

ECOCRITICAL APPROACH TO LITERARY TEXT INTERPRETATION

NEEMA BAGULA JIMMY

Junior Lecturer at the Teacher Training College of Walungu, South Kivu Province, DR Congo

Copyright © 2015 ISSR Journals. This is an open access article distributed under the ***Creative Commons Attribution License***, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT: This article argues that junior researchers in literary criticism should learn to interpret literary texts in ecocritical approach as they do with the rest of the literary devices of age. Strategies to carry out the interpretation exercises are suggested for the learner to find a guide along his path towards reaching the meaning that the story conveys. Ecocritical approach reaches results that are not different from a tool of speech for the defense of the environment. The whole work aims to make it clear to the researcher about the ecocritical reading techniques applicable to both poesy and prose that fit the nature-reading paradigm.

KEYWORDS: Ecocritical reading techniques, Literary text interpretation.

1 INTRODUCTION

Literary critics apply several literary subjects in writing and interpreting texts of literature. They use characterization to study characters in a story as well as the relationships those characters. Besides, they use setting elements to understand the time and place of a text story so as to understand the various influences that those elements may bring to the behavior of characters during their actions, reactions, and reactions. Theme stands for the main point that the writer has chosen to bring about meaning for his potential readers. In addition, Plot explains the correlated events, that is, the major actions that link together to make up a whole: the story. These correlated actions occur in a chronological order as Exposition, Rising Action, Climax, and Denouement which leads to a new stable situation full of scars. Point of view is another device that is used by an author to determine the location of the story narrator during the story course so as help the audience to understand whether the narrator is either omniscient or limited in terms of the story events. Apart from the above mentioned literary techniques, conflict, structural analysis, comparative studies, symbolism, imagery, stream of consciousness, figures of speech are further literary techniques all used to convey meaning from literary prints given that there is nowhere in a text where it is mentioned that Here is the message I wish to send to the reader.

As research is gaining the ground along literary critics' path, further discoveries are forwarding new devices that participate in many of special subdivisions of literature. Owing to this, Ecocriticism is a very recent literary technique for both writing and interpreting literary texts discovered to be used by the coming research generations like others have been used. The Ecocritical process is initially hard to work with, but critics have set a number of strategies to help its users get used to it at a professional scale for the sake of widening the field of literature.

2 DEFINITIONS FOR ECOCRITICISM

Hereby, the major concept of ecocriticism and its derivations are going to be defined according to the few candidates who have made a step ahead toward understanding the concept and its application in literary criticism. Here below are some literary critics who, so far, are known for their contribution to the growth of the ecocritical approach in literary text writing and interpretation:

Owing to the root words that make up the concept, several definitions have been suggested; the first of them should be that by the Wikipedia Free Encyclopedia that Ecocriticism is the ***study of literature and environment from an***

interdisciplinary point of view where literature scholars analyze the environment and brainstorm possible solutions for the correction of the contemporary environmental situation and examine the various ways literature treats the subject of nature, a publication of the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment in the United States of America. This definition makes of Ecocriticism an intentionally broad approach that may be designated in other ways such as "**green (cultural) studies**", "**ecopoetics**", and "**environmental literary criticism**".

The interest that the definition raises in literary studies owes much to the fact that Ecocritics investigate such things as the fundamental ecological values meant by the word *nature*, and whether the examination of place should be a distinctive category, much like class, gender or race. Also, they examine human perception of *wilderness*, and how it has changed throughout history and whether or not current environmental issues are accurately represented or even mentioned in popular culture and modern literature. Other disciplines, such as history, economics, philosophy, ethics, and psychology, are also considered by ecocritics to be possible contributors to ecocriticism.

William Rueckert may have been the first person to use the term *ecocriticism* (Barry 240). In 1978, Rueckert published an essay titled *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*. His intent was to focus on "the application of ecology and ecological concepts to the study of literature. However, because there was no organized movement to study the ecological/environmental side of literature, these important works were scattered and categorized under a litany of different subject headings of which the more famous were *pastoralism*, *human ecology*, *regionalism*, *American Studies* etc.

A second, operational, definition in this series is rather a response to the question of what ecocriticism is or should be. It is a thought by Camilo Gomides. This broad and discriminating definition of ecocriticism: the field of enquiry that analyzes and promotes works of art which raise moral questions about human interactions with nature, while also motivating audiences to live within a limit that will be binding over generations. his contemporary Joseph Henry Vogel implements the definition and makes the case that ecocriticism constitutes an *economic school of thought* as it engages audiences to debate issues of resource allocation that have no technical solution.

Later on, Ashton Nichols has argued that the historical dangers of a romantic version of nature now need to be replaced by **urbanatural roosting**, a view that sees urban life and the natural world as closely linked and argues for humans to live more lightly on the planet, the way virtually all other species do.

3 ORIGIN OF ECOCRITICISM

Ecocriticism is a quite new literary aspect for many of its perspective users. Therefore, it is necessary to make it clear as to its origin. In fact, globally speaking, literature itself originates from our love of listening and telling stories. This love of man to stories is based onto the richness of Mother Nature in things that fascinate and seduce physically and inspire man with new perspectives to look at the physical setting of everything they do.

An ecocritic does whatever is pleasing to him, in green fields; in the sky, in the seas, on the hard ground, in the zoos, and in all parts of his world. He makes the clouds speak, the animals and garden flowers smile and share lots of faculties with man because, in the view of the writer, there's a close link between human and nonhuman.

So the idea of a very applicable technique in literary criticism and yet accurate device for literary appreciation came to us with a dude named **Henry David Thoreau**. Thoreau wasn't the best student. And he didn't comb his hair, and he wore a neck beard that generally grossed people out, especially his friend **Margaret Fuller**. All in all, he was the perfect kind of guy to live by himself in the woods. Though Ecocriticism as such is just an itty bitty baby theory these days, So he took off and found himself a pond, which is actually a rather sizeable lake, but we digress, and lived off the land there for a couple years.

He had a lot of help from the wealthy **Ralph Waldo Emerson** and other **Transcendentalists**. The small cabin he ended up building and writing from was actually on Emerson's property. While there, he wrote gobs of prose about **growing beans** and watching bugs and the importance of walking and how people are generally out of touch with the natural world. The method he actually applied is not clearly mentioned, but it should be agreed that the message he was trying to convey was clear: the imperative "*Live like a bean, live life simply.*"

This is nature's creed, and Thoreau thought it should inspire all of society's institutions. He thought we should model our human world after the natural one. **Walden** is Thoreau's masterpiece, and it remains *the* foundational text for Ecocriticism, even though it was never intended to be used to analyze literary texts.

The work has become such a big deal to today's ecocritic because it examines just how and why humans have become so disconnected from nature. (And neck beards. But we're hoping man's interest in those never, ever makes a comeback—unlike people's interests in conservationism, ecology, and Materialism.)

In brief, the origin of ecocriticism should be attributed to the desire of restoring the connections between humans and nonhumans. In fact, for selfishness, man centered everything on him. While doing so, the network between him and nature breaks down. The whole situation upsets Mother Nature and therefore God Himself. Considering that the link is a natural phenomenon that cannot be abused or broken, ecocritical aspects try to restore the broken harmony at the contact between both sides. And the ideal is to have a new world where man and the environment speak the same language.

As to the temporary setting, Ecocriticism is a theory still in diapers. It didn't officially get going until 1994 or so. Which means that most of the big players in Ecocriticism aren't actually literary critics: like Thoreau, they're just people who think a lot about the ways humans interact with nature. And long before 1994, the world witnessed an eccentric cast of gnarly characters who wrote about how and why humans need to go green, a way to argue that we need to alter our relationship to nature, and the stories we tell about it.

Henry David Thoreau is the designated grand pappy of Ecocriticism, he wrote *Walden*, which describes living in a simply-built cabin, fishing, going on walks, raising and selling beans, and then not paying his taxes as an act of *civil disobedience* to indicate his disapproval of the Mexican-American War and slavery.

Thoreau's work has inspired some of the world's most influential people, from **John F. Kennedy** and **Martin Luther King, to Ernest Hemingway, Theodore Roosevelt**, and even **Gandhi**. His humble, no-frills, authentic life has had a big impact on a lot of people all over the world. He was kind of like the world's first tree hugger. When he hugged a tree in the forest, he made a lot of sounds (and wrote a lot of essays) about it. And people listened.

It should be borne in mind that when people engage with stories about animals or acorns or trees, the tendency is to think *they're all about us*. For example, as you read the old classic *Animal Farm* of Ernest Hemingway, you might think, "Man, the mean pig acts a lot like my gym teacher. This story reminds me so much of my childhood." Soon, you arrive at a literary analysis that is totally centered on your less significant human thoughts, actions, desires, and motivations. But whatever happened to the pig itself to other animals and to plants! Anyway, humans seem very self-centered: they often think in **anthropocentric** ways. What do we mean, exactly, when we say "nature"? What is and isn't part of "nature"?

4 ASPECTS OF ECOCRITICISM

It gives a headache to understand what ecocriticism is actually because of the diversity of the stuff it deals with. However, some lovers of his theory attribute to it each an aspect just to avoid shutting their mouths ahead the numerous words the largest book of the world, Nature, offers to describe it. Top nine aspects have received the attention of this work.

a) *Ecocriticism is Interdisciplinary*

It brings knowledge from different scholarly arenas to bear on your analysis of the same person, place, or thing. To illustrate the above aspect, let's consider this example: A **rose** can be a *symbol* for love. A rose is also a woody perennial that's part of the genus *Rosa*. A rose is also a royal flower. A rose can be studied from the perspectives of philosophy, botany, and history, or more. And that's the heart of interdisciplinarity.

b) *Ecocriticism is Nature*

Ecocritics get into some pretty heated arguments about what does and doesn't qualify as nature. In so doing, they're looking to problematize humans' self-centered views of the natural world. So, they pit two possible definitions of nature against each other: Nature = A place where humans are not—both physically and metaphorically speaking. Nature = everything everywhere. All nature, all the time. **Taylor-Lautner** thinks that Nature is everything in the world that isn't man-made: grass, the sun, wolves that aren't specifically bred by humans to be scary super-wolves or werewolves.

c) *Ecocriticism is Environmentalist*

Like that political movement of environmentalism, ecocriticism also strives to make people care equally about all creatures that live in any single environment. In practice, any side of the environment that is victimized by people in a way should push be repaired as soon as possible so as to seat that equality of human and nonhuman individuals who should be cared about the same way.

d) *Ecocriticism is Anthropocentric*

People tend to see themselves everywhere, in everything. You will hear Man, for example say: "that leaf sure looks like my lover's hand". "And that pig in *Animal Farm* was my high school gym teacher." This comparison made by man is intentionally setting for him a place in literature, botany, zoology, and love, which is ecocritically abusive and refutable.

Regularly, when anthropocentrism enters the scene, nothing can be analyzed without being compared to or informed by human perception, affinities, desires, and so on. Ecocriticism pushes back against this *navel-gazing tendency* of Man's, and requires the latter to consider nature on its own terms. Besides, it asks Man to consider *how they consider nature*, at different historical moments.

e) Ecocriticism is Ecologic

Etymologically, **Eco**, from the Greek *oikos*, means *home*, while *ology*, *the study of*. So **Ecology** is the study of home. This messing around with language is of less importance to this study, nevertheless, the elements that the study essentially refers to are also part of ecocriticism, that is, the study of how living things interact with each other and their environments. The illustrative terms should be the example of how mice and frogs sometimes befriend each other in India. And the results are positively adorable, fascinating. The relationship described above is all what ecocriticism dreams of.

f) Ecocriticism is New Materialism

Great Thinkers like to talk about how humans cannot be reduced to their physical properties, because people are really special. The same way, the New Materialists say that People are made up of their biological bits, which means that even *human thought*, and *human creativity*, that is, those idealistic qualities Man often likes to believe elevate him above other animals, are just part and parcel to human physiology. This idea might get some folks really angry. A question arises from the situation: is a frat guy really a frat guy without his frat house and his beer pong? Or is there something about The Dude, something in his person or his *essence* that is essentially fraternity? The response is all but negative because the ideal at every step is to make complementarity and equality among all creatures.

g) Ecocriticism is science

It has been already mentioned that this theory is quite interdisciplinary. It gets its fundamental stuff from various domains which treat of the interaction between creatures. That is how it is also science because it does all what any science does. Eversince, it becomes a rigorous, empirical business that people like you get into when they observe something about the world, then make a hypothesis about how that thing works, and then *test their hypothesis*. In the preceding lines, **Henry David Thoreau** has been said to have done an adventure in the bush where he observed growing beans and happened to produce a literary work of fame today on the basis of the hypotheses he drew from the natural behavior. And that was the beginning of ecocriticism. If really this definition of science is closely describing what David Thoreau did, so ecocriticism is science. In science today, for example, people are observing new diseases and attempting to cure them (Curing cancer and HIV is expected from those observations). This will be made to restore the harmony that abnormal conditions of the body or the mind have destroyed. New life, a world without trouble is the goal of each of the steps that science/ecocriticism set.

h) Ecocriticism is Wilderness

See also Nature. But in addition, ecocriticism tends to bring together natural aspects of this world and the fruits of technology. It calls therefore that magical land that is far away from human cities, cars, annoying appliances, and repetitive office work, the wi-fi router... wilderness.

i) Ecocriticism is Conservative

The conservative aspect of this baby theory is meant by the fact that it is a powerful tool of speech for the defense of preserving this beautiful world we inhabit for future generations of humans. **Conservationists**, then, spend a lot of time thinking up ways to reduce people's negative impact on the environment (which is home to many, many species of squirrel), while also promoting *the natural order of things*.

5 PRACTISING ECOCRITICAL READING IN LITERARY TEXT ANALYSIS

a) Preliminaries

Ecocritics consider the many relations between literature and the natural world. And in seeking to expand our understanding of the environment, they crank that music and let literary studies party with the hard sciences. An ecocritic believes that literature is a type of living, a breathing being.

b) Strategies of Ecocriticism

Ecocriticism is a really new branch of literary criticism. Using it requires certain knowledge of basic strategies in order to reach a clearer understanding of what is intended by the text of which ecocritical reading is going to be done. This owes

much to the fact that most of other literary branches are usually developed in respect to a number of guide lines. Hence, for this particular technique, some strategies have been suggested by early literary ecocritics.

At the beginning of any work of text interpretation, an ecocritical reader must bear in mind that ecocriticism wants us to take a step back from our navel-gazing and ask such questions as:

- How have people related to nature in different ways at different points in history?
- What's all that got to do with evolving technologies, industrialism, and post-industrialism?
- Is "place" under an oak tree with a squirrel eating a nut, a distinctive lens through which we should read literature and see the world?
- What do our different approaches do to the natural world, e.g., Rape and pillage? Preserve? Adore? What?—and to *writing* about the natural world, tell us about human development throughout history? What do they tell us about nature itself? About subjectivity and objectivity?

The responses to the above questions are powerful tools to read a text and get an environment protection related message of peace and friendship among creatures. A serious analysis will therefore bring the reader back to three major strategies that really should not be separated during the process:

- The description of nature;
- The description of Man, and
- The relationships between humans and nonhumans.

The first strategy is the description of Nature. It is made in respect to the view that Ecological criticism begins with recognition of the nonhuman, the study of literature as if the environment mattered (David Mazel, *A Century*: p1). Ecocriticism asserts the primacy of the natural world by expanding the field of literary study from merely social relations to the discursive constructions of nature in texts. In so doing, three major things rise to attract the critic about ecocritical reading:

- It takes as its object natural, constructed and imagined places;
- It seeks to broaden the ethical domain of language to the non-human; and
- It frames questions about how we experience the natural world as well as how our textual representations of nature render meaningful the world around us.

Most of the time the description of Nature is made possible with quality adjectives so as to afford providing appropriate answers to the question "**What's Nature" in this particular text?** The first trial to respond to this question took place in the early days of Ecocriticism debates by environmentalists. There is a heavy dosage of environmental activism in this style of literary analysis, no matter how we answer the question. Four major answers were suggested in those debates in addition to the one you may think of as you are ahead a literary text to read for understanding it in ecocritical perspective.

WHAT'S NATURE?

A. NATURE IS GOD

God, Africa, and Monday are written with capital initials English to emphasize them. To make them seem more important than any proper noun. So when some Ecocritics want to write nature with a capital **N**, they are equating the Natural world with Godliness. The **American Transcendentalists** were a bunch of white dudes that wrote about nature and self-cultivation. Ecocritics would later link these spiritual and societal philosophies to textual analysis. **Ralph Waldo Emerson** believed that Nature helped guys like him get away from corrupt human society and grow closer to God. **Romantic Literature** treated Nature in much the same way. In that tradition, Nature is God, and people are small and insignificant and only mess things up.

There is something that ecofeminism addresses today concerning what Adam and Eve did in the Garden of Eden; in the views of the authors of Romantic Literature, actually Eve was the one who really screwed it all up. Even the author of several nature-writings **John Muir**, believed that *Yosemite* was a type of church. Every cliff was a cathedral, every cloud a choir of angels, every flower a prayer. Nevertheless, many Ecocritics and environmentalists oppose the idolization and idealization of the natural world because of many reasons. For one, the science of trees and birds and all that is often far richer than what is implied by this human-desire-centric view of nature. Nature has got a lot of its own purposes, you know; it's not just around to serve as our guiding light. The choice to position nature as our God or as our ward says a lot about who we are.

B. NATURE IS A VICTIM

Saying that Nature is a victim implies the presence of a disturbing creature that impacts it negatively. In the context of this theory, men and women are pointed to by ecocritics as enemies that need to be set out of reach of Mother Nature, which disconnects them from her beauty. **Rachel Carson** and **Aldo Leopold** uncovered all the ways men and women are disconnected from nature and how that lack of intimacy between us and our environment leads people to abuse the bejesus out of nature.

In the same range of thought as **Upton Sinclair's** *The Jungle*, **Carson's** *Silent Spring* and **Leopold's** *A Sand County Almanac* both show how literature can be a tool to critique the harmful practices of human society—only the latter two works focus on the brokenness of the **human-nature relationship**. And so these writers pushed back against the idea of nature as a pristine religious experience (*I will bless you, tiny human, with my awesome rainbow*) by emphasizing how nature is a victim of our horrible practices. Instead of being there for man to worship, nature is there to be abused. And now that nature cannot take it anymore, humans have got to step in and save it. **Weird** (fated) relationship (*I abuse you, and then I save you*). In addition to being yet another site for reflection on the fundamental nature of humans, this element of the great debate about "What is nature?" raises a lot of questions about how invasive our "green," nature-saving' practices should be. For instance,

- Are we supposed to arrange our lives so as to impact the natural world *less*? Or
- Do we have to get out there and plant some trees? Etc.

C. NATURE IS A WILD PLACE FOR PEOPLE TO DISCOVER THEMSELVES

The contact between man and nature is an opportunity for man to mirror himself so as to understand what sort of creature he is. It sounds, however, queer that in the process it often hard for him to get enlightened about his own life. Except the few honest souls that accept that in the contact man is corrupt, it is often hard to understand what man looks like in this particular situation, barked loudly about how awful human habitats are.

According to **Edward Abbey**, a Transcendentalist-stylist, people are corrupt, and we corrupt the world we live in. So, he believes that true nature is only found out in the **wilderness**, and that traveling into said wilderness is the only way we can discover who we truly are. The illustrative case he takes includes the wild wilderness adventures of the British and American male that have been well-catalogued in The Canon—consider *Moby-Dick*, *The Old Man and the Sea*, and *Heart of Darkness*.

In each of these tales, a man gets out of Dodge, discovers himself, conquers death (or not), has profound visions (or not), and returns to society *changed*. He then shares the secrets of the universe with his poor and limited society (or not). Or these guys just continue to make for themselves riches and only return to wilderness on expensive vacations. In any case, this Eco-school-of-thought positions Nature not as God, exactly, but as a place to discover God in one's self. Some people think that is a pretty self-centered and anthropocentric notion.

D. Nature is LITERALLY everything

Unlike prior thinkers, the newest ecocritics like to argue that there is as much nature in a National Park as there is in a shopping mall. Ecocritics like **Lawrence Buell**, **Serpil Oppermann** and **Dana Phillips** are now actively moving away from the debate over what is "natural" and what is "unnatural" or man-made. These writers think human habitats can get pretty wild. So cities can be counted as wildernesses. And there is little nature out there that is truly untouched by human hands at this point, except a lot of the ocean bottom.

While today's ecocritics think that in order to move environmental thought forward, we have to embrace action that cleans up our cities, too. To end with, the answer to that "What is nature?" debate might not be an answer at all—it might be a new set of questions intended to know the most important mysteries of literature and human behavior.

The second strategy consists of describing man. The kind of description you do here in not necessarily physical, spiritual, moral or what, unless it will fall into a study of characters. It rather looks at the affective aspect, that is, the behavior of man in interaction with his environment. A sharp eye will be focused on the artificial environment set by man because it part of human nature. For GARY SNYDER, *Ecocriticism as a Practice of Reading* (1997: p xxv), Ecocriticism proposes a radical mode of **intertextuality** that encompasses both the human (built) and nonhuman (natural) environment.

As distinguished from other critical approaches that focus attention on the social and cultural contexts in which those texts are written and read, the ecocritical perspective is shaped by the idea that the practices of reading and writing take place within and affect cultural systems, and that cultural systems arise out of and are determined by the natural systems of which they are always already a part.

Unfortunately, Ecofeminist scholarship has emphasized most explicitly, the domain of nature has been culturally constructed in particular and often destructive ways; it is therefore not surprising that a growing number of ecocritics have turned their attention from the **pristine** and privileged domain of wild nature to the urban and suburban environments where issues of race and class and social justice become central analytic concerns. In a way, the description of human environment

The last strategy in the list is the relationships between both worlds. Indeed, understanding the possible relations among them is of critical consideration in the interpretation process of a literary text. In fact, there are many relationships that may be spoken about, but the most critical in an ecocritical perspective include the following:

- Natural Relationships
- Artificial Relationships

The Natural relationships include those between sets of species in interaction in a world that has not been altered yet. In there, species move in a quite natural way so as nothing can be said to belong to a species and not to another; everything belong to everybody for the welfare of all. Adam and Eve were the first humans to share such a world with animal and vegetal livings until one of them broke the natural law. In this kind of relationship, you find the **Human – Physical environment Relationship** (human-human, human-beast, human-botany, human-water, human-air, etc.).

The artificial relationship also identified to human one is the relationship that species set for themselves. The more concerned species in this context if mankind. It stands for the altered world where mankind, to satisfy his selfish desires, transforms the physical environment for his own welfare. Most of time this, occurs with the pushing technology. Hereby, part of the physical world is set apart from the rest of the whole for quite personal use and with destructive purpose. The most illustrative case of this truth should be the creation of industries, firms, where the machine is receiving greater attention from man in disfavor of other species. Moreover, other species face serious problems when man behaves that way. In search for his new life (life without other species), ecological problems and the whole world is affected.

Ecocriticism has, in a way, developed rapidly from a literary concern with nature writing in the perspective of restoring the natural law that the ignorant man has tried to disturb. This literary view the physical environment started in the United States to a broader investigation of the ways language and thought mediate human relationships with the physical environment. From its initial study of a group of nature writers, such as *William Wordsworth, Henry David Thoreau, Susan Fennimore Cooper, John Muir, John Burroughs, Mary Austin, Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson, as well as Annie Dillard, Edward Abbey, Wendell Berry, Gary Snyder, and Barry Lopez*, the field now encompasses a wider spectrum of environmentally-oriented texts and authors, non-literary environmental discourses, and disciplinary, interdisciplinary and extracurricular contexts.

At the end of the text analysis, it is a good idea if some suggestion is made to restore harmony in the part of the physical world that has been altered during the interaction among its residents. For instance, in text where trees are complain about deforestation, or a mountain screaming for rescue about its minerals, it may be suggested to grow more trees, turning the minerals back to the underground.

In another case where a woman is screaming that a snake bites her baby, probably better should be to carefully study the reason for a snake to bite a human baby, then search for a common ground for both species. In fact, the ideal world as foreseen by Nature (God) should be one without war, catastrophe, screams and cries. In a way, a snake will always fear man and vice versa, but what if both would happen to live together?

In spite of the permanent hindrances that ecocritics meet along their path, they keep optimistic as to the restoration of harmony among all species and the physical world. For them, there will be set a new world where none of creatures and their environment will fight another. They trust strongly in the power of the world so that nothing will defeat it even if the struggle lasts for all days. *Charles Sanders Peirce*, said, "Whatever it actually is, it will not fulfill our conceptions or assumptions. It will dodge our expectations and theoretical models. The greatest respect we can pay to nature is not to trap it, but to acknowledge that it eludes us and that our own nature is also fluid, open, and conditional."

From, Charles' belief, one understands that there's nothing man has to dictate to his physical because his knowledge of it is very restricted to very small things that cannot help him understand it fully. This is probably why despite the destructive eye with which he looks at world the latter persists and he does not. Globally, not only is our knowledge thus limited in scope, but it is even more important that we should thoroughly realize that the very best of what we, humanely speaking, know about the world [we know] only in an uncertain and inexact way.

6 REASONS FOR USING ECOCRITICAL READING IN LITERATURE

For readers, it is often nonsense to do anything for the sake of doing it. Ecocritical perspectives have been searched and brought to life so as they can help deal with literary reading and writing in a rather professional way. This theory differs from others in opportunities and the expected results from it. Its contribution to the growth of the field of literature should be acknowledged and talked about.

There are three proud monuments parents of literary criticism who don't always get along concerning these reasons, but they all agree on one central notion that ***both our imaginations and understandings of the environment expand when we dissect the relations between the human, the natural world, and the text.***

The top in their list is **Lawrence Buell**. He thinks we lack imagination when we analyze nature. He is on that whole, "not every pig is a fascist just because Orwell said it was" bandwagon. The second is **Serpil Oppermann**. Ole Serpy stresses the need for this theory to be interdisciplinary. Like, how are we supposed to wrap our little minds around the real meaning of the tree in *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn* if we don't even understand how **photosynthesis** works? For him, the approach to a literary text requires knowledge from other life domains so as to understand and interpret the phenomena the text describes. Therefore there's nothing to boast for in lit crit unless you have completed the knowledge of things from several resources. The last of team is **Dana Phillips**. This guy thinks we over-romanticize nature, and that contemporary nature writing is basically a crock. He would really like for us to re-think what we mean when we use the word **nature** to begin with, actually.

When most lit critics analyze texts, all they think about is *me*. What do *Spy Novels* have to do with *my* contemporary life? With *my* beauty and *my* flaws?, etc. It should be borne in mind that humans have never invented the material world that authors write about; for example, rose (as a rose, not just as a symbol, Congo's equatorial forest, and so on. As people, we've just fashioned particular ways of talking and writing about the material world. So, Ecocriticism challenges us with this question:

Why read literature as though it's all about us, when so much of what gets captured in The Canon is *not human*—is *more than human*, even?

Ecocritics want us to

1. Investigate what the tendency to see ourselves in every-little-ant (that is, to **anthropomorphize** our natural world) tells us about the human condition.
2. Analyze how the actual real, scientific facts of nature influence our lives and our literature.

In practice, when it comes to reading *The Canterbury Tales* with our Ecocriticism Eyeballs in, for instance, we might ask: How did disease (particularly the Bubonic Plague) influence the language of these tales? What about **Charles Darwin's** theory of **evolution** and the literature of **George Eliot**? What's up with those volcanoes and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*?

Ecocriticism becomes a nice theory for the reason that it helps to wrest us out of ourselves and into the real world.

As for the theorists, they should care about Ecocriticism for much more important reasons than **Nature is excellent** and **Animals are adorable**. They must bear in mind that incorporating the scientific study of natural objects into literary criticism helps scholars to better understand how nature might be its own force in literature (one that operates outside of human principles and motivations). It grants new insight into people.

When we view great texts through a less anthropocentric lens, we can reveal the hidden ways volcanoes and clouds and other awesome nature-type-stuff influences human thought and behavior. We may even get at the root (pun intended) of why we're so obsessed with seeing ourselves in every overturned leaf and glassy pond.

7 CURRENT CONSIDERATIONS OF ECOCRITICISM

Globally speaking, ecocriticism is a really new branch of literary criticism. It can seem like it is all over the planet today, but true. The theory has got some issues with focusing its attention on a particular topic, or moving in one steady direction. We guess that is what happens when a movement attempts to analyze the nature of Nature itself, which ultimately includes human nature and literature.

However, that does not mean that Ecocriticism is an anything-goes kind of theory. Today's ecocritics are interested in both analyzing how literature is a part of the problem; the way we nature is portrayed in books reflects man's problematic

relationship to it, and part of the solution, the text can be an activist tool for helping people to take better care of the environment.

So from the intellectual fray, two distinct groups of thinkers have emerged: the New Materialists and the Ecofeminists. And these two groups offer disparate approaches to trying to save the environment/the world. New Materialists believe that by paying attention to the physical details of our natural world, we will be better analysts of the text, of people and life, and the great everything. Ecofeminists, on the other hand claim that men love to make rules and draw lines. As in, *let's draw this line around this pretty piece of land and call it a National Park and here are the rules for this park: You pay to go in. No one can live there. The animals can't leave. The people running the place will wear snappy uniforms that will look like they're in the military.*

Seeking and Speaking in the Environment-Poem is also part of current news of the ecocritical theory; the argument that poems offer models for relating to environments has been made recently with varying degrees of literal intention. Mathew Cooperman suggests that "the question of relevance demands an environmental imagination" in contemporary poetry, and that those poems are most significantly responsive to this demand which moves from Echolocation, mapping a place through voice, to Ecolocation, an experience of "the World in scale. From this perspectives, poems are environments in that they map or describe places in a way that leads us to "relate ethically to where we live" Angus Fletcher in his outlining a literary tradition of descriptive poetics that runs from Jonh Clare to William Whitman to John Ashbery, offers a less concrete conception of the poem as environment.

Indeed for poetry, contrarily to science, human belonging and not belonging is the criterion for membership in an environment and all environment-poems are striving to present this structure on two levels today:

- 1) *The poetry will express the mere existence of those creatures who belong or do not belong, and*
- 2) *It will show how this belonging occurs, especially tracing the boundaries that define inclusion and exclusion.*

8 CONCLUSION

This work has been Entitled Ecocritical Approach to literary text interpretation. It is a qualitative research paper that has tried to present its results in a form of learning younger researchers in the field of literature to use the theory of ecocriticism in their ever day attempt to interpret a literary text of prose or poesy. Also, it has been designed in such a way as to look like tool of speech for the defense of the physical world so as to restore the connection that broke between mankind and his world some time ago.

The work has developed six major sections including the definitions for the concept of Ecocriticism according to different critics, the origin of ecocriticism in time and place, the aspects of ecocriticism, the practice of ecocritical reading, the reasons for ecocritical approach in text interpretation, and the current considerations of this theory.

This work is just a collection of many ideas from various literary critics who enjoy pushing literature forward through research. Therefore, it may be reliable to certain weaknesses related to the human nature of its author, but it keeps its sense of guide to interpreting literary texts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brian Glaser. *Journal of Ecocriticism* 4(1) January 2012, Chapman University, 2012;
- [2] Joseph Meeker. *The Comedy of Survival* 1974.
- [3] KenHiltner: *Ecocriticism: The Essential Reader*, 2013.
- [4] Marilyn Cooper. *The Ecology of Composition* 1986.
- [5] Marvin Harris. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* 1968.
- [6] McKibben, Bill. *The End of Nature*: New York: Random House, 1989.
- [7] Merchant, Carolyn, *Nature as Female: The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution*New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
- [8] Naess, Arne. *The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects in Philosophical Inquiry, Volume 8, Issue 1/2* 1986.
- [9] Raymond Williams. *The Country and the City*, 1973.
- [10] Shepard, Paul. *Introduction: Ecology and Man—A Viewpoint in The Subversive Science: Essays Toward an Ecology of Man*: Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- [11] Snyder, Gary. *The Place, the Region, and the Commons in The Practice of the Wild*: San Francisco: North Point Press, 1990.
- [12] William Rueckert. *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism*, 1978.
- [13] Williams, Raymond. *The Country & the City*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.