophobia. These are symbolism associated with 'storm', 'animal', and 'blood' representing 'fear', 'bestiality' and 'violent passion' for murder (147) respectively. Knight observes:

They stand for contest, destruction and disorder in the outer
world and in the reader's mind, mirroring the contest,
destruction, and disorder both in the soul of the hero and in
that element of the poet's intuitive experience to which
the plays concerned give vivid and concrete dramatic form (148).

Wilson Knight's aforesaid observation enforces the fact that ecophobia extends from the hero to the poet/dramatist and from the poet/dramatist to the audience. The storm imagery is made all the more poignant and appealing in the opening scene of *Julius Caesar* and pathetic fallacy combined with personification make the imagery all the more visually powerful, fearful yet relishable with wonder and awe. While addressing Cicero about the nature of the storm, Casca wonders:

I have seen tempests, when the scolding winds
Have riv'd the knotty oaks; and I have seen
The ambitious ocean swell and rage and foam,
To be exalted with the threat'ning clouds:
But never to-night, never till now,
Did I go through a tempest dropping fire (*Julius Caesar*.1.3. 5-10)

Significantly, the storm is connected with the ‘civil strife in heaven’, and also with the wrath of the gods which is caused by the man-made ‘chaos and disorder’ of the world that invites destruction. This is a brilliant instance of ecophobia caused by the destruction of order in ecosystem.

Either there is a civil strife in heaven

Or else the world, too saucy with the gods,

Incenses them to send destruction (1.3.11-13)

Together with ‘storm’, ‘blood imagery creates Senecan horror and fear in the audience. For instance, Calpurnia dreams of Caesar’s ‘pure blood’, gushing forth ‘like a fountain with a hundred spouts’ (2.2.77) is unfortunately materialized in reality when ‘the fiery’ Roman rebel- warriors stabbed Caesar from all sides and ‘drizzled’ blood upon the capitol’ (2.2.19). The word ‘blood’/ ‘bloody’ appears seventeen times in Act III, Scene I alone and blood-thirsty Brutus advises the conspirators to stoop and bath their swords in Caesar’s blood. Like Brutus, Macbeth too dramatically expresses his blood-thirsty demoniac urge with horror and fear that moves the audience:

What hands are here! Ha! they pluck out mine eyes.

Will all great Neptune’s ocean wash this blood

Clean from my hand? No, this my hand will rather

The multitudinous seas incarnadine,

Making the green one red (*Macbeth* 2.2.60-64)

Wilson Knight aptly comments that “in both plays the essentially murderous and destructive nature of the action is emphasized by recurrent blood imagery” (56). Besides ‘blood’, animal imagery constitutes and the effective medium through which Shakespeare develops the theme of ‘disruption of natural order’ as well as reversal of moral order and environmental consciousness. The unnatural behaviour of characters in Shakespearean

tragedy not only invites the rage and fury of heaven, but also infuriates the animal world and imbalances the eco-system. The unnatural behaviour in the human world has its direct repercussion in the world of birds, animals and elements of heaven as well. Wilson Knight argues that these creatures representing nature “suggestive of a disjointed and disorganized state”, and that “they are creatures of unnatural disorder reflecting the unnatural and disorderly acts of Brutus and Macbeth” (152). The harmony and order of a ‘natural man, both externally and internally, as emphasized in Environmental ethics is broken, and this prompts/propels beasts and birds to behave in an altogether outrageous way. The murder of Caesar and Duncan is heralded by several unnatural phenomenon.

The beasts and birds like lion and owl break all habits of their ‘quality and kind’ (1.3.64). The bird of night sits at the market place hooting and shrieking at noon (1.3.17). Graves have opened and the dead ones are found walking forth shrieking. This ominous change from ‘innocence’ to ‘barbarity’ generates ecophobia (1.2.60). To, Wilson Knight, ‘vivid- animal disorder symbolism’ is profusely permeated in Macbeth wherein the animals are in most part, characterized as fierce, ugly or ill-omened. There are references to ‘Hyrcan tiger’, armed rhinoceros, and ‘rugged Russian bear’ (3.4.100-101). Whereas wolves howl (2.1.54), the raven croaks with the entrance of Duncan under Lady Macbeth’s battlements (1.5.39). The owl is depicted as a ‘fatal bell-man who gives the stern’st good night’ (1.2.4). Shakespeare has copiously used animal imagery in Macbeth to show the ‘rage and fury’ of the animal world against the ‘innocent murder’ of Duncan. There are hounds, and mongrels, spaniels and curs, water-rugs and demi-wolves (3.1.93), the ‘cloistered flight’ of bat and the sounding row in the ‘rooky wood’. All these ‘night’s black agents’ (3.2.13-53) evoke many-sided ecophobic situations that stand for the dance of death, destruction and colossal loss to life and environment.

Knight has insightfully located unpredictability in the world of nature through the irrational behaviour of animals and birds which corresponds to the ‘hideous abnormality’ in the world of man. Even Macbeth’s poisonous state of mind is best expressed through an animal imagery that his mind is full of ‘scorpions’ (3.2.36). Even Macbeth’s dual state of mind is brilliantly brought to the fore through the positive and negative aspects of the

animal world. For instance, the valiant Macbeth is compared to a 'lion' and 'eagle' and the same Macbeth as a murderer is compared to an 'owl' and 'hell-hound'. Fear for unruly and ferocious beasts and birds is best expressed through ecophobic situations of three worlds- human, animal and supernatural that are absolutely in the grip of the 'metaphysics of evil'. Even the most faithful horses of Duncan develop monstrosity: "Tis said they eat each other" (2.4.18). At the same time, the nocturnal habit of the one corresponds to the sleeplessness of Macbeth and also signifies his cowardishness to hunt (murder) the innocent 'falcon' (Duncan) at night. Whereas, the owl clamours throughout the night, the ghastly tempest roars with 'screams of death' and the earth herself trembles with fear' (2.3.60-67).

In the Cauldron Scene, ecophobia is aroused by three weird sisters who, with their fearful beard are found preparing the 'holocaust of filth'. The whole play abounds in instances of ecophobia signified by mystery and darkness, abnormality and hideousness, irrationality and tempestuous behaviour of both human and animal world which satisfactorily convinces the audience/readers about 'the essential fearsomeness of the universal' (166). Five decades before the publication of Simon.C.Estok's book *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Rereading Ecophobia* (2011), Wilson Knight had heroically and also insightfully brought to the fore the 'essential fearsomeness of this universe'. Knight observes:

We are confronted by mystery, darkness, abnormality,

hideousness and therefore by fear. The word 'fear' is ubiquitous.

All may be unified as symbols of this emotion. Fear is predominant.

Everyone is afraid. There is scarcely a person in the play who does not feel and voice at the same time a sickening, nameless terror.

The impact of the play is analogous to nightmare (*The Wheel of Fire* 167).

The nightmare and abnormal quality of the Macbeth universe stands vindicated by the foul weather and the ferocious tempest, the phantasies and ghosts, the dagger of Macbeth's mind, the ghost of Banquo and the three weird sisters appearing in the heath with thunder, lightning and rain. The very beginning of Macbeth shows that the witches are inseparable to weather in Macbeth and that the heath is the meeting place of the witches. As the mysterious stage for the enactment of the drama of ecophobia, the heath constitutes a 'wasteland of little value' (Bruckner 209).

Significantly, ecophobia also appears in form of Macbeth's fear for the movement of Birnam Wood which he had thought to be impossible. The march of Macduff's army under the cover of the twigs and branches of Birnam forest hastens Macbeth's fear for death and his philosophical musing on life as a 'tale told by an idiot' signifies Nature's victory over the ambitious and power-mongering anthropocentric world of Macbeth. Whereas the heath stands for chaos, disorder, destructive passion and power of Macbeth, Birnam forest walking up to Macbeth's castle on Dunsinane Hill of Scotland stands for nemesis- nature's revenge (5.3.2). Though it is an optical illusion, Birnam Wood can be viewed through ecocritical lens, as retaliation of Nature against the innocent murder of Duncan, just as the Storm in *King Lear* chastises and chastens King Lear through suffering for having deprived Cordelia of 'land', 'justice' and 'paternal love'. Malcolm and Macduff take revenge upon Macbeth under the protection of the 'forest' (Nature) at daytime, whereas Macbeth, the victim of 'metaphysics of evil', killed innocent Duncan under the 'cover of darkness'. Towards the fag end of the play, nature symbolized by Birnam Wood strikes back and Macbeth is killed.

In this connection, Wilson Knight highlights Shakespeare's ecoconsciousness by his insightful observation; 'This is creative nature, accusing, asserting her strength after her long torment of destruction (*The Wheel of Fire* 141). What he means to say is that virtue and order were restored to counter anthropocentric vision of life. Wilson Knight interprets nature's move as a 'peculiar reversal' of the situation through 'deceit' (movement of the forest). The movement of Macduff's army under the cover of forest points, according to L.C.Knight points to the dubious measure of 'deceit' which

Macbeth had applied to murder Duncan-king as the invited guest. However, this ‘deceit’ delivers a significant ecocentric message that Nature knows how to take revenge in order to set the environment in right track by removing, ‘the weight of horror’ (ecophobic) from the mind of the audience (2006, 62). The canvas of ecophobia in Shakespeare plays extends from tragedy to comedy and dramatic romance. In the post-colonial and postmodern discourses, *The Tempest*, *The Winter’s Tale* and *The Taming of the Shrew* have been critically discussed from the standpoint of power, hegemony, eco-feminism with emphasis on the concept of ‘other’.

Ecophobia can be contested by celebrating the song of the earth. To celebrate the song of the earth is to reclaim a sound ecological system/ecocentric vision by tenaciously imbibing the philosophy of Biophilia and Gaia hypothesis. Gaia hypothesis as such celebrates the glory and magnanimity of the Mother goddess Earth which is suggested by the concept of Song of the Earth. Otherwise called Gaia Theory or Gaia principle, the Gaia hypothesis can be taken as a powerful panacea to heal the environmental wounds created by Ecophobia. Derived from the Greek word ‘Gaia’ meaning Earth, Gaia is regarded in Greek mythology as the primordial goddess of Earth. The goddess Earth epitomizes at once creativity, preservation, and protection for her creation(s) with patience, motherly affection and benevolence. Her Indian counterpart can be located in the goddess Dharitrī (Prithvi) who is worshipped as the mother goddess of fertility, creativity, protection and preservation. In Vedic mythology and Classical Sanskrit literature, the mother goddess has been eulogized in conjunction with the sky who like the Greek Uranus embodies the masculine potential that fertilizes the mother earth through rain. In other words, out of the union between sky and the earth, the world of vegetation emerges for the sustenance of the countless living beings.

‘The Gaia hypothesis’ as a concept was formulated by the chemist James Lovelock and the microbiologist Lynn Margulis in the 1970’s, and is studied in the discipline of Geo psychology, Earth Science and Ecology as well. The scientific explanation of Gaia hypothesis consists in how the biosphere and the evolution of life forms contributed to the stability of Global temperature, ocean salinity, oxygen in the

atmosphere and other factors of habitability. It views Earth as a single integrated organism, capable of sustaining and rejuvenating itself through self-regulating mechanisms. As a self regulating system it involves the biosphere, the atmosphere, the hydrosphere and the pedosphere, tightly coupled as an evolving system. It points to broad stabilization of the conditions of habitability in a full homeostasis. In environmental ecology it is accepted as an “ecological hypothesis proposing that the biosphere and the physical components of the earth (atmosphere, cryosphere, hydrosphere and lithosphere) are closely integrated to form a complex interacting system that maintains the climatic and bio chemical condition of earth in a preferred homeostasis” (James Lovelock- Gaia hypothesis environment.ecology.com). The theory is based on the idea that the biomass self regulates the conditions of the planet to make its physical environment more hospitable to the species which constitute its life.

Gaia theory is often taken in conjunction with Biophilia to pacify the belligerent relationship between man and environment. It was the Harvard naturalist Dr. Edward O. Wilson, who coined the term biophilia to emphasize the innate feeling of man to love all other forms of life with naturalness. At the same time, ‘biophilia’ is etymologically explained as love of life, nature and the ecosystem consisting of the biotic (living) and abiotic (non-living elements). Whereas ‘bio’ means ‘life’ and ‘philia’ means ‘love’ and it is now obvious that biophilia as a concept means man’s love for nature and environment and it also points to a ‘natural feeling’ for other forms of life obviously reinforcing our sense of obligation and responsibility to respect nature/ environment and other forms of life thereby formulating an ecocentric vision (Wilson 1). At the same time, both Gaia theory and the philosophy of biophilia tend to integrate the biosphere where land, surface, rock, water and air interact with each other to support life, with the physical components of the earth.

In the light of the above problematization on Gaia hypothesis and biophilia, it would be profitable to negotiate Gaia theory in Shakespeare’s relevant plays with special emphasis on *As You Like It* and *The Winter’s Tale*. There is no denying the fact that interconnectivity between man and nature, more particularly between the human world

and animal world constitutes one of the striking features of the play *As You Like It*. Viewed through ecological/ecocritical lens, Shakespeare seems to have emphasized in this play the vital fact that biophilia is the most powerful cementing force that connects the human world with the animal world. This is all the more true when the readers view the Forest of Arden as an ideal world of communion between man and nature which serves as a powerful contrast to the complex and complicated go of the life at city and court. Like the Egdon Heath in Hardy's *The Return of the Native*, the Forest of Arden constitutes the real backbone of the play. Its pastoral life and idyllic charm, benevolence and unsophisticated innocence is strongly reminiscent of mother Gaia's unpretentious affection and unfailing kindness for her creation/creatures bereft of hypocrisy and artificiality. The forest teaches most of the characters in the play how to live a life of simplicity in close communion with Nature. Like a mother attracting her children by virtue of her boundless and selfless affection, the Forest of Arden attracts both Rosalind and Celia and also Touchstone who follows them to the forest.

Needless to say, contrast characterizes Shakespeare's environmental imagination and this is fairly applicable to *As You Like It* where the life of simplicity and pristine innocence led by shepherds becomes a perfect ideal and a sure shelter. The Forest of Arden epitomizes Mother Nature's unalloyed love and affection, simplicity and naturalness which are embraced by the banished Duke Senior and subsequently by Rosalind, Celia and Touchstone. Shakespeare presents a telling contrast between the lives at the court full of pretension, hypocrisy, jealousy, and revenge and the life of simplicity, freedom and naturalness which is signified by the pastoral bliss in the Forest of Arden. Under the benign canopy of Nature-Mother's love and affection, characters like Rosalind, and her lover Orlando, Touchstone, Celia, Oliver, Phebe, Silvius, Corin, Audrey and the melancholic philosopher Jacques learn how to lead a life of simplicity and naturalness that the Mother Earth teaches to all its creatures. In mother's kingdom, pride and pretence, jealousy and envy, complexities and intrigues represented by the 'painted pump' of the life at the court of Duke Frederick has no entry and significantly whoever comes to the kingdom of mother Nature with pure heart, is finally endowed with

happiness and pastoral bliss. Just as mother's love knows no bounds, the kingdom in the nature of the Forest of Arden signifies freedom for all and transcends the narrow and artificial restriction, exploitation and subservience epitomized by court. Under the blessing of kind Mother Nature Rosalind not only buys an estate of a shepherd but also lives the life of simplicity; her love for Orlando finally tends to fruition in marriage. It is in the lap of the forest that Orlando seeks shelter to compensate the torture of his wicked brother Oliver. In much the same way, Duke Frederick who out of jealousy came with a large army to the forest to take revenge upon his brother undergoes drastic change under the impact of a holy hermit. Repentance dawns upon him; the Duke gives up his "bloody intentions" and becomes an anchorite (5.4.168)

The Gaia hypothesis is fairly vindicated here when revenge is alchemized into biophilia. Mother Earth rewards Frederick with spiritual bliss and justice is done to the Senior Duke as he is restored to his dukedom as its rightful owner. What is worth noting here that in mother's kingdom love has no boundary and it transcends the narrow barriers and "domestic wall" raised between the outsider and the insider in the Forest of Arden. In other words, apart from the outsiders like Senior Duke, Duke Frederick, Rosalind, Celia, Orlando, Oliver and Touchstone, the original innocent insiders- Shepherds and shepherdess- have also been rewarded by Mother Nature's benign benediction. Phebe- the fair shepherdess and her despairing lover Silvius and the old shepherd Corin have learnt from Nature's kingdom lessons of naturalness, purity, innocence and pastoral bliss bereft of hypocrisy and pretension. Old Corin the shepherd is a perfect embodiment of celestial virtue of Mother Nature which is powerfully attested by his own confession in *As You Like It*: "Sir I am a true labourer/I earn that I eat, get that I wear; owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness; glad of other men's good, content of my harm; and the greatest of my pride is to see my cows graze and my lambs suck" (3.2.82). The aforesaid lines vindicate perfect naturalness and Corin's biophilic attitude towards the nameless creatures of Nature such as cows, lambs and the green grass. At the same time Corin's mind and heart are permeated with the Gaia philosophic view that human beings should love Nature and the Physical Environment unpretentiously.

One of the characteristic features of Gaia Hypothesis as expounded by James Lovelock runs that Earth is a self regulating system that allows life of all forms- men, animals, beasts, plants and trees to exist on the planet without any threat or conflict among themselves. Gaia Hypothesis entails that all should live in peace and harmony which is a characteristic and quintessential nature of the concept of Mother-Earth (Gaia). Lovelock further maintains that Gaia is “a complex entity involving the earth’s biosphere, atmosphere, oceans and soil; the totality constituting a feedback of cybernetic system which seeks an optimal physical and chemical environment for life on this planet” (10). Gabriel Egan sings to the tune of Lovelock when he holds that given the framework of Gaia, Shakespeare tended to subscribe to the Elizabethan notion of unity and believes in a structure that binds the living matter(flora and fauna) with the non-living ones(*Shakespeare and Ecocritical Theory*,38). The way the characters in the Forest of Arden have been interconnected under the benign blessings of Mother Nature with significant changes and transformations in their attitude towards the human and the natural world vindicates the fact that Gaia hypothesis is a “transcendental concept” that emphasizes homogeneity and interconnectedness between man and environment (Havel).

While negotiating Gaia hypothesis in *As You Like It*, an ecologically conscious reader satisfactorily locates the fact that Shakespeare has made an admirable admixture of the divine and the human the earth and the universe. In this connection, Vaclav Havel aptly maintains that the Gaia hypothesis is prompted by an optimistic message for the 21st century. Havel’s message is that “ we are not here alone nor for ourselves alone, but that we are an integral part of higher, mysterious entities against whom it is not advisable to blaspheme”(1994,14). In the Forest of Arden, this integrated ecocritical vision and ecological awareness is felt through celebration of nature and respect for Mother Earth with love for all its creatures. The forest witnesses the dynamics of equality and benevolence of Mother Earth showered upon birds and animals, the banished Duke’s cave and Rosalind’s cottage, the woods, mountains and fountains, the antique oak and the crawling brook, the old shepherd Corin’s pastoral way of life and his love for cows, goats and sheep.

The Forest of Arden teaches the readers/audience the greatest lesson in Environmental Ethics and Biophilia that the other name of life is to love- both the human and the environmental world. This is evident from the realization of the wise banished Duke in the following lines:

And this our life exempt from public haunt,
Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything” (2.1. 15-17)

Mother goddess Earth loves her creatures-both human and non-human- with equal affection without discrimination and this is evident from Shakespeare’s love for the animal world in several plays such as *As You Like It*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. In these plays, as Todd A Borlik rightly maintains, Shakespeare has discouraged hunting as an anthropocentric act and “a disturbing barbaric pastime” (179). In other words, hunting is a shocking onslaught on Gaia theory and the notion of biophilia.

Shakespeare’s contention is that mother Gaia wants her animal creation, also to live a free life without fear and torture from the human world. Whereas the slaughter of a doe serves as a metaphor for the rape of Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*, poaching of deer and seduction of citizens’ wives brought about reversal of fate to Falstaff in *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Similarly in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, Shakespeare is critical about the idea of hunt as a part of royal prestige and social obligation that prompted the princess to spill the “Poor deer’s blood that my heart runs no ill” (4.1.23-34). In *As you like It*, Shakespeare poignantly presents the pathetic condition of a ‘sobbing deer’ and the weeping character of Jaques, who accuses the Duke of inflicting injustice on the animals in the Forest of Arden that epitomizes ‘Republic of Nature’ (2.1.61-63). To frighten the animals and to kill them in “their assigned and native dwelling place” is totally unacceptable in Gaia theory and the ethics of Biophilia. In his anti-hunting polemics, J

Jaques celebrates Shakespeare's glorification of mother Goddess Gaia. In his anti-hunting discourse, Shakespeare seems to be celebrating Gaia hypothesis in that both human and animal worlds created by the same mother goddess should live in peace without inflicting pain and injury upon each other and that they should be guided by the principles of biophilia-love of Life.

Significantly, the instances of reversal of fate and punishment to hunters in three other Shakespearean plays discussed above strongly remind us of ecophobia in which nature has full power to rebuff and to retaliate. Though the kind mother Gaia is as such not revengeful, her reaction is nevertheless inevitable and interestingly James Lovelock's book *The Revenge of Gaia*(2006) is a significant pointer that indicates how earth can also fight back to save the integrated and balanced eco system. The pastoral republic of nature in *As You Like It* with emphasis on protection of beauty, serenity and purity of the forest environment together with an idyllic way of life through peaceful co-existence, happiness and harmony with surroundings enriches the periphery of Gaia discourse in Shakespeare. The forest represents nature's happy asylum for characters seeking respite from corruption, cruelty and injustice of court and complex urban culture. The forest is Mother's bountiful bower where Rosalind and Celia get their happy love consummated in marriage and where the healing power of nature brings balance and order. Closely connected with Gaia hypothesis, the Forest of Arden brings happiness and a safe haven for regeneration and self-regulation, with emphasis on harmony, balance and order for the Senior Duke and for the four pairs of lovers - Rosalind- Orlando, Celia-Oliver, Phoebe-Silvius and Audrey-Touchstone.

Whereas Shakespeare used animal imagery, birds and, flowers, weather and climate as symbols/metaphors to arouse Eco phobia in his tragedies in comedy and romance, particularly *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale*, he has used them pleasantly with aesthetic alacrity which comes closer to the principle of Gaia, Biophilia and Cornucopia which means a symbol of nature's plenty. Like the Forest of Arden, Perdita's

‘rustic garden’ (I.4-84) in the idyllic pastoral landscape of Bohemia stands for her innocence, beauty and virginity. The Gaia principle of unity between all components of life on earth is evident from Perdita’s inviolable interconnectedness with several flowers, plants, trees and the animal world represented by Shepherds in *The Winter’s Tale*.

In *The Winter’s Tale*, Shakespeare connects flowers with seasons (winter, vernal and spring/summer) signifying the different stages of man (Child, Youth and Old age) and also his sufferings and prosperity in life. Whereas the youthful lovers, Perdita and Florizel are surrounded by flowers of springtime and summer, the aged Sicilian king Leontes in his winter of life symbolizes remorse and repentance. Perdita’s rustic garden is an attempt to reclaim the Edenic paradise that stands for balance and order of a sound eco system where Mother Nature/mother goddess Gaia is in a state of everlasting bliss. The play’s landscape is transformed from the barren winter world of Sicilia into one of pleasant flora and fauna. Fertility which is characteristic of mother goddess earth prevails here and this signifies creation, growth and prolonged continuation of the vegetative world symbolizing the fulfillment of Gaia hypothesis.

Thus, the chapter begins with eco phobia and the anthropocentric world view of the Renaissance man as evident from Shakespeare’s tragedies and ends with representation of Gaia hypothesis and Biophilia in his Comedy and Romance thereby vindicating love of life, song of the earth and efficacy of a sound-eco system.

Works Cited

- Borlik, Todd A. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature: Green Pastures*. Routledge, 2011.
- Bruckner, L. "Teaching Shakespeare in the Ecotone." *Ecocritical Shakespeare*. Edited by L. Bruckner and Dan Brayton. pp. 223-237. Ashgate, 2011.
- Dandy, John Francis. *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: A Study of King Lear*. Faber and Faber, 1948.
- Egan, Gabriel. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- Estok, Simon C. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011,
- Griffiths, Emma. *Medea*. Routledge, 2012.
- Jones, Gwilym. *Shakespeare's Storm*. Manchester UP, 2016.
- Knight, G.Wilson. *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretation of Shakesperian Tragedy*. Routledge Classics, 2001.
- Lovelock, James. *The Revenge of Gaia: Earth's Climate Crisis & The Fate of Humanity*. Basic Books, 2006.
- Meeker, Joseph M. *The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology and A Play Ethic*. 3rd ed. Tucson, U of Arizona Press, 1997.
- Morton, Timothy. *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Harvard UP, 2007.
- Montuschi, Eleonora. "Order of man, order of nature: Francis Bacon's idea of a 'dominion' over nature. Order: God's, Man's and Nature's". Discussion Paper. Centre for

Philosophy of Natural and Social Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK. 2010.

Sobel, David. *Beyond Ecophobia: Reclaiming the Heart in Nature Education*. Orion Society, 1996.

Stallybrass, Peter. "Macbeth and Witchcraft in Focus on Macbeth". Edited by John Russell Brown, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Stallybrass, Peter. "How many Children had Lady Macbeth?" In his *Hamlet and Other Shakespearean Essay*, Cambridge UP, 1979.

Wilson, Edward O. *Biophilia*. Harvard UP, 1984.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

Ecocriticism constitutes a significant segment of Postcolonial discourse following the devastating havoc of the IInd World War. There is no denial of the fact that ecocritical/ecological discourse is primarily based on study of literature in relation to ecology and environment. The primary purpose of ecocriticism, ecological study and environmental discourse is how to reclaim the inviolable relationship between man and Nature and more significantly, how to restore a healthy ecosystem that thrives on an amicable relationship between biotic and abiotic elements. In the backdrop of globalization, industrialization and galloping march of science and technology, the world has been largely threatened by deforestation, desertification and various types of environmental pollution. For the last five decades or so, environmentalists, ecologists and ecocritics have deeply pondered over the precarious condition of the earth, and they persistently insist on the fact that Nature/environment should not be used as a 'free lunch' by the human world with egocentric and anthropocentric outlook of exploitation, hegemonization and commoditization. The onus lies in the change of our perception from anthropocentrism to an ecocentric approach to Nature/environment. With this end in view, critics and theoreticians have formulated various concepts, theories and approaches like- Romantic ecology, Deep ecology, Eco-feminism, Social ecology, Eco-philosophy, Literary ecology, Environmental imagination, Wilderness ethics, Environmental ethics, Eco-Marxism, Green Studies, Landscape ecology, Biophilia and Gaia hypothesis. These theories have been elaborately problematized in Chapter One of the present thesis.

Strictly speaking, the history of Ecocriticism goes back to the Romantics who tenaciously tended to counteract science, the spirit of Enlightenment and the anthropocentric outlook that developed in the aftermath of Enlightenment and Industrial Revolution. It was the French philosopher, Rousseau, who in his two famous Discourses and the novel, *Emile* called upon the whole world to return to Nature. At the same time, in his Discourse on the Origin of Inequality (1754), Rousseau tended to emphasize the efficacy of man's 'natural goodness' and the 'State of

Nature' embodying purity and primeval innocence. Romantics like Wordsworth and Coleridge imbibed Rousseau's spirit of 'natural man' and his idea of 'noble savage', and 'wilderness Ethics'- all of which taken together laid the foundation of environmental ethics, Deep ecology and Romantic ecology. 'Deep Ecology' developed by Norwegian Philosopher Arne Naess in 1973 postulated the idea that Nature needs immense care and protection for the sake of Nature only and not for the anthropocentric use of the human world. While emphasizing a holistic approach, it not only focused on interrelatedness and interdependence of the human and non-human on each other but also assigned human responsibility to appreciate all forms of life so as to overcome the ecological crisis that confronts the globe for the last five decades.

Closely akin to Deep ecology is the concept of 'Romantic ecology' postulated by Jonathan Bate in his *The Song of the Earth* (2000) and *Romantic Ecology, William Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991) under the impact of Rousseau and his poetical son William Wordsworth. While romantically celebrating the song of the earth, Bate also emphasized, through another term 'ecopoetic', the beauty and balm of Nature and imbibed the romantic notions of Rousseau and Wordsworth that Nature is the best teacher. Gaia hypothesis developed by James Lovelock and Lynn Margulis in the 1970's and Biophilia postulated by Edward O Wilson (1984) and Erich Fromm, the US psychoanalyst in the 1960's, are two other corollary concepts that emphasize the innate feelings of man to love all forms of life –love of nature and natural environment- naturally rather than mechanically or anthropocentrically. Modelled after the Greek pastoral tradition of Bion, Moschus and Theocritus, is the term 'Pastoral' ('Pastor' meaning 'shepherd') and in his *Some Versions of Pastoral* (1935), the famous New Critic William Empson advocated simple life in pastoral idyllic setting rather than the complexity and cacophony of modern life/society.

The environmentalists and literary ecologists like Richard Kerridge (*Writing the Environmental: Ecocriticism and Literature*, 1998), Joseph Meeker (*The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology*, 1972) and Lawrence Buell tended to highlight the role of literature in analyzing the interrelationship between human cultural productions and environment for a balanced ecological thinking and art of living. And with the publication of Lawrence Buell's *The Environmental Imagination* (1995) and Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm's *The Ecocriticism*

Reader (1996), ecocriticism and environmental discourse have received immense support to negotiate ecological/environmental issues from literary, philosophical and interdisciplinary perspectives. Lawrence Buell's book *The Environmental Imagination* has been highly influential not only in classifying an environmental text, but also in augmenting environmental consciousness and ethics of pastoralism. Buell argues that an ideal environmental text should accommodate the non-human environment as an 'actual presence' in literary representation and that anthropocentric human interest cannot be accepted as the only legitimate interest in an environment discourse. At the same time, the text should ensure that human accountability/responsibility to the environment plays a prominent part in the text's ethical orientation. Buell's notion that environmental consciousness entails a dynamic rather than a static process has been a decided influence in determining the Renaissance environmental imagination.

In Chapter two of the thesis, it has been stated that Shakespeare's environmental imagination was shaped by a dynamic process of development in environmental/ecological consciousness. Furthermore, it is also significantly noticed that in Shakespearean texts like *As You Like It*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, the dramatist's environmental imagination oscillates between ecocentric vision and anthropocentric urge for exploiting Nature/environment under the influence of colonial hegemony and dynamics of power. Shakespeare's environmental imagination has been under the prevailing influence of adventures at sea, maritime ecology/environment, naval politics, commercial success through utilization of sea, sea- routes and inexhaustible treasures of sea as well. The frequent wars at sea with the Spaniards coupled with several sea voyages and adventures undertaken by John Hawkins and Francis Drake have thrilled the Elizabethan mind with jubilant joy and excitement for sea, the symbol of a boundless and brave new world of infinite passion, vaulting ambition, profit, power and pleasure. Shakespeare's copious references to sea experiences and treasures of sea in *The Merchant of Venice*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Pericles*, *The Tempest*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *Romeo and Juliet* vindicate this fact. The rulers of Tudor dynasty exercised their political power to utilize nature and natural resources for England's political gains, commercial success and economic stability. An unbridled desire to

tame nature and to utilize her resources/environment for human welfare gradually developed the homocentric/anthropocentric vision of the Renaissance man. Dan Brayton's marvelous book *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration* (2012) shows how various voyages in the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf of Mexico tended to define human life in terms of 'Maritime Environment'(12), not in terms of the 'culture of plunder' alone. To Brayton, Shakespeare, as a representative Renaissance writer offered a counter to the 'culture of plunder' and tended to imagine 'the ocean not as a void, wasteland, adversary or vast fish cooler, but as an integral part of our being" (12). Here, it is pertinent to mention that towards the end of the 16th century, London had become the 'centre of maritime and mercantile England' and the river Thames bears true testimony to this fact. Elizabethan marine ecology became so powerful that besides poets and dramatists like Marlowe, Spenser and Shakespeare, the Renaissance painters were enthused to portray human life in painting in terms of 'sea voyage'(Brayton 2).

Under the decided impact of marine-ecology/maritime environment, Shakespeare's Renaissance imagination tended to characterize 'sea' as a veritable mystery paradoxically imbibing both creative and destructive nuances of nature. This is evident from his sonnet no 64, wherein the mutability of the coastal landscape is pitted against the ruthless scourges of the 'hungry ocean' that devours the terraqueous coastal landscape. The 'hungry ocean' epitomizing eternity is contrasted with the ephemeral 'kingdom of shore' and this dichotomy between the temporal and the Timeless shapes Shakespeare's Renaissance imagination in much the same way, his environmental imagination is preoccupied with the dichotomy between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism. This is all the more evident from *The Tempest* wherein Gonzalo envisages a commonwealth with a powerful plea for 'solidarity of dryland', 'brown furze' and 'an acre of barren land'(2.1.65-67). On the contrary, Prospero's intrusion into the island and exploitation of Caliban, Ariel and the natural resources of the island signifies the hegemonic and anthropocentric outlook of the colonial master.

Shakespeare's Renaissance environmental imagination conceives of Caliban as a peculiar product of the marine environment-'half-fish' and 'half-flesh'- by combining both the elements of 'sea' and land. Brayton establishes him as a hybrid product of maritime environment and coastal topography embodying naturalness, noble savagery and love of the earth which is evident

from his love for the delicious treasures of the island- trees and plants, flowers and fruits, roots and animals, sights and sounds. Both Caliban and Prospero represent two opposite poles of Renaissance environmental imagination. Whereas, Caliban, the ‘crabby subaltern himself’ in the island, epitomizes the natural coastal ecosystem, Prospero, the outsider embodies anthropocentric Renaissance New Learning, dynamics of power and colonial politics. Shakespeare’s environmental consciousness is caught between two paradoxical perspectives. Whereas the unfathomable sea and marine environment furnish fish, crab, fruits, birds, flowers, and animals for the aesthetic appeal of the native, the expansionist and colonist outlook of Prospero propels him to exercise his power of magic to enslave Caliban and the spirits for materializing his selfish political interest.

It is further noticed that Shakespeare’s environmental imagination has been profoundly influenced by the contemporary Elizabethan belief in Astrology and his frequent use of tidal metaphors and references to solar/lunar eclipses, ‘environment’ and ‘reddened sun’ in *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Winter’s Tale*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Henry IV* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* vindicates the fact. There is no denying the fact that Elizabethan people evinced keen interest in witchcraft, ghost, sorcery, magic, faeries, angelic spirits, occultism and astrological belief, as the New Learning was yet to empower them completely. The innumerable references to the working of spirits and supernatural agents such as Ariel, Puck, Titania, Oberon, ghosts, witches, ominous birds, thunder, storm and lightning show that Shakespeare’s mind was akin to the Elizabethan belief in astrology and folk beliefs like lunar and solar eclipse and the influence of Dog Star and Pole Star. That Renaissance astrology recognized the influence of the “inauspicious star” on the mind and imagination of the Elizabeth people is evident from Romeo’s reference to ‘the yoke of inauspicious stars’ (5.3.109-111). Their astrological beliefs were firmly fortified during the natural calamities, disease and famine, and the impending dangers of war. Significantly, ‘moon’ and ‘sun’ occupy two permanent shaping forces in Elizabethan astrology that determines the environmental imagination of the Renaissance man. Whereas moon is characterized in Elizabethan belief, as a planet of romance, feminine temperament, wild imagination, tempestuous emotion and fickle-mindedness as well, sun stands for power and authority, patriarchy and masculinity, and both solar and lunar eclipses cause ill health, suffering,

misfortune, mental disturbance and catastrophe in nature. In *Romeo and Juliet*, ‘the inconstant moon’ guides the lover’s imagination and in *Othello*, tragedy is commissioned for the ‘very error of the moon’ that comes closer to earth to make man mad with tempestuous passion (5.2.109-111). In the mouth of Gloucester in *King Lear*, Shakespeare forecasts great danger and reaction in Nature because of the solar and lunar eclipses. In *Hamlet*, Horatio wonders how lunar eclipse has brought about the death of King Hamlet (1.1.116-120). Shakespeare is fairly convinced by the astrological belief that tide, and reaction at sea and the moon fortify the astrological belief and environmental imagination of the Renaissance people. The dichotomy between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism gets all the more intensified with the march of civilization and culture, and a ruthlessly unkind attitude to Nature and environment has led during the last five decades, to grave ‘environmental crisis’ and ‘eco-destruction’.

Etymologically speaking, ecology derived from the German word ‘Oecologie’- *okios* meaning ‘household’ and ‘logos’ meaning ‘knowledge’-signifies a sound ecosystem that sets the house in order. Ecology is based on a balanced ecosystem in which organisms are harmonious constructed by the principle of interconnectedness. Barry Commoner in his book “*The Closing Circle: Nature, Man and Technology*” (1971) regrets how a harmoniously constructed house of ecology based on healthy working of biotic and abiotic elements has been deconstructed by man following scientific and technological progress, march of industrialization, materialistic outlook, consumer culture, capitalist politics and large scale deforestation, desertification and loss of landscape in the event of mushroom growth in human population. Commoner’s formulations of four fold laws of ecology have been blatantly violated. His idea that ‘everything is connected with everything else’ by the ‘law of interconnectedness’ is forgotten. Another important law that ‘Nature knows best’, and that any man-made change in a natural system causes serious destruction to the ecosystem is nowadays blissfully forgotten. Last, but not the least, in the ecological scheme of things, there is nothing called ‘free lunch’, and as such, human beings should stop exploiting, hegemonizing and notoriously utilizing Nature, environment and natural resources as ‘free lunch’. Commoner has aptly indicated a counter hegemonic attitude/outlook to deprecate anthropocentrism.

In the light of the above, Chapter three of the thesis titled, 'Deconstructive Ecology: Culture and Hegemony', has successfully showcased the notion of 'Deconstructive ecology' and politics of power/hegemony in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and *As You Like It*. The philosophical basis of 'deconstructive ecology' goes back to Derrida's theory of Deconstruction. In his '*Of Grammatology*', Derrida used the term to signify 'internal contradiction', 'destabilization', 'desedimentation', and a sort of dislocation that dismantles the order- the centre-margin relationship. In other words, deconstruction, originally a translation of the word 'destruktion', points to the fact that everything is divisible. Derrida debunks Ferdinand de Saussure's binary theory- between centre and margin, between Nature and culture. Instead, he argues that the coexistence of Nature and Culture leads to a sound ecosystem and separation of culture from Nature leads to deconstructive ecosystem. And in the chapter 'The End of the Book and the Beginning of Writing' in *Of Grammatology*, Derrida discussed Nature and Writing- eternal writing in the metaphoric sense and finite writing in the liberal sense (15). To him, Nature is sublime and more vital than culture, and in *Of Grammatology*, he is wise enough to recognize the amicable relationship between 'living' and 'non-living things' so as to transgress the 'frontiers of anthropocentrism'. To Derrida, a sound ecological text is neither the language of God nor the anthropocentric vision of 'Economic man' or 'Technical man'. It should deconstruct the grand narrative that Nature embodies the language of God. Derrida's position is that a sound ecological text should not show distinction between Nature and Culture, and that it should encompass both the positive and negative nuances of 'Nature –culture Entanglement'. Reminiscent of Lawrence Buell's idea of an ideal environmental text, Derrida's viewpoint is that an ideal ecological text should set aside the controversial questions of 'hegemony' and 'subordination'. Neither 'Nature' nor 'Man' should consider himself/herself superior or inferior to the other. What is required in an ecological text is the 'desiccation of self' and hence negation of 'self' constitutes the hallmark of deconstructive ecocriticism. Once the spirit of 'Entanglement' ('interwovenness') is realized, the question of Nature-culture binary does not arise at all.

Viewed from the post colonial perspective, ecological socialists argue that capitalism is the fundamental cause of global ecological crisis and environmental problems. It is with the expansion of capitalism combined with the philosophy of Enlightenment and urge for industrial-

-zation that led to the destruction of physical and human environments. Given the Elizabethan world picture, the dichotomy between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism was intensified by the emergence of New Philosophy, egocentric Renaissance urge for illimitable power, pleasure, profit, and commercial success. There was an unbridled ardour and vaulting ambition for imperialism and boundless passion for knowing the unknown and for ransacking nature for the sake of utility. Gabriel Egan in his concluding remarks to his book *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism* (2006) observes that “two views of nature compete in Shakespeare’s writing- an older view of order/organism and the Renaissance view of the world as a machine”(174). The New Historicists like Jonathan Dollimore and Stephen Greenblatt subscribed to the anthropocentric nature of Renaissance man in so far as they evinced keen interest in contemporary socio-political and cultural issues of the Elizabethan Age. In his *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy* (1990), Greenblatt emphasized ‘social energy’ proliferated through actor-audience relationship, and the relation between the theatre and the surrounding institutions (1). Harold Bloom in his book *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (1999) tended to establish Shakespeare as the greatest humanist of Elizabethan Age, and while showing his keen interest in the secular and anthropocentric world of Renaissance humanism, Bloom maintains that to be human is to be ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ in secular sense of the term (xx). Almost two decades before Bloom, Carolyn Merchant in her powerful book *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and Scientific Revolution* (1980) categorically stated that in the sixteenth century “the characterization of nature as an organic, animate, and female were systematically undermined by the emergence of modern science and its conception of nature as dead, inert matter”(56).

In the light of the above observations, it has been noticed that *The Tempest* is a politically conditioned Shakespearean play in which the colonial master exercises his dynamics of power to exploit Nature/environment/landscape together with the native dweller. The healthy ecological condition, and cordial man- nature relationship is largely affected by the outsider/intruder Prospero, and his politics of hegemonizing everything on the island. This is a brilliant example of deconstructive ecocriticism as in the anthropocentric onslaught on the island dislocates the ecosystem, its flora and fauna, its native Caliban who clamours for freedom from the clutches of

the colonial master Prospero, the Renaissance man of knowledge. The colonial master enslaves Caliban and even Ariel, orders for deforestation and encroaches upon the 'wilderness ethics' by imposing civilization and culture from outside. Here, civilization intrudes upon native culture and destabilizes and deconstructs the already constructed ecosystem, language and culture, Caliban laments that by his birth from Sycorax, the island originally belongs to him, and Prospero has made him a situational subaltern—"Thou most lying slave" (1.2.345-47- deprived him of all his rights over the island and bound him to a 'hard rock' (1.2.341-44). There has been deconstruction and destabilization, not only of the well-constructed eco-system, but also of the identity, history and culture of the indigenous people. And this is a clearcut instance of deconstructive distortion made by white colonization. In other words, this is an onslaught of 'reason' on Nature/environment and art of naturalness/natural goodness which constitutes a cardinal feature of Environmental ethics.

Apart from the politics of power, the colonial master too exercises his politics of language and culture- the ecocentric language and culture of the natural man is threatened by the egocentric, anthropocentric and eurocentric language and culture imposed upon Caliban by the white master. Prospero's colonial and anthropocentric outlook is evident from his command over the elements of nature: "Command these elements to the silence" (1.1.24-26). This vindicates his Renaissance propensity for taming Nature/elements of Nature. Destruction of the natural environment in *The Tempest* causes degradation of ecological condition and environmental ambience. Prospero's exploitation of the island is evident from his order for deforestation and his obsession with 'wood' and cutting down of oaks, pines and cedars (5.1. 47-48). Gabriel Egan aptly observes that right from his arrival on the island, Prospero's primary activity has been 'deforestation' which is a kind of deconstruction in form of destruction (Egan 155). In much the same way, Randall Martin in his book *Shakespeare and Ecology* (2015) indicates the contemporary problem of overconsumption of wood during Shakespeare's time and Prospero's obsession with wood, certainly reflects the Renaissance man's propensity for overconsumption (16). The binary between man and nature, between nature and culture and the master-slave dialectics in *The Tempest* can be furthered correlated with the dichotomy between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *As You Like It*. In *A Midsummer*

Night's Dream, an ecophobic situation is marked through Shakespeare's fear of loss of agency and control over Nature. The fear in Oberon and Titania, the representatives of the fairy world, leads to several outer and inner conflicts. Since the faeries occupy the highest place in the hierarchical order, they obviously tend to subordinate the human world and even quarrel over the possession of the handsome Indian boy, and this is a brilliant instance of eco-colonialism and Eco-imperialism. The very fighting among the faeries affects the healthy working of the ecosystem, as a result of which the wind fails to sing the song of peace and the water level of the sea has gone up thereby disrupting the eco-system. Whereas the untimely flood inundates vast areas of crops and leads the extinction of a good number of species, the seasons and climates have taken a deconstructive turn forecasting eco-destruction, anxiety and fear. The smiling spring, the scorching summer, frowning autumn and the cruel winter have changed their constitutional characteristics- the reason why people cannot identify them. More important than anything else is Titania's confession that they are responsible for the change in the cycle of seasons that not only invited eco-disaster, but also created unexpected diseases. Significantly, the super- human world here takes the responsibility of endangering biodiversity/ecosystem and causing suffering to the human world. The Elizabethan hierarchical system, here it is important to note, was responsible for intensifying the dichotomy between Man and Nature, between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism. Environmental ecology is threatened by human ecology on one hand, and super- human interference on the other. E.M.W. Tillyard in his masterpiece *The Elizabethan World Picture* (1943) problematized the concept of hierarchy in Elizabethan society and made a significant observation that Elizabethan world picture retained "two contradictory principles" that "coexisted in a state of high tension" (2). This 'high tension' is further located in *As You Like It*, in which there is a telling contrast between the idyllic way of life of peace, innocence and naturalness in the forest of Arden and the hypocrisy, jealousy, revenge and fear epitomized by the court of Duke Frederick. Through the character of melancholic Jacques, Shakespeare brings to the fore man's passion for hunting animals. Jacques weeps because of the weeping of a wounded deer (2.2.56) waiting for death, and also castigates Duke Senior for his tyranny exercised upon innocent animals-"To fright the animals and to kill them up/ In their assigned and native dwelling place"(2.1.60-63). It is thus fairly evident that together with defo-

-restation, exploitation of environment, killing of animals is a significant factor that accounts for destructive ecology.

Chapter four has been devoted to study yet another angle of Shakespeare's environmental imagination- Environmental Ethics, culture and the idea of 'romantic ecology' coined by Jonathan Bate. In his book *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition* (1991) and *The Song of the Earth* (2000), Bate problematizes the concept of romantic ecology not as mere romanticization of ecology or environment, but in terms of glorification of 'pastoral landscape', 'natural goodness', 'economy of Nature' and nourishment of ecological consciousness in conjunction with pastoral language and love of life- both human and non human. While analyzing Wordsworth's romantic poetry, Bate has been influenced by his pastoral imagination, use of rustic language and natural behaviour of the pastoral characters. Use of pastoral myths, metaphors and language as a whole, according to Bate, constitutes the primary demands of ecopoetics. In this connection, Bate has been profoundly influenced by Rousseau's emphasis on the natural goodness of man, his pristine purity and primeval innocence in the 'state of Nature' (Bate 2000, 42). By emphasizing man's natural goodness, Rousseau contests the age old Christian belief that man is an unfortunate offspring of the 'Original Sin' committed by Adam and Eve. And in his *The Song of the Earth*, Bate states that the primordial man imbibed innocence and natural goodness in the idyllic setting of a pastoral landscape where in the 'state of Nature', wherein Nature becomes his best teacher, friend, philosopher and guide. Therefore, zest for communion with nature constitutes the core of romantic ecology/ecopoetics. To the romantic ecologists, Nature is therapeutic, the healing balm for anthropocentrism, and the veritable teacher of Environmental ethics/culture. Love for Nature and an integrated vision of oneness with Nature constitutes another cardinal feature of Romantic ecology. This integrated vision can be acquired through unconditional bond of love for Nature and her flora and fauna, sights and sounds and through an ecological vision of interconnectedness.

Even though Shakespeare was increasingly aware of the anthropocentric vision of the Renaissance man, his environmental imagination was profoundly influenced by his romantic sensibility and his unalloyed love of nature. In this chapter, an analysis of his romantic comedy *As You Like It* and his dramatic romance *The Winter's Tale* vindicates the point. In *As You Like*

It, Shakespeare seems to have subscribed to the tenets of Romantic ecology in that the Forest of Arden presents an ideal idyllic/pastoral setting to the play. Here, time is measured by no human clock, and an air of freshness, freedom and perennial peace and happiness permeates everywhere. Everyone lives in the forest with the principle of peaceful coexistence and coil of interconnectedness. Here, the tropical snakes and hungry lionesses live amicably without slightest fear and oppression. Far away from the politics of power, jealous, anger, revenge, and hypocrisy of the life in court/urban landscape, life in the lap of the forest of Arden is not governed by any dull and prosaic routine. Here, people subscribe to the ethics of naturalness, and the Duke Senior is surrounded by many young men perhaps learning lessons of peace, happiness, patience, naturalness, love and friendship in true sense of the term (1.1.110). Here, people enjoy the joys of spring and the rough wind of winter with peace and patience and equanimity of mind. The Duke seems to be a professional follower of Eco-philosophy and in his vision, life in the forest is bereft of hypocrisy, pretension, artificiality and unnaturalness. He candidly acknowledges that the pastoral environment of the forest has exercised profound influence on him, and that he has learnt very many lessons, from birds and trees, flowers and seasons, pebbles and murmuring brooks. And like a romantic ecologist, the Duke has close communion with nature finding; “tongues in trees, brooks in the murmuring books, sermons in stones. And goodness in everything” (2.1.16-17). In the mouth of the Duke, Shakespeare has imparted the greatest lesson of ‘goodness’ and ‘naturalness’- two cardinal principles of Environmental ethics. Here romantic love between Orlando and Rosalind attains the zenith of perfection. Rosalind is glorified as a pure rose, and as ‘Diana in the foundation’ (3.2.410), and Orlando, like the medieval courtly lover, goes poetic with love- sickness and writes love lyrics on the bark of trees. Romantic ecology and Romantic love are intertwined in the play because love is enriched by weather, seasons, months, animals and birds. Under the benign blessings of a conducive ecological condition, the old shepherd Corin goes ecstatic in his love of life and Nature, while recalling his own youthful love of romantic exuberance. Significantly, the rustics of the pastoral landscape glorify their ecocentric environmental culture and more predominantly glorify months, seasons, trees, air and weather in *As You Like It*. It is thus a pastoral idyll that celebrates the song of earth and the principles of Gaia hypothesis and Biophilia- love of all forms of life as a whole

and that vindicates the highest lesson in Environment ethics that Nature is by nature therapeutic as it heals worldly wounds, anxiety and suffering.

The contrast between ‘urban space’(court) and ‘idyllic space’(forest of Arden) can be correlated with the dichotomy between ‘royal space’ and ‘pastoral space’, between Perdita’s ‘rustic garden’ in Bohemia, and Hermione’s ‘artificial garden’ in Sicily in *The Winter’s Tale*. Romantic ecology has been satisfactorily negotiated in this play, wherein Perdita, like Rosalind, stands for the world of purity, peace and ‘natural goodness’. As a dramatic romance, the structure of the play is built upon the mixed fabric of the tragic and the comic which is signified by ‘winter’ and ‘spring’ respectively. The very title aptly suggests that weather and season play significant part in the pastoral romance. Perdita was initially a part of the suffocating wintry world of Leontes’ court and in the second part, romantic ecology predominates and winter is replaced by bounteous spring. Symbolically speaking, Sicily epitomizes the anthropocentric fallen world of winter- of artificiality, cruelty, pretension and politics of power, and the shift from Sicily to Bohemian landscape signifies an attempt to reclaim the lost Edenic paradise. The Bohemian landscape is characterized by romantic ecology and pastoral glory, as it is enriched with flowers and creepers, luxuriant growth of plants and trees with spontaneous ease, freedom and natural grace. The play abounds in a cluster of flowers. Whereas Autolycus celebrates daffodils, Perdita, being identified with Virgin Mary, glorifies ‘lily flower’ signifying innocence and purity, naturalness and virtuosity. Like Kalidasa’s Shakuntala and Wordsworth’s Lucy, Perdita is reared in the lap of Nature, and is identified with Nature. Like Dushyanta praising Shakuntala’s natural dress made of flowers, foliages and bark of the trees, Florizel praises Perdita’s natural dress. Shakuntala is identified with the creeper Vanajyotsna in much the same way Perdita’s is identified with Virgin Mary, lily flower and also with the goddess of flower-Flora in Greek Mythology. Like Shakuntala, Perdita is not a creeper, but the creeper- Nature goddess itself. From rosemary to lily, from lily to rue, from rue to carnations, Perdita is visualized as a gentle ‘scion of the wildest stock’ (4.4.92-95). In a pastoral setting adorned with flowers in benign romantic ecological condition, Perdita embodies the pastoral world of innocence, purity and natural goodness –qualities that are unabashedly extolled by Florizel, Polixenness and Camillo. For instance, Florizel’s father Polixenness adulates her as ‘too noble’ for

the shepherd's world, whereas Camillo eulogizes her as 'the Queen of curds and cream' symbolizing whiteness/purity. Her desire to possess such other flowers as daffodils, violets, primroses and lilies with virgin branches amply vindicate the fact that under the fostering care of Nature in a pastoral landscape, Perdita shines bright as a pure and peerless piece of beauty, and *The Winter's Tale* remains an inexhaustible treasure house of flowers reared in the conducive condition of romantic ecology.

Chapter five tends to celebrate the Song of the Earth- Gaia Hypothesis and deprecates 'Ecophobia' which etymologically points to fear of man for losing home. As has been problematized, ecophobia is associated with excessive and sometimes unrealistic fear for Nature's rage and fury which inevitably causes 'eco-anxiety' and eco-despair in man. At the same time, in the aftermath of globalization and industrialization, large scale deforestation and desertification after the two devastating World Wars, mankind is obviously in the grip of 'eco-disaster', 'eco-depression', 'climatic anxiety' and 'eco-despair' for the loss of pastoral landscape and forest environment/ecology and for the increasing exploitation of Nature and assault on environment thereby fomenting fear for the future of environment and the world at large. Ecophobia is as such a many-sided postcolonial, ecocritical construct that encompasses multiple fears- fear for loss of environment/landscape and beauty of Nature, fear for not being able to compensate the loss inflicted upon Nature/environment, fear for unexpected retaliatory response from Nature on man manifested in terms of torrential rain, violent storm, and unruly wind, tempestuous reaction of the sea, volcanic eruption, unbearable thunder, lightning and rain. At the same time, ecophobia is prompted by fear for loss of man- nature relationship and damage of the healthy relationship between biotic and abiotic elements that constitutes a sound ecosystem. Last but not the least, ecophobia creates moral fear characteristic of a guilty conscience and ignites in man a propensity for taming and subduing nature through repressive measures. Keeping in view, the aforesaid dimensions, Simon C. Estok has defined Ecophobia as 'a pathological aversion towards nature, an aggravated form of anthropocentrism expressed variously as feared hatred of or hostility towards nature's imagined unpredictability'(2011, 128).

Even as serious ecological approach to Shakespeare emerged only in the first decade of the 21st century, Shakespeare was well aware of both the eco-centric and anthropocentric aspects

of ecocriticism. It is the homocentric and anthropocentric outlook of the Renaissance mind that finds a poignantly telling expression in Shakespeare's plays like *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar*, *The Tempest* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Guilt-consciousness being an important facet of ecophobia, the old king Lear realizes that he has done great injustice to his daughter Cordelia on one hand and to Nature by dividing his land among two wicked daughters- Goneril and Regan on the other. As the pure embodiment of Nature's innocence, Cordelia is Nature's child and by depriving her of property/land and paternal love, Lear in fact did great injustice to Nature, and viewed from the standpoint of ecocriticism, the tragic flaw of Lear consists in his assault on Nature and 'natural goodness' epitomized by Cordelia. The play takes the turn of an environmental tragedy, apart from being a moral/spiritual tragedy. It is an environmental tragedy in which Lear nourishes ecophobia for Nature, and a lonely helpless old king is pitied against the violent forms of reactions and retaliation from nature in form of incessant rain, thunder, storm and lightning. The anthropocentric Renaissance man's audacity and ambition to ransack nature by exploiting rivers, sea, forests, pastoral landscape/land and trees inevitably invites Nature's retaliatory reaction thereby creating ecophobia and environmental tragedy. Fear of Nature and 'environmental unpredictability' loom large because of Lear's 'error of judgement', injustice to Cordelia and division of land/landscape. He wrongly exercised his hegemony- 'royal power' and 'patriarchal power- to control Nature and nature's darling daughter -Cordelia. The highest lesson of Environmental ethics one learns in *King Lear* is that any injustice to 'nature' and 'natural goodness' would lead to chastisement through Nature's rage and fury thereby creating an ecophobic situation. An arrogant exercise of anthropocentric notion of power over natural environment disturbs the peaceful coexistence of natural environment and its symbiotic relationship among different forms of life.

What is true of *King Lear* is true of *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* as well. Both Lear and Macbeth epitomize anthropocentric arrogance and centres of power hegemony. For the sake of power, Macbeth, a devoted general killed his master, innocent Duncan, and this innocent murder of the king in sleep is in fact a murder of 'natural goodness' and 'innocence' symbolizing Nature. Viewed from the standpoint of Environmental ethics, Macbeth can sleep no more and like Lear goes mad, as he has killed the innocent king in sleep only for occupying the throne of Scotland.

The defeat of Lear and Macbeth in the hands of Nature arouses ecophobia, and more than that it points to the defeat of their self-proclaimed arrogance and vaulting ambition for power/exercise of power. In the Storm Scene, Lear is stricken with fear for belligerent Nature and surrenders to her like a poor and helpless situational subaltern. Ecophobia runs through both the plays, and the 'foul weather' and 'violent storm' in *King Lear* can be correlated with the 'foul weather', thunder, lightning and the three witches in *Macbeth* and more predominantly, with the foul play of 'fog', 'filthy air', 'wild and unpredictable weather', 'thick night', the blanket of the dark, the bestiality of animals and ominous sound of birds. In *Julius Caesar*, Brutus, like Macbeth, has no sleep precisely because both of them are murderers. After Caesar's murder, Brutus is in the grip of fear, and like Macbeth, he is condemned to 'sleep no more'. The ecophobic situation becomes all the more intense in both the cases and G. Wilson Knight aptly observes that 'one of the worst terrors of the Macbeth and Brutus experience is imaged as 'a loss of the sweet curative of sleep' (2001, 145). If Duncan epitomizes innocence, natural goodness, peace and unity of life signifying ecocentric outlook, Macbeth stands for murder, blood and power, and like Lear and Brutus, he epitomizes the anthropocentric vision of man.

However, in the second part of the chapter, it is cogently argued that Nature can be pacified/assuaged and eco-phobia can be overcome by celebrating the song of the earth and by reclaiming the philosophy of Gaia hypothesis and love of life in manifold ways, otherwise termed 'Biophilia'. Gaia hypothesis is grounded upon the basic principle of celebrating the glory and magnanimity of Mother Goddess Earth. Since hoary past, civilizations including those of India and Greece have glorified Earth as a benign embodiment of love and mercy, of patience, tolerance, creativity, preservation and benevolence of the biotic and abiotic elements existing on the Earth. Since Mother Earth is by nature affectionate and benevolent, it is imperative to love and respect her as well as her creation-life forms. Gaia philosophy is taken in conjunction with the theory of Biophilia which means 'love of life', nature and the eco-system as well. Taken together, both the concepts signify the fact that one must love all forms of lives- both human and non-human with a sense of 'natural goodness' which constitutes the hallmark of Environmental ethics. The imperative emphasis on love of all forms of life on the earth obviously points to a

sense of responsibility and obligation of the human world towards the world of Nature so as to counter ecophobia and anthropocentric vision of life and attitude towards Nature.

An indepth analysis of the plays *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale* reveals that long before the emergence of the critical theories of Gaia hypothesis and Biophilia, Shakespeare was engagingly interested in the philosophy of love of life- all forms of life with an ecocentric orientation. If Biophilia is taken as the most powerful cementing force that connects the human with the non-human world, this is fairly applicable to *As You Like It* with special reference to the miraculous magnanimity of the forest of Arden. The forest embodies the cardinal principles of both Gaia hypothesis and Biophilia. It embraces everybody and treats everyone with the magic power of harmony, peace and 'natural goodness'. The forest symbolizes an ideal world of peace and happiness as against the animosity, complexity, arrogance, hegemonic outlook of power mongers in the court. Shakespeare has showcased a telling contrast between the life of pristine purity, rustic innocence and natural goodness in the Forest of Arden and that of complexity, artificiality, wickedness and revenge epitomized by the court of Duke Frederick. The natural benevolence and unpretentious innocence in the Forest of Arden closely corresponds to Mother Gaia's ungrudging affection and unfailing kindness. The forest has taught the characters like the Duke Senior, Rosalind, Orlando, Touchstone, Phebe, Silvius, Audrey, Corin and the melancholy philosopher Jaques how to lead a life of simplicity and naturalness bereft of hypocrisy, complexity and pretence, which the Mother Earth teaches to all its creatures. Like the benevolent Mother attracting her children by virtue of her unalloyed, selfless affection, the Forest of Arden embodies the cardinal principles of both Gaia hypothesis and Biophilia. It embraces everybody and treats everyone with the magic power of harmony, peace and 'natural goodness'. The Forest of Arden teaches the old shepherd Corin, a labourer, how to love and live life without fear and malice, envy or hatred for others. Corin declares with self-satisfaction that "the greatest of my pride is to see my cows graze and my lambs suck" (3.2.82). Corin's biophilic attitude towards the nameless creatures of Nature such as cows, lambs and also the green grass can be taken as a powerful lesson in Environmental ethics. Gaia hypothesis views Earth as a forest of Arden where lives of all forms-men, animals, beasts, plants and trees do live without any fear, threat or animosity among themselves. The way the characters in the Forest of Arden have been intercon-

nected under the benign blessings of Mother Nature with significant changes and transformations in their attitude towards the human and the natural world vindicates the fact that Gaia hypothesis is a ‘transcendental concept’ that not only emphasizes symbiotic relationship between man and environment, but also tends to negotiate between the human and spiritual worlds.

Shakespeare’s love for the animal world, a cardinal feature of Biophilia, also comes to the fore in such plays as *Titus Andronicus*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and also *As You Like It*. Here, one is reminded of Greg Garrard’s observation that animal study constitutes an important aspect of ecocritical discourse. In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare chides, in the mouth of Jaques, how animals are killed in their “assigned and native dwelling place” (2.1.61-63). In his anti-hunting polemics, Shakespeare celebrates Gaia hypothesis and offers a powerful plea for animal protection and this is all the more evident from his poignantly pathetic presentation of the gasping and ‘sobbing deer’ wounded by the human world. Jaques argues that in the ‘Republic of Nature’ (2.1.63), frightening and killing of animals should be denounced outright. Whereas in *Titus Andronicus*, the dramatist reprimands the deer poachers and doe-killers, in *Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, he is decidedly critical about the idea of hunting as a royal luxury/pastime or social obligation that prompted the princess to spill the ‘poor deer’s blood’(4.1.23-24). In *The Winter’s Tale*, the Renaissance dramatist moves from animal protection to the love of trees, plants, flowers and seasons and interestingly different flowers symbolically stand for the three stages of human development from childhood to youth and from youth to old age. Whereas Perdita and her lover Florizel are decked with spring time and summer flowers, the aged Sicilian King Leontes epitomizes winter. Perdita’s rustic garden in the ideal and idyllic landscape of Bohemia stands for a world of naturalness where flowers, plants, and trees grow spontaneously without fear and envy. Though Perdita’s garden, Shakespeare attempts to reclaim the lost Edenic Paradise which is contrasted with her mother Hermione’s artificial garden in Sicily-epitomizing winter. In *The Winter’s Tale*, the most interesting part is the flowery tale in Bohemia where Mother goddess Gaia is in a state of everlasting bliss and where the landscape is transformed from the barren wintry world of Sicily into one of flora and fauna embodying everlasting nuances of Springtime beauty of Nature.

Thus, a trajectory into Shakespeare's dramatic corpus succinctly shows that Shakespeare's Renaissance environmental imagination cannot be situated in isolation from the topical, socio-political, economic and cultural issues/problems of contemporary England. Shakespeare was admittedly aware of the Renaissance man's propensity for political power, profit and commercial success nourished by the philosophy of utilitarianism. That is precisely the reason why the rulers of Tudor dynasty encouraged maritime/naval activities and sea adventures so as to elevate England to a big political power by utilizing Nature and natural resources for political gains, economic strength and material profit. This is all the more evident from Prospero's hegemonization and exploitation of both human and non human world to establish himself as a seasoned colonial master. Such an anthropocentric attitude can also be situated in the Renaissance man's passion for hunting and killing of animals in *As You Like It*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Love's Labour's Love*. The various stages of ecophobia in such plays as *King Lear*, *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar* further reveal the anthropocentric vision/outlook of the Renaissance man which is vindicated from the regular assault on 'hungry ocean'- the infinitely copious treasure house of natural resources ravished and ransacked by the human world. Shakespeare's romantic imagination, imaginative ecology and unpretentious love for flowers, plants, trees, birds, animals and emphasis on symbiotic relationship- interconnectedness between human and nonhuman world as evident from in *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale*- and his adumbration of romantic ecology, Gaia hypothesis and Environmental ethics compel us to concede that Shakespeare was an environmentally conscious writer and a pure ecocentric admirer of Nature/environment. However, the tug of war between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism remains a permanent feature of Elizabethan environmental imagination and Shakespeare's environmental sensibility is largely conditioned by this dichotomy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Lamb, Charles and Mary Lamb, *Tales From Shakespeare*. Mumbai, 2008.

Wells, Stanley and Gary Taylor, editors. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. 2nd ed. Oxford UP, 2005.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Ackroyd, Peter, *Shakespeare: The Biography* London: Vintage, 2006

Adamson, Joni. *American Indian Literature, Environmental Justice, and Ecocriticism: The Middle Place*. U of Arizona P, 2001.

Alden T. Vaughan. et al. Introduction. *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare, The Arden Shakespeare, Thomson Learning, 2006.

Aristotle, *Meteorologica*, Translated by E.W.Webster. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, vol 1, Princeton UP, 1984.

Armstrong, Edward A. *Shakespeare's Imagination*. Nebraska. 1963.

Ashcroft, Bill, et al., *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2006.

Augustine, Saint. *City of God*. Edited by G.R.Evans. Penguin Classics. 2003.

Barry, John. *Environment and Social Theory*. Routledge, 2007.

Barton, Anne. *Essays Mainly Shakespearean*. Cambridge UP, 1994.

Bate, Jonathan. *The Song of the Earth*. Basingstoke and Oxford, 2000.

Bate, Jonathan. *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition*. Routledge, 1991.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester UP, 1995.

Bellamy, John, et al., editors. *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism's War on the Earth*. NYU Press, 2010.

Berry, Philippa. *Shakespeare's Feminine Endings: Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies*. Routledge, 2012.

Blank, Paula. *Shakespeare and his Mismeasure of Renaissance Man*. Cornell UP, 2006.

Boehrer, Bruce. *Shakespeare among the Animals*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.

Borlik, Todd. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature: Green Pastures*. Routledge, 2010.

Bottomore, Tom. Editor. *Karl Marx*, Blackwell. 1979.

Bowerbank, Sylvia Lorraine. *Speaking for Nature: Women and Ecologies of Early Modern England*. The Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Bradley, Andrew Cecil. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. New Delhi, 2000.

Brayton, Dan. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. U of Virginia P, 2018.

Brissden, Alan. *Shakespeare and the Dance*. Humanities Press, 1981.

Bristol, Michael. *Carnival and Theatre: Plebian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. Methuen, 1985.

Brooker, Peter. *A Glossary of Cultural Theory*, 2nd edition, Oxford UP, 2003.

Bruckner, Lynne, and Dan Brayton, editors. *Ecocritical Shakespeare*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing and the Formation of American Culture*. Harvard UP, 1995.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*. Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Bushnell, Rebecca. *Green Desire: Early Modern English Gardens*. Cornell UP, 2003.

Campbell, SueEllen. "The Land and Language of Desire: Where Deep Ecology and Post-Structuralism Meet". *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. U of Georgia P, 1996.

Capp, Bernard. *English Almanac 1500-1800: Astrology and the Popular Press*. Cornell UP, 1979.

Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Cartwright, David Edgar. *Tides: A Scientific History*. Cambridge UP, 2001.

Charlton, H.B. *Shakespearean Comedy*. Methuen, 1969.

Clark, Timothy. *Ecocriticism on the Edge: The Anthropocene as a Threshold Concept*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Clark, Timothy. *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and the Environment*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Cody, Richard. *The Landscape of the Mind: Pastoralism and Platonic Theory in Tasso's Aminta and Shakespeare's Early Comedies*. Clarendon. 1969.

Cohen, Derek. "Searching Shakespeare: Studies in Culture and Authority". U of Toronto P, 2003.

Cohen, Michael P. "Blues in the Green: Ecocriticism under Critique." *Environmental History*, vol.9, no.1 Jan.2004, Chicago UP, pp.9-36, <http://doi.org/10.2307/3985943>.

Cousteau, Jacques. *The Whale: Mighty Monarch of the Sea*. Translated by J. F. Bernard. Doubleday, 1972.

Crosby, Alfred. *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe 900-1900*. Cambridge UP, 2004.

Dandy, John Francis. *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: A Study of King Lear*. Faber and Faber, 1948.

Davis, Philip. *Shakespeare Thinking*. Continuum, 2007.

Debus, Allen. *Man and Nature in the Renaissance*. Cambridge UP, 1978.

Devall, Bill and George Sessions. *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*. U of Michigan, 1985.

Dean, Thomas K. "What is Ecocriticism"? *Association for the Study of Literature and Environment*. U of IOWA.

<http://www.asle.org/site/resources/ecocritical-library/intro/defining/Dean>

DeLoughrey. et al., *Introduction, Postcolonial Ecologies: Literature of the Environment*. New Oxford UP, 2011.

Doolittle, W.F. "Is nature really motherly?" *CoEvolution Quarterly*. 29:58-63.1981

Donaldson, James Woman: *Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and Among the Early Christians*. Longman, 1907.

Dusinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*, Harper & Row, 1975.

Ellis, Richard. *The Empty Ocean: Plundering the World's Marine Life*. Island Press, 2003.

Egan, Gabriel. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2006.

Empson, William. *Some Versions of Pastoral*. Chatto and Windus, London, 1935.

Estok, Simon.C. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Estok, Simon. "A Report Card on Ecocriticism", *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, 96(November 2001) 1, 220-238, DOI: [10.1179/aulla.2001.96.1.04](https://doi.org/10.1179/aulla.2001.96.1.04)

Evans, J. Claude. *With Respect for Nature: Living as Part of the Natural World*. State U of New York P, 2005.

Fagan, Briar. *The Little Ice: How Climate Made History, 1300-1850*. Basic Books, 2000.

Falconer, Alexander. *Shakespeare and the Sea*. Constable, 1964.

Fitzpatrick, Joan. *Food in Shakespeare: Early Modern Dietaries and the Plays*. Ashgate, 2007.

Fromm, Harold. *The Nature of Being Human: From Environmentalism to Consciousness*. The Johns Hopkins UP, 2009.

Fudge, Erika. *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality and Humanity in Early Modern England*. Cornell UP, 2006.

Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2004.

Giamatti, A. Bartlett. *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*. W. W. Norton, 1989.

Gifford, Terry. *Pastoral*. Routledge, 1999.

Glotfelty, Cheryll, and Harold Fromm, editors. *The Ecocritical Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens: The U of Georgia P, 1996.

Gillies, John. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, Cambridge UP, 1994.

Gold, John R. and George Revill, editors. *Representing the Environment*. Routledge, 2004.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *The Tempest in the Caribbean*. U of Minnesota P, 2004.

Goodboy, Axel, and Kate Rigby, editors. *Ecocritical Theory: New European Approaches*. U of Virginia P, 2011.

Graubard, Mark. *Astrology and Alchemy: Two Fossil Sciences*. Philosophical Library, 1953.

Gross Matthias, and Harald Heinrichs, editors. *Environmental Sociology: European Perspectives and Interdisciplinary Challenges*. Springer, 2010.

Griffiths, Emma. *Medea*. Routledge, 2012.

Gudorf, Christine E., and James Edward Huchingson, editors. *Boundaries: A Casebook in Environmental Ethics*. Georgetown UP, 2010.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge UP, 1996.

Guha, Ramachandra and Joan Martinez- Alier. *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*. London: Earthscan, 1997.

Haila, Yrjo and Chuck Dyke, editors. *How Nature Speaks: The Dynamics of the Human Ecological Condition*. Duke UP, 2006.

Hakluyt, Richard. *Voyages*. Edited by Edmund Goldsmid. British Library Historical Print Editions. 2011.

Harding, Juliet, Online Interviews with Gary Synder: Modern American Poetry. *Northern Lights*. Winter-Spring 2000. http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/s_z/synder/interviews.

Harrison, Robert Pogue. *Forests: The Shadow of Civilization*. U of Chicago P, 1992.

Hawkes, Terence. *Shakespeare in the Present*. Routledge, 2002.

Hay, Peter. *Main Currents in Western Environmental Thought*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana UP, 2002.

Heise, Ursula K. "Science and Ecocriticism". *American Book Review* 18, 1997.

Heise, Ursula K. *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global*. Oxford UP, 2008.

Hiltner, Ken. *What Else is Pastoral?: Renaissance Literature and the Environment*. Cornell UP, 2011.

Howarth, William. "Some Principles of Ecocriticism" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. U of Georgia Press, 1996.

Hulse, S. Clark. "Wresting the Alphabet: Oratory and Action in *Titus Andronicus*". *Criticism* 21, 1979.

Hughes, J. Donald. *Ecology of Ancient Civilizations*. U of New Mexico P, 2000.

Huggan Graham, "Greening Postcolonialism: Ecocritical Perspectives". *Modern Fiction Studies*. vol.5, no.3, 2004.

Ivo Kamp., et al. *Early Modern Ecostudies: From the Florentine Codex to Shakespeare*. New Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Jackson, John B. *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape*. Yale UP, 1984.

Jones, Gwilym. *Shakespeare's Storm*. Manchester UP, 2016.

Kalidasa. *Abhijnana Sakuntala*. Translated by Romila Thapar, Anthem, 2002.

Kerridge, Richard. *Writing the Environment: Ecocriticism and Literature*. Zed Books, 1998.

Kerridge, Richard & Neil Sammells. editors. *Writing the Environment: Ecocriticism and Literature*. Zed Books Ltd, 1998.

Knight, G.Wilson. *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretation of Shakesperian Tragedy*. Routledge Classics, 2001.

Kovel, J and Michael Lovy. "An Ecosocialist Manifesto". *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*. Paris. 2001, Retrieved from <http://www.cnsjournal.org/manifesto.html>

Langston, Marcia. "Homeland: Sacred Vision and the Seller State", *Artlink*, vol. 20. (1), pp.11-16, 2000.

Legouis, Emile and Louis Cazamian. *A History of English Literature*. The Macmillan Co, 1929.

Leiss, William. *The Domination of Nature*. G. Braziller, 1972.

Levy, Neil. "Foucault's Unnatural Ecology." *Discourses of the Environment*. Edited by E'ric Darier. Blackwell, 1999.

Lindley, David, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge UP, 2002.

___ Shakespeare and Music: Arden Critical Companions. London, UK: Thompson Learning, 2006.

Lorenzi, Rosella. "Oysters and Crabs, the Popcorn of Shakespearean Theatergoers". *London Times*. 12 February. 2010. <http://news.discovery.com/history/oysters-and-crabs-the-popcorn-of-shakespearean-theatergoers.html>.

Love, Glen A., *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology, and the Environment*. U of Virginia Press, 2003.

Lovelock, James, et al., editors. *Gaia, a New Look at Life on Earth*. Oxford UP, 1979.

Lovelock, James. *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth is Fighting Back and how We Can Still Save Humanity*. Allen Lane, 2006.

Love, Glen. A. *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and the Environment*. U of Virginia P, 2003.

Mandel, Jerome. "Dream and Imagination in Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1, Oxford UP, 1973, pp. 61-68, *JSTOR*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2868739>.

Manes, Christopher. "Nature and Silence" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. U of Georgia P, 1996.

Marx, Karl. *Das Kapital*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, USSR, 1887.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. Oxford UP, 1964.

McAlindon, Thomas. *Shakespeare's Tragic Cosmos*. Cambridge UP, 1991.

McGrann, Jerome J. *The Beauty of Inflections: Literary Investigations in Historical Method and Theory*. U of Minnesota Press, 1985.

McKusick, James.C. *Green Writing: Romanticism and Ecology*. Macmillan, 2000.

McIntosh, Robert. P. *The Background of Ecology: Concept and Theory*. Cambridge UP, 1985.

Meadows, A. J. *The High Firmament: A Survey of Astronomy in English Literature*. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1969.

Meeker, Joseph. *The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology*. Scribner's Press, 1972.

Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. Harper and Row. 1980.

Merchant, Carolyn. *Radical Ecology: The Search for a Livable World*. Routledge, 2005.

Milton, Kay. *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory: Exploring the Role of Anthropology in Environmental Discourse*. Routledge, 1996.

Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*. Henry Holt and Company. New York, 1874.

Morton, Timothy. *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Harvard UP, 2007.

Montuschi, Eleonora. "Order of man, order of nature: Francis Bacon's idea of a 'dominion' over nature. Order: God's, Man's and Nature's". Centre for Philosophy of Natural and Social Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK. 2010.

Mowat, Barbara. A and Paul Werstine, Editors. *Shakespeare's Sonnets & Poem*. Simon and Schuster, 2015.

Myers, Norman. "Biodiversity and the Precautionary Principle", *Ambio*, vol.22, no. 2/3, Biodiversity: Ecology, Economics, Policy, May.1993, Springer, pp.74-79, *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4314050>. PDF download.

Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement. A Summary", *Inquiry*, 16:1-4, 95-100, 1973, DOI: [10.1080/00201747308601682](https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747308601682).

Nardizzi, Vin, 'Felling Falstaff in Windsor Park', in *Ecocritical Shakespeare*, ed. by Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, pp. 123-38.

— "Shakespeare's Globe and England's Woods", *Shakespeare Studies*. 39, 2011, pp. 54-63.

Nixon, Rob. "Environmentalism and Postcolonialism". *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*. Edited by Ania Loomba and Suvir Kaul. Duke UP, 2005.

Oelschlaegar, Marx. *The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology*. Yale UP, 1991.

Ortner, Sherry. "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" *Women, Culture, and Society*. edited by Rochelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere. Stanford UP, 1974. pp. 67-87.

Oppermann, Serpil. "Theorizing Ecocriticism: Toward a Postmodern Ecocritical Practice." *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 13.2 Summer. 2006, pp.103–28.

Orgel, Stephen. "Introduction" *The Tempest*. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford UP, 1987. 1-87.

--- "Prospero's Wife." *Representations* 8 (1984): 1-13. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Aug. 2014.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by David Raeburn. Penguin Classics. 2004.

Parker, Patricia. *Shakespeare from the Margins: Language, Culture, Context*. U of Chicago P, 1996.

Parry, J. H. *The Discovery of the Sea*. Dial Press, 1974.

Pepper, David. *Eco-socialism: From Deep Ecology to Social Justice*. Routledge, 1993.

Peterson, Douglas L. *Time, Tide and Tempest: A Study of Shakespeare's Romances*. Huntington Library, 1973.

Perkins, David. *Romanticism and Animal Rights*. Cambridge UP, 2003.

Phillips, Dana. *The Truth of Ecology: Nature, Culture and Literature in America*. Oxford UP, 2003.

Plato. Symposium. Translated by Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff, Indianapolis, 1989.

Plato. *The Republic of Plato*. 2nd edition. Translated by Allan Bloom. BasicBooks, 1968.

Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. Routledge, 1993.

Plumwood, Val. "The Ecopolitics Debate and the Politics of Nature". *Ecological Feminism*. Edited by Karen J. Warren, Routledge. 1994.

Rackham, Oliver. *Trees and Woodland in the British Landscape*. J. M. Dent, 1976.

Rueckert, William. "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Edited by Cheryl Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, U of Georgia P, 1996.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse On the Sciences and the Arts*. In Basic Political Writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing, 1987.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse On the origin of Inequality*. In Basic Political Writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing, 1987.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Emile*. Translated by Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1979.

Rudd, Gillian. *Greenery: Ecocritical Readings of Late Medieval English Literature*. Manchester UP, 2007.

Sabine, George .H. *A History of Political Theory*. Dryden Press, 1973.

Saccio, Peter. *Shakespeare's English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama*. Oxford UP, 2000.

Scott.C.M.Heidi, "Haven and Horrors: The Island Landscape", *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 21, no.3, OUP, 2014.

Selvanomy, Nirmal, "Chennai. International Institute of Tamil Studies", 2003. *Essays in Ecocriticism*. Sarup & Sons, 2003, pp.345.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Edited by A.W.Verity. Methuen. 1967.

Shiva, Vandana. *Monocultures of the Mind*. Bloomsbury Academic, 1993.

Shiva, Vandana. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development*. Zed Books. 1989.

Silko, Leslie Marmon. "Landscape, History, and the Pueblo Imagination" *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Edited by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. U of Georgia P, 1996.

Sillars, Stuart. *Shakespeare and the Visual Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. New York: Avon Books, 1975.

Smith, Kimberley. *African American Environmental Thought*. UP of Kansas, 2007.

Smith, Bruce R. *The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture*. Chicago UP, 2009.

Sobel, David. *Beyond Ecophobia: Reclaiming the Heart in Nature Education*. Orion Society, 1996.

Spencer, Theodore. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*. Macmillan, 1942.

Spurgeon, Caroline. *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*. Cambridge UP, 1961

.

Stallybrass, Peter. "Macbeth and Witchcraft in Focus on Macbeth". Edited by John Russell Brown, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Stallybrass, Peter. "How many Children had Lady Macbeth?" In his *Hamlet and Other Shakespearean Essay*, Cambridge UP, 1979.

Sturgeon, Noël. *Ecofeminist natures*. Routledge, 1997.

Tansley, Arthur.G. "The Use and Abuse of Vegetational Concepts and Terms". *Ecology*, vol.16, no.3, Ecological Society of America, Wiley, 1935, pp.284-307, *JSTOR* <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1930070>. PDF download.

Theocritus. *Idylls*. Translated by Anthony Verity. Oxford UP, 2002.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Penguin Books, 1984.

Tigner, Amy L. *Literature and the Renaissance Garden from Elizabeth I to Charles II*. London: Ashgate, 2012.

Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Vintage Books. 1943.

Trevelyan, G.M. *English Social History*. Orient Black Swan, 2011.

Wagner, P.L. and Marvin W. Mikesell. *Readings in Cultural Geography*. U of Chicago P, 1962.

Watson, Robert N. *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.

Woodward, Colin. *Ocean's End*. Perseus Books, 2000.

White, Lynn, Jr. "The Historical Roots of our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 March.10, 1967, vol.155.Issue. 3767. pp.1203-1207. [DOI:10.1126/science.155.3767.1203](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.155.3767.1203).

Wilson, Edward O. *Biophilia*. Harvard UP, 1984.

Wilson, J. *The Elizabethan Shakespeare*, Humphrey Milford, 1929.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620*. Illinois UP, 1984.

Wordsworth, William. *Preface to Lyrical Ballads*. Edited by Warwick Jack Burgoyne Owen. Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1957.

Worster, Donald. *The Wealth of Nature: Environmental History and the Ecological Imagination*. Oxford UP, 1993.

Yaeger, Patricia S. "Editor's Column: Sea Trash, Dark Pools, and the Tragedy of the Commons". *PMLA*, vol.125, no. 3, Modern Language Association May. 2010, pp.523-545. *JSTOR* <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25704454>.PDF download.