



# Nature Embraced: An Ecocritical Approach to the Study of Selected Poems by P.B. Shelley

ID No.3716

(PP 280 - 290)

<https://doi.org/10.21271/zjhs.24.6.19>

**Ibrahim Ali Murd**

English Department-College of Education / University of Garmian

Ibrahim.ali@garmian.edu.krd

**Received: 17/08/2020**

**Accepted: 29/11/2020**

**Published: 25/12/2020**

## Abstract

Trying an analytical article from the Eco critical perspective is by no means an easy task especially its theoretical part since the term 'Eco critical' itself is a complicated concept to cover, let alone its still burgeoning status which demands close and continuous follow-up of the latest studies about the topic. Yet it is, simultaneously, an interesting task that firstly enlightens its writer about the significance of nature, and secondly it clears the path for future studies about the topic. The article tries to study some Romantic poems through the lens of ecocriticism because it hypothesizes that some significant resemblance could be found between the purposes of the poems- and by extension their writers- on the one hand and Eco criticism as a theory or approach on the other hand. The study also refers in critical expressions, to such fields as environmental studies, green studies, and ecological studies, since they are connected in one way or another to the Eco critical approach. It covers three poems by the second generation Romantic poet Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822) from an Eco critical perspective and at the end, reaches some conclusions the most obvious one being that, though lived and wrote much earlier to the environmental and Eco critical studies, his ideas and beliefs which are expressed in the studied poems reflect, to a great extent, what those studies about nature and the universe call for. The article is concluded with the list of works cited.

**Keywords:** Eco criticism, environmental, Romantic, study, nature, resemblance.

## I. Introduction

Because of its juvenile age and controversial nomenclature, studying the term Eco criticism is, in fact, a thankless and complicated project for any writer. Notwithstanding its existence in one way or another much earlier to its official appearance; yet, still it encompasses a great deal of argument. Its predecessors include environmental studies, green studies, eco-poetics, ecological studies, ect. and still the track is on the move. It is even not settled yet whether it should be labeled a theory or an approach. For Adrian Geoffrey Tait, for instance, as it is shown in the title of his Ph.D. dissertation, "From Wessex to Time's Laughingstocks: An Eco critical Approach to the Poetry of Thomas Hardy", it is an approach. Others regard it as "one of the newer theoretical-critical schools" (Qtd in Easterlin: 118). Furthermore, its very establishment as an independent domain is not taken for certain and is still, as mentioned earlier, under further study and scrutiny as one modern critic states: "It is still distinctly on the academic margins . . . and the movement still does not have a widely-known set of assumptions, doctrines, or procedures: (Barry: 223).

Its appearance, on the contrary, brought about little to nothing of dispute and hullabaloo. Most critics agree that ecocriticism as a term appeared to the literary circles at the end of the 1980s and the 1990s especially in the American journals and culminated in the publication of *The Eco Critical Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology* in 1996 by Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. They define it simply as "the study of the relationship between literature and



the physical environment". "Just as feminist criticism examines language and literature from a gender-conscious, and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of modes of production and economic class to its reading of texts" they write, "Eco criticism takes an earth-centered approach to literary studies" (xviii).

But such a concept and belief has certainly existed years, and ages earlier to such dates. The critic Peter Barry, for instance traces it back to the American Transcendentalists, especially Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882), Margaret Fuller (1810-1850), and Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862) and he should have depended in this upon the field of their interest which commonly was nature and environment. In his influential *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, he supports his belief with a well-written quote from Fuller's book *Summer on the Lake*:

For here there is no escape from the weight of a perpetual creation; all other forms and motions come and go, the tide rises and recedes, the wind, at its mightiest, moves in gales and gusts, but here is really an incessant and indefatigable motion. Awake or asleep, there is no escape, still this rushing round you and through you. It is in this way I have most felt the grandeur- somewhat eternal, if not infinite (225).

In the same way, the English branch of ecocriticism or green studies as it is sometimes called, critics like Peter Barry agree, goes as far back as the Romantic literature of the early nineteenth century. And therefore, the forefather of ecocriticism is nature with its denotations and connotations. In this respect but may not be in others, it burgeoned on both sides of the Atlantic from almost the same derivation, taking into account both transcendentalists' and Romantic' focus upon nature and wilderness.

Yes, the young theory or approach focuses on nature as the center of the things and cases. For this reason, the last part of Glotfelty and Fromm's definition is both interesting and significant. Whereas previous environmental studies put nature and its elements as simply an 'other' to man; In Eco Criticism man is just an element in the huge biosphere rather than the controlling power over it that subjugates all other elements to its benefits and uses. And it is in this aspect, the researcher believes, that the Romantic literature helps to guide and urge human reaction to the natural phenomenon and creatures in a way that is close to ecocriticism. The Romantic writer's complaint was, in the main, against man's role in destroying nature through introducing technology and industry that changed man from a productive character to a mere consumer.

The term ecocriticism itself goes along the Romantics' beliefs more than other previous ones, since its prefix 'eco' is a clear reference to the spontaneous occurrence of things in nature. Thus nature becomes the center of everything; while in the environmental studies for instance, everything in the environment revolves around man who is the center and subject of focus. For the Romantics, at least on the surface view of things, every member of the ecosystem is equally significant through the role it plays within the overall biosphere. (See Barry: 232-38). This, necessarily, brings the deep ecology into mind that supposes, at least, equality between man and nature as components of the whole ecosystem. Although considered by some critics as radical, deep ecology does not criticize man; rather it rejects anthropocentric ideology that makes man the center and the other creatures oppressed by him and used only for his benefit. According to Kevin Hutchings, "Deep ecology's critique of anthropocentric systems of value that instrumentalize non-human creatures and natural environments has led some of its practitioners to advocate an alternative mode of identification with nature, one that eschews not only instrumental rationality but, arguably, any mode of self-reflexive engagement" (182).

The Romantic writers, notably the poets, reflected almost all such ideas and philosophies prior to their announcement and introduction by later critics. Some environmentalists,



however, criticized them of being selective in their natural concerns in that they stressed upon animals and in the animals, the domestic ones drew their attention more. For this, of course, the Romantics are simply innocent and their poetic products refute such claims. Samuel Taylor Coleridge's (1772-1834) "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" (1798) is a stark proof. The works of William Blake (1757-1827), William Cooper (1731-1800), William Wordsworth (1770-1850), and Robert Southey (1774-1843) – to mention just a few- are other examples in case. And so, attacking the Romantics on the ground of being non- holistic- an accusation addressed more by the environmentalists- could simply be considered groundless. With Percy Bysshe Shelley, however, the story is even more straightforward. He turned vegetarian as a protest against the maltreatment of animals as one critic writes: " Percy Bysshe Shelley went so far as to advocate moral vegetarianism not only to prevent the inhumane treatment of animals, but also to protest against a carnivorous mode of human sustenance that promoted social inequity and the waste of agricultural resources" (Qtd in Hutchings: 187).

The Romantic ecocriticism (if the term is accepted as such) draws most of its power and motivation from industrialization of the British society due to the industrial revolution and its destructive consequences. And so, the Romantic poets and writers were seriously concerned about the dear cost of such a demolishing procedure, as Kate Rigby remarks;

both to subordinate humans and to the earth, of our production processes and consumption habits has grown in equal measure to its difficulty. For at the same time that the ecosystems sustaining all life on earth have become ever more critically endangered by our growing numbers and levels of consumption, ever more people live in ever greater remove from the natural world, unmindful of their impact upon the earth (Qtd in Wolfreys: 151).

This serious concern can only be touched when someone is worried about a man or humanity in general and so, it could be interpreted as a symptom of the range of the Romantics' understanding of, interest in, and worry for nature as an organic unit capable of generation, death, and rebirth. Such feeling of uneasiness can be traced in the poetry of some prominent Romantic and even Pre-Romantic poets; that's why Percy Bysshe Shelley was chosen for the present study and some of his poems will cover the next sections of this article and elucidate the concepts and ideas expressed in this introductory section.

## II. Physical Reality

Percy Bysshe Shelley, the radical and revolutionary Romantic poet shares some of the good characteristics of what is later came to be called environmental studies and some steps further received the more modern nomenclature of Eco criticism. Without having clear natural and wild backgrounds as Wordsworth's Lake District and Hardy's Wessex; Nature and its significance were firmly planted in his innermost and, necessarily, in most of his poems. His Platonic perspective of nature can well be deduced from the following quote from his wife's preface to his collected works: "His life was spent in the contemplation of nature; he knew every plant by its name and was familiar with the history and habit of every production of the earth. He could interpret, without a fault; each appearance in the sky and the varied phenomena of heaven and earth filled him with deep emotion" (Shelley: 5).

With such interest at the background, writing poems like "Mont Blanc" is beyond astonishment for the readers and followers of the vegetarian Romantic poet. Composed while he was in a tour in Europe with his wife, Mary and his step sister in 1816, the poem witnessed publication the following year within a volume entitled *History of a Six Weeks' Tour through*



*a Part of France, Switzerland, Germany and Holland.* The poem, captioned *Lines Written in the Vale of Chamouni*, starts with a foundational beginning where the natural scenery attracts not only his eyes- as it is casual for any normal seer, but his innermost: "The everlasting universe of things / Flows through the mind, and rolls its rapid waves" (Greenblatt: 770). The mountain exemplifies nature in general not as simply an attractive backdrop to be enjoyed; rather it is part of the 'everlasting universe' and consequently part of what could form the whole biosphere- necessarily- including the speaker of the poem as well. It is not, then, in the margin of a circular existence at the center of which man could lie relaxed, neither less than an equal entity:

Thus thou, Ravine of Arve-dark, deep Ravine-  
 Thou many-colored, many-voicéd vale,  
 Over whose pines, and crags, and caverns sail  
 Fast cloud-shadows and sunbeams: awful scene,  
 Where Power in likeness of the Arve comes down  
 From the ice-gulfs that gird his secret throne,

(Ibid).

Here is the real beginning of the poem; the reverend river is directly addressed as an equal entity and even a sublime one. The capitalization of the initial letter (r) in its chasm is an indicator. Instead of just describing its thrilling scene and enjoying its appealing images the way Coleridge did in *Kubla Khan*; Shelley indulges in its overt fearful strength and power. What is he doing is to deal with what confronts him- to use Peter Barry's expression, as "actually present as an entity which affects us, and which we can affect, if we mistreat it"(227). The natural show of the highest mountain in Europe is never a passive thing just to be seen; rather an active contributor that affects and is affected by human nature and culture. The interaction between the poet's mind and nature-represented here by 'Ravine of Arve' is extended to a significant range; he is heavily affected by the massive element of the ecosystem and his reaction to its existence and horrible capacity could be considered as a stark acknowledgement by the poet to such capabilities. In this, Shelley seems faithful to William Wordsworth's description of the relationship of the poet and nature in the preface to the 1802 edition to his *Lyrical Ballads*: "The poet" Wordsworth writes, "considers man and nature as essentially adapted to each other, and the mind of man as naturally the mirror of the fairest and the most interesting qualities of nature" (Qtd in Greenblatt: 301). And therefore, the writer's belief and desire to join the natural wilderness and become part of it could be attributed, in the main, to the Romantic poets, and consequently leads to a fact that they embody- in one way or another- the ecocritics' beliefs in the overall ecosystem of which man is an equal part like the other components including nature.. Thus, Shelley seems to have responded, in this poem, to one of Lawrence Buell's characteristics which should be observed in any environmental piece of work, "the nonhuman environment is present not merely as a framing device but as a presence that begin to suggest that human history is implicated in natural history"( 7). This condition and requirement is met, consciously or unconsciously, in the beginning of the poem's fourth stanza:

The fields, the lakes, the forests, and the streams,  
 Ocean, and all the living things that dwell  
 Within the daedal earth; lightning, and rain,  
 Earthquake, and fiery flood, and hurricane,

.....

The works and ways of man, their death and birth,  
 And that of him and all that his may be;  
 All things that move and breathe with toil and sound  
 Are born and die; revolve, subside, and swell.

(Greenblatt: 772).



It is an unembellished acknowledgement and even desire of the correspondence between man and the natural elements, and shows the harmony which Shelley and his colleagues in the Romantic Movement called for among the constituents of the large and inclusive ecosystem, especially between man and his environment. It is that harmony and common fate that the poem is trying to stress; the 'all things that move' should not be interpreted as human being alone, rather every active member of the overall biosphere represented, here, by nature and man respectively.

These lines and even other lines and poems by Shelley or his contemporaries refute the Eco critics' complaints that man is responsible for the destruction and demolition of the natural environment, since, after all, not all human beings share the same belief about the significance of technology and its development which led to the devastation of the environment on behalf of cosmopolitanism. In this respect, Peter Coates states that "environmental threats (like everything else) are socially constructed and culturally defined; there are no shared, universal threats- different groups privilege those confronting their own particular interests. . . . It may be argued that what some might see as crisis, others may regard as change (Qtd in Tait: 25). What others regarded as change in the industrial revolution during Shelley's time, was for certain a serious threat for the community from the perspective of all the Romantics writers and poets whose outcry against it was clearly heard. And nature was at the center whenever such threats and horror of their occurrence were presented as a caution and warning for humanity at large.

### III. Destroyer and Preserver

While still in a journey in Italy, Shelley penned another 'poem of nature' that brought about a great deal of response to its merits and the poet's genius from its publication time in 1820 almost to the present time. Multiple interpretations were made about it the majority of which stress its significance as a representative of Shelley's belief about and love for nature as one of the second generation Romantic poets. Therefore, the present article will go further in this respect and try to follow its green study, ecological, and Eco critical aspects.

Unlike "Mont Blanc", Shelley starts the poem by addressing the wind from the first line, giving it an awful and grandeur aura: " O, Wild West Wind, thou breath of Autumn's being, / Thou from whose unseen presence the leaves dead / Are driven, like ghosts from an enchanter fleeing," (Greenblatt: 791). The wind is never just a natural element or phenomenon as it is regarded traditionally and perceived without much care or attention. Shelley, therefore, addresses it as an equal or even lofty element:

O, thou,  
Who chariotest to their dark wintry bed  
The winged seeds, where they lie cold and low,  
Each like a corpse within its grave, until  
Thine azure sister of the spring shall blow  
Her clarion o'er the dreaming earth, and fill

.....

Wild Spirit, which art moving everywhere;  
Destroyer and preserver; hear, O, hear!

(Greenblatt:791).

It is a dignified entity rather than just moving air, and so it ' chariotest the winged seeds' to where they are reborn and regenerated. It resembles the power that directs the circular movement of life on earth from generation to death and regeneration. The ' azure sister', here, could be interpreted to refer to the birth-giving ability of the wind. Although 'destroyer' in autumn; yet it is at the same time the ' preserver' of life on earth, since it causes the regeneration of plants and renewal of greenery in the following spring.

Though Shelley was known as an atheist and he identified himself so; yet reference to religion could be seen here and there in some of his poem. The power of the wind, it is clear,



is unbearable for every element in the biosphere at large, including man. The word 'clarion' could refer to Israfil, the angel who will blow the trumpet to announce the day of resurrection. The personified azure will blow 'her' trumpet, in the way Israfi will do, to create a rebirth and resurrection on earth for its already dead plants. In this, Shelley may have been influenced by Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802) and his theories of biological evolution especially that later, his grandson, Charles Darwin (1809-1882) shocked and affected most of the writers and artists for ages. Shelley could well have been one of them, taking for example Mary Shelley's theory of evolution through life after death.

The poet, still addressing the wind, tries to identify himself with it:

O, uncontrollable! If even  
I were as in my boyhood, and could be  
The comrade of thy wanderings over heaven.

.....  
Oh! lift me as a wave, a leaf, a cloud!  
I fall upon the thorns of life! I bleed!  
A heavy weight of hours has chained and bowed  
One too like thee: tameless, and swift, and proud

(Ibid: 792-3).

The poet's longing for identification with this natural power and joining it spiritually is for certain related, in one way or another, to the technological and demographic changes at his time as Keith Thomas reiterates in his *Man and the Natural World*: "There had gradually emerged attitudes to the natural world which were essentially incompatible with the direction in which English society was moving. The growth of towns led to a new longing for the countryside. The process of cultivation had forced a taste for weeds, mountains, and unsubdued nature" (Qtd in Garrard: 115).

Shelley is moving, unconsciously, away from the man-centered attitudes towards a bio centric, an approach later came to be known as ecocriticism. The 'O, uncontrollable!' with its awe-bringing smell, is in itself a denunciation of instrumentalization of nature (evaluation of every non-human thing according to the range of its usefulness and its role in promoting human being). The wind is revered for its enormous power over the other natural organisms, and in this-Shelley seems to hint- as an element of nature, it is at least equal to man's status. The speaker in the poem, necessarily Shelley himself, rejects to where he belongs and completely identifies himself with the wind; he feels 'tameless, and swift, and proud' just like the wind; yet he is in a status where he feels peculiar and even oppressed by 'weight of hours'. That is why he appeals for the wind to rid him from his unwanted status. He simply wishes, as Naess remarks to "adopt an ethic of 'identification' with all things, a mode of relationship involving an extension of sympathy that reaches so far and becomes so contrast that the self loses any desire to differentiate between itself and the world" (Qtd in Hutchings:182).

In the concluding stanza, Shelley philosophizes upon the concept he presented in the previous stanza through apostrophizing the wind:

And, by the incantation of this verse,  
Scatter, as from an unextinguished hearth  
Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind!  
Be through my lips to unawakened earth  
The trumpet of a prophecy! O, wind,  
If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?

(Greenblatt: 793).

Attempting identification with the wind earlier; Shelley sees himself entirely in the lap of this element of the ecosystem and at 'his' grip, and therefore he asks the wind to support him (may be as a Muse) to blowout his ideas and concepts (most probably those related to his beliefs



about the equality among the different elements of the biosphere) among the people. For him, the situation of the people in Europe in his time is a mere winter. People are unconscious about the impact of nature and environment, so they need to be awakened from their dead dreams in this respect. Such a philosophy could be regarded as a corner stone for the ecological studies and later Eco criticism itself. In connecting love of nature to love of mankind; Wordsworth means this concept and belief, and Shelley seems, here, to echo his master-leader.

Additionally, Wordsworth's and by extension, Shelley's radical beliefs above (according to the standard belief of their age) are simply manifestations of the philosophy of the deep ecology and Eco criticism. "Deep ecology movement" the philosopher Arne Naess states, "rejects human-in-environment image in favor of the rational, total field image: organisms as knots in the biospherical net or field of intrinsic relations" (1).

Shelley's outcry, here, and in fact elsewhere in many other poems, could well be interpreted as an excellent foreshadowing for the nature-supporting movements that emerged gradually until the present day. Shelley's question and interrogation in the concluding line of the poem (most probably a rhetorical question since- it seems he was sure of its happening in advance) almost came true theoretically albeit not practically, since the dangers that horrified him and the other Romantics in general, are still there with even more deteriorations.

#### IV. Unattainable Perfection

To describe Shelley as a poet of nature is never an unexpected thing since Romanticism and nature have long ago become parallel expressions; yet his interest in nature differs somehow from that of his colleagues especially Wordsworth. For him nature is endowed with a dynamic quality, and this belief drives him close to the later studies and theories of nature and wilderness. While still in Italy, he composed the thrilling and elegant poem "To a Skylark" in 1820. Though written much earlier to every theory and approach about nature, the poem seems to embody one of the major principles of the deep ecology proposed by its philosopher Arne Naess. "The deep ecology" writes Naess "emphasizes principles of diversity and of symbiosis. Diversity enhances the potentialities of survival, the chances of new modes of life, the richness of forms. And the so-called struggle for life, and survival of the fittest, should be interpreted in the sense of the ability to coexist and cooperate in complex relationships, rather than ability to kill, exploit, and suppress" (2). It is for such reasons that the green study usually adopts and uses the principles and ideas of the deep ecology for Romantic literature and especially poetry. As a companion who envies his betters, Shelley directly addresses the bird in the opening line of the poem:

Hail to thee, blithe Spirit!  
Bird thou never wert,  
That from Heaven, or near it,  
Pourest thy full heart  
In profuse strains of unpremeditated art.  
(Greenblatt: 834).

The addressee is more than just a bird, it is, rather, a 'blithe spirit'; two connoting epithets that Shelly, and by extension, man is deprived of due to development in technology, destruction of the countryside as a result of the mass immigration to the cities, and neglecting the biospheric elements other than man himself. Everything around the bird is abnormal and thrilling not because skylarks sing only high in the sky; rather because such a source of natural pleasure and enjoyment has become strange for the metropolitan inhabitants. It is this unbelievable ecstasy that urges the poet to ask for its origin and spring: "O'er which clouds are brightening, / Thou dost flow and run; / Like an unbodied joy whose race is just begun" (Ibid). The puzzlement of the speaker stems, most probably, from the mortal and pain-stricken life of man as compared to the immortal and everlasting pleasure of one of the components of nature. It can also be interpreted as an eager longing of the speaker for unionization with



nature as part of the holistic system that governs the world. It is a quest for the great society described as late as 1964 by Lyndon Johnson (1908-1973), the thirty sixth president of America as " a place where man are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods" (Qtd in Rome: 533).

This 'great society'- it seems to Shelley- is beyond reach; therefore, he could have meant by those lines a dream of attaining the unattainable pleasure of the bird's ecstasy in the world. Towards the end of the poem, he discloses this hope even more:

Yet if we could scorn  
Hate, and pride, and fear;  
If we were things born  
Not to shed a tear,  
I know not how thy joy we ever should come near.  
(Greenblatt: 836)

Man, Shelley wants to stress, is plagued with a number of diseases and complications that cause obstacles and barriers on his way towards reaching the state of union with and joining the other biospheric elements and constituents mentally and spiritually. 'Hate, and pride, and fear' are exclusively human features in which no other element in the ecosystem shares him. He is alone in hating others- human or non-human- for no clear and logical reasons, and consequently alone in killing for no reasons. The pride that man feels over every trivial earthly achievement, is not found among the others including even animals; therefore, he, most of the times, lives in fear, worry, and even tear as Shelley likes to stress. The feeling of going astray that permeates the speaker is caused by the fact that man has almost lost his role in the encompassing ecosystem and so he feels alone, deserted, sad, and afraid. Man has become so egotistical that he forgot that everything living around him is holly and worthy and that their values are intrinsic, i.e. every creature should be valued for itself rather than for its benefit for man. Losing the feeling of interconnectedness between man on the one hand and the other ecosystem characters on the other hand, is responsible for 'know not how thy joy we ever should come near'. Finding himself, and by extension, humanity astray; the speaker takes refuge in the bird for support and guidance:

Teach us, Sprite or Bird,  
What sweet thoughts are thine:  
I have never heard  
Praise of love or wine  
That panted forth a flood of rapture so divine  
(Greenblatt: 835).

Man, represented by the speaker here, is urgently in need of help, support, and guidance because he is at a loss as far as culture-nature relationship is concerned though as Kate Rugby remarks, "culture constructs the prism through which we know nature" (Qtd in Wolfreys : 153). This interdependence, however, could be taken in the reverse direction since, normally; nature precedes rather than succeeds culture and following nature's principles lead to an acceptable and healthy cultural trend. It is this reverse direction-it seems to me- that is behind Shelley's plea and request from nature, exemplified by the bird, to teach not only himself but humanity at large how to live and love. In this respect, again according to Kate Rugby, "Eco criticism remembers the earth by rendering an account of the indebtedness of culture to nature" and that the ecocritics "are concerned to revalue the more-than-human natural world, to which some texts and cultural traditions invite us to attend" (Ibid: 154).

Shelley, in the position of the representative of man, embodies this concept and looks for the source of real pleasure and ecstasy which he finds in the bird but not in man on earth,



including himself. Love and wine, which are the mightiest bases for man's happiness, Shelley stresses, could not arouse in him the 'rapture so divine' he finds in and enjoys from the bird.

Neither Shelley nor the other Romantics, of course, were aware about Eco criticism and its ways and principles while composing their works; yet the analogy springs from the common goals of the two parties, namely that of stressing the situation of man in nature and his connection to it. Shelley's plea in the extract could well have been an attempt to restore the severed relationship of man to nature; a concept at the heart of the philosophy of the Eco critics. Therefore he concludes the poem with another, more specific request:

Teach me half the gladness  
That thy brain must know,  
Such harmonious madness  
From my lips would flow  
The world should listen then, as I am listening now.  
(Greenblatt: 836).

As he is seeking for perfect rapture, Shelley, here unlike the previous stanza, asks for the bird's maintenance and backing so that he can be able to come up with the 'harmonious madness' that Plato defined in his *The Phaedrus*. As for Plato, describing love without a Muse would render it useless and trivial; Shelley feels that his poetry without a Muse (here the bird as the symbol of nature and wilderness) would not be received or valued correctly. This belief seems to echo Raymond Williams's confidence that "the song of rural labour, the song of delight in the many forms of life with which we all share our physical world, is too important and too moving to be tamely given up, in an embittered betrayal, to the confident enemies of all significant and actual independence and renewal" (271). The importance Williams felt in 'the song of rural labour' is certainly felt by Shelley in this stanza, this poem, and even a large number of other poems written by him and his co-Romantic writers, and such ideas render his poetical works viable to be studied from the lens of environmental studies, green studies, ecology, and Eco critical assumptions.

## Conclusions

Studying any Romantic piece of literature, unquestionably, brings about some interesting notes into mind since the Romantic Movement in itself is rich and inclusive for different concepts that years and even centuries later came into light in the literary and critical circles. The present study concludes that the Romantic writers and thinkers, exemplified in this study by Percy Bysshe Shelley, valued nature and environment, not as objects for man's relief and uses, rather as entities to be esteemed for their very significance in the world at large. Such a belief, then, makes the movement and its writers close to the approaches and theories concerned with nature and environment like the environmental studies, green studies, ecology, etc. In this respect, the Romantics are never indebted to those theories and approaches, as they applied them in their works much earlier; rather, the approaches and theories adopters and pioneers should be obliged to Shelley and his Romantic colleagues who illuminated the path for appreciating nature that led, gradually, to the appearance and adoption of different concepts about the position of the natural elements in the world's ecosystem. The poems under study in this article prove what is mentioned above and ecocritical theorists have surely depended on these poems and other similar pieces of literature to come up with their theories and findings. The article further concludes that the studied poems reveal their great affinity to all the studies concerning nature and wilderness, especially ecology, biospherical concept, and ecocritical studies. In the extracts used in this paper, Shelley shows clearly how he is affected by the giant elements of the ecosystem and how man has to adapt himself to these natural elements. The studied poems also show the



ephemeral status of man compared to the everlasting characteristics of nature and by extension, the inclusive ecosystem. The cornerstones of such theories and concepts (in ecology, the deep ecology is meant for the purposes of this article) can roughly be seen and touched in the poems under study here and, by extension, in the majority of the Romantic poems and literary works.

### Works Cited

- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 3rd Edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 2009. Print.
- Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Easterlin, Nancy. "Practical Eco criticism." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies: A Journal of Criticism and Theory* 8.1. 2006. 118-129.
- Ford, Boris. (ed). *The New Pelican Guide to English Literature*. Vo. 5. London: Penguin Books. 1990. Print
- Garrard, Greg. "The Romantic View of Nature" [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu)  
Accessed 29-3-2020
- Glotfelty, Cheryl and Harold Fromm. (ed). *The Eco criticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. London: The University of Georgia Press. 1996.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. (ed). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. Vol. D. London: W.W. Norton & Company. 2012. Print.
- Hutchings, Kevin. "Eco criticism in British Romantic Studies". *Literature Compass*. 4/1 (2007): 172–202.
- Naess, Arne. "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement". [www.iseethics.files.wordpress.com](http://www.iseethics.files.wordpress.com) Accessed in 4-4-2020
- Rome, Adam. "'Give Earth a Chance': The Environmental Movement and the Sixties". *The Journal of American History*. 90:2 September 2003. Pp. 525-554
- Shelley, Marry. *The Complete Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Available at [www.gutenberg.org](http://www.gutenberg.org). Accessed in 29-3-2020
- Soper, Kate. *What is Nature?* Oxford: Blackwell. 1995. Print.
- Tait, Adrian Geoffrey. *From Wessex Poems to Time's Laughingstocks : An Eco-critical Approach to the Poetry of Thomas Hardy*. PhD thesis. The Open University.2010.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, rev. ed. London: Fontana, 1983.
- Wolfreys, Julian. (ed). *Introducing Criticism at the Twenty-First Century*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.2015.
- [https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/victor\\_hugo\\_152535](https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/victor_hugo_152535).

**سروشته له باوهش دهگیریت: خویندنه وه په کی ئیکۆکریتیکی بۆ چهند شیعریکی پیرسی بیش شیللی****ابراهیم علی مراد**

زانکۆی گهرمان-کۆلیژی پهروه رده-به شی ئینگلیزی

Ibrahim.ali@garmian.edu.krd

**پوخته**

نووسینی ههر بابتهکی رهخهیی له گۆشه نڤگای ئیکۆکریتیکیه وه به ههچ شپوهیهک ته رکیکی ئاسان نیه به تایه تڤیش لاینه تڤوریهه کهی، چونکه خودی زاراهوی ئیکۆکریتیسیزم ئالۆز و پر کڤشه به، جا چی جای دۆخه گشتیهه کهی که هڤشتا له نهش و نما کردنایه، ئەمهش پڤویستی به به دواداچوونی ورد و به ردهوام ههیه بۆ ئەو لیکۆلینه وانهی که دهربارهی ئەم چه مکه ئەنجام دهرڤن. به لآم هاوکات کارکردن له م بوارهدا خۆش و چڤز به خشه چونکه به رچاوی توڤزهر زیاتر روون دهکاته وه له مهڤ گرنگیی سروشت و ههروهها و ههروهها ریگه بۆ ئەنجامدانی توڤزینه وهی زیاتر له م بوارهدا خۆش دهکات له ئایندهدا. ئەم توڤزینه وهیه ههولیکه بۆ هه لسه نگانندی چهند دهقیکی شیعری رۆمانتیکی له روانگی ئیکۆ کریتیکیه وه چونکه گریمانای ئەوه دهکات که لیکچون له ئیوان ئامانجی دهقه شیعریه کان و شاعیره کان له لایهک و تڤوری ئیکۆکریتیکی له لایهکی تره وه هه ڤیت. توڤزینه وه هاوکات ئامازهی رهخهیی به چهند بواری و چه مکیک دهکات وهکو لیکۆلینه وهی ژینگهیی و لیکۆلینه وهی سه وراپی و لیکۆلینه وهی ئیکۆلۆجی، چونکه سه رجه م ئەو چه مکه به پوهستن به تڤوری ئیکۆ کریتیسیزمه وه. توڤزینه وه سه دهقی شیعری شاعیری نه وهی دووه می رۆمانتیکی پیرسی بیش شیللی له روانگی ئیکۆکریتیکیه وه هه لده سه نگینت و له کۆتاییدا دهگاته چهند دهره نجامیک. گرنگترین ئەو دهره نجامانهش ئەوه که سه ره رای ئەوهی شیللی زۆر له پڤش سه رده می لیکۆلینه وهی ژینگهیی و ئیکۆکریتیسیزم ژیاوه، به لآم بۆچوونه کانی که له وه دهقه شیعریانه خراونه ته روو، تا راده هیکه ی زۆر دهرخه ری ئەو بۆچوونانه که لیکۆلینه وه کان دهربارهی سروشت باسیان کردوه. له کۆتاییدا دهره نجامه کان و لیستی سه رچاوه کان نووسراون.

**کلله وشه کان:** ئیکۆکریتیسیزم، ژینگهیی، رۆمانتیکی، لیکۆلینه وه، سروشت، لیکچوون**الطبیعة تحتضن: دراسة ئیکۆکریتیکیه لعدد من قصائد الشاعر بیرسی بیش شیللی****ابراهیم علی مراد**

جامعة کرمان-کلیه التریبه-قسم اللغة الانکلیزیه

Ibrahim.ali@garmian.edu.krd

**ملخص**

ان کتابه موضوع نقدی من وجهه النظر الیکۆکریتیکیه لیس بالامر الهین و خاصه الجانب النظری منه لان مصطلح الیکۆکریتیسیزم بنفسه شاک و معقد بالاضافه الی وضه العام و الی هو فی طور النمو و التطور. و یتطلب ذلك متابعة دقیقه للبحوث و کتابات المنجزة فی هذا المجال. و لکن و من ناحیه اخرى، فان العمل فی هذا المجال یتعتبر و صیفة ممتعة و مسلیة لانها تنور الباحث بشكل افضل فیما یخص اهمیه عنصر طبیعه و تمهد الطریق كذلك لانجاز بحوث اکثر فی هذا المجال فی المستقبل.

و یتعتبر هذا البحث بمثابة محاولة لتقییم عدد من القصائد الرومانتیکیه من الزاویه الیکۆکریتیکیه، و یفترض البحث وجود تشابه بین هدف و مقصد النصوص الشعریه و شعرائها من جهة و النظریه الیکۆکریتیکیه من جهة اخرى. و یشیر البحث كذلك بصورة نقدیه الی عدد من المجالات المشابهة مثل الدراسة البئیة و الدراسة الخضراء و الدراسة الیکۆلوجیه لان جمیع هذه الدراسات و المفاهیم ترتبط بالدراسة الیکۆکریتیکیه.

و قد استخدم لاغراض هذه البحث ثلاثة قصائد لشاعر الجیل الثانی من الشعراء الرومانتیکیین بیرسی بیش شیللی لکی یتم تحلیلهم من الزاویه الیکۆکریتیکیه و یتوصل فی النهایه الی عدد من الاستنتاجات. و من اهم تلك الاستنتاجات هی انه بالرغم من ان شیللی عاش و كتب قبل فترة کتابات البئیة و الیکۆکریتیکیه، فان وجهات نظره المطروحة فی القصائد المختارة تشابه و بشكل کبیر مع الدراسات و النظریات الی تاخذ طبیعه موضوع لها. و فی نهایه البحث هناك الاستنتاجات الی تم التوصل الیها بالاضافه الی قائمة المصادر.

**الكلمات المفتاحیه:** ئیکۆکریتیسیزم، الدراسة البئیة، الرومانتیکیه، الدراسة، طبیعه، التشابه