

Nature without humanity in the poems of Wordsworth and Shelley

Madhulina Bauri

Asst. Professor, Dept. of English,
Surendranath College.

Abstract: It is clear to claim that nature is essential to the literary awareness of the nineteenth century. When Wordsworth demanded that we 'purchase [our] books' in 'The Tables Turned' (1798), he formulated the infamous motto of 'return to nature.' However, the author wishes to reply that the request from Wordsworth does not point to the appropriate way from an environmental point of view. In other words, the need to pay great attention to nature is not ecological. Humanist ecology theories have generally emphasised on maintaining nature for mankind's sake. In contrast, recent posthumanist environmental theories highlight the necessity to 'decentrate' nature in areas around the centre by putting it in the background. At the turn of the 21st century, from "deep ecology" to "dark ecology," there was a key change. This essay looks at features of the latter and certain of its relationship to posthumanism in Europe.

Keywords: Posthumanism, Wordsworth, Shelley, nature; Ambience, Deep ecology.

Posthumous and ecological issues theorising:

In this essay, one of its most fresh consequences, 'post-humanist ecology' is explored by posthumanism. It is an ecology which deals in post-humanist, after-anthropocentric terms with the affinity between humans and their environment, not in the conventional sense as a "environment" in which human protection is required, but rather in what will be known as "dark-environmental" mode, i.e., something that 'just happens to us' on a fleeting scale [3].

First, what's the meaning of being post-human or taking a post-humanistic approach? Posthumanism is well known as a symbol for the technical development of the human body and the desire to realise the potential for humankind through the supervision of, inter alia, the natural/fictitious polarity associated with Cartesian thinking. She talks about cyborgs as 'animal and machine entities concurrently,' thereby emphasising the concept of post-humanity, as it was theorised at the beginning of the 21st century. However, before Haraway – who, curiously, never thought she was 'post-humanist' – Ihab Hassan declared, back in 1977, 'human form may change profoundly,' when traditional humanism comes to an end, turning it into 'what we must term post-humanism haemorrhages.' The posthumanism of this essay is not about what might replace humanism or what would be the claimed "end" of humanism. As the editors already argued in their introduction to this EJES theme, posthumanism, and particularly its «critical» version – known as 'critical posthumanism' or 'met posthumanity' as the editors have insightfully called it – not emphasises the need to banish humanism or humanity (how can that be done?). As stated by Ivan Callus, Stefan Herbrechter and Manuela Rossini, posthumanism is not only a discourse of questions about what it means to be human, it also shows a trend towards thinking beyond humanism, anthropomorphism or anthropocentrism, but also the relationship between human beings and their non-human beings.

Like the others in the essay, this piece is concerned with what may be considered as a 'European' post-humanist building that could criticise the technological determinism of certain previous transatlantic post-human interpretations. In this light N. Katherine Hayles refrain from transhumanist fascination for disincarnation in the How We Became Post-human – which involves trying, for example, to digitalise the

body or upload the human mind to a computer – as a sole response to the question of what humanity should seem like in future. On the other hand, the European approach to posthumous people is crucial for the unproblematic use of technology. European posthumanism fosters a critical postthumanism, since it sees the body as "the original prosthesis we are all learning to handle" that is "without technology." Precisely because the European version of posthumous is hardly connected to technological "things," it is linked to alternative modes of thinking that decenter people, by privileging nonhuman or other views; in other words, it is crucial for building a truly ecological post-anthropocentric stance or policy. The latter word *ambiente*, which promises a sort of "without subject" and without what we typically call "nature," is fundamental to the evolution of the ecological method used for this essay. The goal is to stop objectivizing, exploiting, and polluting nature once we stop talking about it. Moreover, an ecology without a subject or a nature is an ecology which does not highlight human beings or the environment – and it really is environmental.

But what is mankind's role in the discussion on the environment? In *What Is Posthumanism?* (2010), Post-humanist Theorist Cary Wolfe is grappling with the relationship of humans and animals as one which is marked by the latter's continual objectivity. Wolfe thinks that post anthropocentrism works together with the human being (s). The postwriting element of my essay lies in the fact that (but tacitly) the nonhuman – in this case the environment – is being uncannily privileged... leaving the human being alone: the underlying assumption here is that although people are well aware of how to treat, represent, safeguard or safeguard the environment, they are still going to harm, pollute, misrepresent or target it. This approach aims to take ecological posthumanism and post-anthropocentrism one step further, since it poses a problem with the very viability of a constructive coexistence, or interdependence, of the humans and the human beings. Such an approach may be characterised as 'dark ecological' as it looks to be a much darker vision of the future of humanity and of real, actual, natural life on this planet.

Romanticism 'adores' nature:

It is clear to claim that nature is essential to the literary awareness of the nineteenth century. In The preface to *Lyrical ballads*, William Wordsworth's renowned cry for a return to life encapsulates the desire of romanticism to restore the link to physical nature and the 'natural' ways of humankind. But does this return to nature inevitably mean a true ecological perspective of the earth and humankind's place in it? In other words, Romanticism is very favourable to what we call "the environment;" that is, the environment that surrounds and inspires or is it damaging to the romantic poet? The demand for an ecologic approach to nature may indeed represent a profoundly un-ecological approach, in so far as it is founded either on a worldly view which dictates that nature be preserved and protected as it is the homes of men or on an anthropomorphic view which inanimates nature does not become as inanimate. Afterwards, I would like to argue for this latter case (traditional animism). In a word, nature is unlikely to be any chance if it does not have any connection with people who treat it either as an object, leading to its exploitation or as a subject that it does not.

Ecology has, of course, come a long way since Aristotle originally suggested the totally humanistic idea of the existence of nature for mankind. The latter forms of humanist ecology presented the prospect of spiritual contact between mankind and the inanimate nature, while more modern ideas on the environment build on this possibility to argue for deep-rooted inter-relationships between man and the environment [5]. To put the relationship between the humanity and its surroundings at the forefront, the awareness of a deep identification of the self and the ecosystem was later named "deep ecology." Arne Naess articulates such a 'deep ecology' attitude, stating that "the ecosophical perspective is generated by a profound identification so that one's self is no longer properly bounded by the self or the organism. You feel that you are a true part of life.' This profound ecological awareness is obvious also in the call of Jonathan Bate for profound emotional communication between humankind and nature; in Karl Kroeber's effort to develop "ecologically based

literary criticism"; and in Fritjof Capra's acknowledgment of the value inherent in all living conditions (1995: 24) and also Roderi's demand that humanity be interconnected with nature. Fascinatingly, philosophers like John Frank Newton, whose assertion that vegetarianism prevents not only animal abuse but also man's suffering, has foretold post-anthropocentrated ecology of post-humanism, have anticipated the profound ecological state of mind already.

Deep ecology prevents the distinction between the self and the world, thereby removing all sign of an affinity between the subject and the object in the union of nature and the human element. Deep ecology however, as far as it requires peaceful exchanges between humans and their environments are concerned, is not less humanistic than earlier environmental theories. At the turn of the 21st century, there had been a change from a deep ecology to what could be viewed as a "black ecology" post-humanistic: an ecosystem that does not have to pay any more for humanity. Dark ecology emphasises the necessity to decenter nature by placing it provisional in a vague environment rather than in the centre and remote from people. Timothy Morton (2007) focuses in *Ecology without Nature* on the notion of dark ecology as the idea that being really ecological can mean not talking about nature or ecology or being involved, because addressing them directly means contaminating them from a human perspective. Ecology without nature The phrase Nature is a transcendental term, after all, 'in a material mask,' at the conclusion of a potentially endless number of other words that collapse into it...: fish, grass, mountain air, chimpanzees ... nature.' I will argue in this paper that there is an unconscious hesitation between the deep ecology and the dark ecology in certain poems of such leading British Romanticism figures as William Wordsworth and Percy Bysshe Shelley in the sense that they are continuously moving from a vision of self-identification with nature to a view of the natural environment as living in an area where they can (and need to) live [1].

Wordsworth: from anthropomorphism to profound ecological consciousness:

I used to say that anthropomorphism is an immanently anthropocentric view because it depends on the assumption that people must recognise attributes akin to their own to be truly caring for others. Contrary to that view, theoreticians have tried to make anthropomorphism an advantage by acknowledging the human feature of emotionally identifying with 'inanimate' natural environment and, therefore, taking care of it. Jane Bennett recognises that anthropomorphism dangers such as 'superstition, divinisation of nature and romance,' are involved, but they are the very risks that produce a sense of 'being with' the natural world and not 'over or outside a not human environment.' He talks in the name of a more practical and more realistic political environment, but it doesn't mean that if we truthfully believe that we are integral in the physical world around us, we should become superstitious. Post-human ecology coincides with a postanthropocentric worldview that always seeks to leave behind anthropomorphism. Posthumanity "thinks beyond humanism, anthropomorphism," as claimed by the editors in this thematic question of EJES.

Before it turned 'deep' or 'dark', English Romanticism had to drop anthropomorphism first. In *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, when William Blake says that 'When man is not nature, he gives mankind an honour to 'imprompt' the (barren) environment around us by putting in the inventive force that the self has. This anthropocentric viewpoint is that nature is brought to fruit through man. In Blake's adage, however, the lack of punctuation offers areas for conceptual ambivalence, as we might just as well choose a second reading: "Where man is not nature[it] is barren." This version of the proverb points to the combination of the individual mind with outside nature as a pre-requisite for the romantic fulfilment of the destiny of men. As Mark Lussier says, in the absence of man "just like nature is barren," man is barren in the absence of nature, because of the symmetries themselves. The issue is a transition from anthropocentrism into deep ecology: man and nature should become a harmonic ecosystemic totality, such that a distinction between oneself and inanimate 'other' can no longer be made.

The idea of a deep ecology, which yet is already shot through by concerns posed by the post-humanistic dark ecological world, is presented by William Wordsworth in several of his poems [8]. The poetical insights of Wordsworth indicate to reevaluating the significance of the environment so that what we now call the 'ecological awareness' emerges. Jonathan Bate (1991) discusses in his seminal study *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and Environmental Tradition* how Wordsworth foreshadows the entire debate over environment and lies specifically with his poetry a profound ecological experiment of the emotional identification of oneself with the universe: 'In the poetic of romanticism poetry cannot only be found in language, it is also a means of emotional communication between human beings and the natural world, but is not merely a means of linguistic expression.' A poem called "Nutting" by Wordsworth seems to create an emotional dialogue among a poet and a hazelnut [9].

The poet has entered the grove 'unvisited' and pure so far, as if the hazels had welcomed or tried to get in touch with him. It's as near as possible to a man-made look at the poem's atmosphere. It is an anthropomorphism, however, that anticipates the development of a close relationship with this atmosphere. The poet indulges in the joys of the grove, merging himself harmoniously into the celestial environment. A thorough ecological reading would concentrate on the act itself of identification of the poet, with every single element in the hands; the hazels increase because they are supposedly benefiting of the presence of the poet, while the poet sensed that at last he would be released from the manacles of industrialisation or artificiality by an act of thought and merge with the mind of the nature itself. Suddenly, however, it ravages the region, dragged to Earth both the branch and the branch, which seems unprecedentedly intrigued with folly and wrath, thus destroying the virgin bough, having consumed it, pleased it. This conduct on the surface seems unreasonable, unimaginable or even perverse. However, in essence, it reveals the unavoidable danger of attempting to recognise the environment around him both emotionally and mentally - we should retain deep ecology. Environmental identification means that it can be destroyed. "Nutting" is an ecological poem because of the lucidity and sympathy with which he examined the reasons why our ecosystem is being destroyed," Ralph Pite informs us. On the other side, the poet's destructive behaviour is not 'sympathetic.' Pite is perhaps right when he claims that Wordsworth's proposal is to link the intimate imagination with nature with the relentless depoliation of nature [7]. The one appears to lead to the other; their destruction follows the projection of oneself into inanimate things. However, it never complies with the consequences of his statement: creating a profound ecological affinity for our environment can be dangerous for both ourselves and the environment itself.

In another essay I analysed how an ecological way of living, of reading and creation is bound together with a more efficient and restful knowledge generation process, which is linked by 'deceleration' and 'critical pause.' In particular, literary criticism should indeed 'slow down' in an ecological mode in our age of global risk and scientific or technical acceleration, unless it falls 'in the fence of positivism' and is a major storey of development [2]. The ecological viewpoint of Wordsworth is very similar. The compañero of the poet never tries to create a 'meaningful' contact with the surrounding environment. Such an attempt could have been useless if we considered the view of dark ecology that nature is too complex to understand by people. The companion does not want either to excite the supposed "secrets" of nature, by embodying itself in (or pushing himself) her enigmatic ways, ambitiously and possibly presumptuously. Only in order to feel the ecological humour of doing nothing 'ecologic,' he seems to 'decelerate,' or even to cease. Through the vague and enigmatic environment that covers us and which we describe as 'nature.' Therefore, a rest period takes place. The healthiness of a (non-)activity stems from its separation from every human illusion that persons have the necessary means to safeguard the environment or unite in a deeply ecological way with the environment.

Dark ecology: a post-human treatment of 'nature':

The denial of everything human beings term 'nature' is among the most prominent trends in dark ecology. The idea of dark ecology can be attributed to its feeling that nature does not represent the mind of humans - contrary to conventional Romanticism, it is necessary to believe that natural landscape reflects the very thought or want of the poet. Indeed, post-humanist (black) ecology 'must confess both the object and the subject to their unnaturalness: environmental desire is not chaste' But nature in particular must be thoroughly reconsidered as unnatural to its core within a romantic environment. In the novel of Frankenstein's novel, the aesthetics of the unnatural item for 'naturalisation,' might be allegorised.

The 'stitches' of the monster show — they try to tell us that he never becomes a human being. No reconciliation between oneself and others will be found in the storey. The frog isn't converted miraculously into a prince, thus the monster must be honoured and loved: a mystery other. When the difference between us and the surrounding environment collapses deep ecology (in this case, the monster's disgust) asking us to harmonically unite ourselves to the mysteriousness (or perversity) of the world – by further objectivisation and demystification of this mysteriousness in a non-ecological fashion – dark ecology maintains the gap between humanity and inhumanity or between ourselves and others.

Like the horrible other person (Frankenstein's monster, or even frightening nature) can never be naturalised, a lovely – yet distant – person should also not be naturalised, so that the error of 'friendly' nor of "domesticated" should never be committed. For example, the skylark keeps the dark melancholy of the lovely and far-off thing in a well-known poem by Percy Shelley since it does not combine with any human voice or aspect. In the context of dark ecology it is necessary to read the 'A Skye-Lark,' even as the 'Human' is a Romantic poet, to do justice to the distance between the bird and the human. The skylark symbolises the impossibility of mentally joining with others as though in a cosmic one. This does not mean, however, that the black ecology already does not contain deep ecological remains. In the poetic view of Shelley in particular, as I will show, there is a hesitation of profound ecology and dark ecology between a temporary identification with "natural" other people and a future depiction as entirely at odds with, and even unfriendly to, mankind [4]. This kind of hesitation is ecologically relevant, since it hard to solidify into a certain position almost by definition – precisely by being a hesitation – by refusing to be inlaid into conceptual binaries, therefore risking being reduced to only another fundamentalist conception or attitude.

The skylark, for example, is liked by Shelley to a "gllow-worm" '[s] cattering un beholden/its airborne hue,' or a rose that sweets the sweetest smell at the exact moment of its waning. The photos above have precisely their intactness in common: this is the purest nature, since it keeps a distance from the presence of the human being and so avoids objectification by human touch or gaze. The bird's joy is so great that people can never comprehend it even if they give up feeling pride, fear or hatred. An alternative reading of the stanza is also available. If Shelley says, "But when we might despise/hate and fear, .../I don't know how close your delight should be, it may well have meant precisely because humans are able to sense the sublime nature of all these subjective emotions—the skylark itself. All expressions of nature are useless without human awareness. The poem takes a broad ecological perspective as it promotes a healthy interchange between nature and humanity, to the extent that it favours the interchange. Indeed, it is an endeavour to bridge the gap between mankind and nature that constitutes the exact act of addressing the skylark ('thou'). Deep ecology thinks that human life is always linked to the planet's entire environment. Consequently, there is an issue of the death of nature by a careless humanity, but of the existence of man through a merciful nature. For the latter scenario, it demands nothing less than a poetry-based mind revolution: 'Poetry is the way that deep ecology can enflame 'a complete consciousness revolution,' [the revolution] that will be useful for preserving our planet's life supporters. Deep ecology appears to desire to adapt poetic discourse to eliminate the human predisposition to exploit or to target the environment, as if it had taken a change of address only to shape the intimacy of the "outside" relationship, now perceived more as a subject than as an object. Shelley apparently

embraces this, yet, seems reluctant to take it in, because dark ecology claims to think like a mountain, and you have to 'think not like a mountain,' paradoxically. Outside nature is neither merciful nor a 'subject' capable of communicating with human subjects (or needed) and Shelley is conscious of this. Shelley's mind is based on a "non-position" of an oscillation between a profound ecological position and a dark ecological one, complicating his view of nature and what would then be called 'ecological thinking.'

Shelley: from 'deep' to 'dark' and back:

Shelley has usually been pigeonholed from a very ecological point of view in recent studies. Such a claim was commonly made in relation to one of the "local poetry," the "Mont Blanc."

Mont Blanc is the highest peak of the Alps, to be visited or overwhelmed by Shelley on his visit to South-East France. In the poem Shelley's "fall in love with a ravine, a river and a mountain, for the sake of his very own human intellect which cannot conceive itself as a truly autonomous, separate life," he adds that the poem "creates a picture of sublimity which constantly hypostatizes an eternity of consciousness." Shelley allows "things" to make a spectacular entry right from the beginning. It cannot be further apart from an anthropocentric perspective of the cosmos to present the 'eternal universe of things.' Nevertheless, this world seems inextricably linked to the mental process of the understanding of a raw nature by means of consciousness: 'the speaker has to evaluate the movement of relationship-based thinking by establishing a relation of 'mental' to 'natural' interactions,' argues Jerrold Hogle [6]. Another critic, Onno Oerlemans, indeed, in Shelley, argued against the anthropocentrism, but quickly endorsed the idea that the poet is faithful to a profound ecological vision in 'an awareness of the connection of nature and awareness that will at least produce an ecological imagination in us, notwithstanding our alienation from the outside world.'

Shelley does not need to enhance the obscurity and mystery connected with pure materiality, as raw matter (or what we call "nature") essentially exalts itself and does not enjoy humanity's patronisation. In a passage above, where is the human element? Shelley is alone on the mountain, ravine and the Arve river in this non-act of reflection. Morton argues that '[deep ecological] interconnecting sensations of loneliness and separation bring us in contact with the environment.' True, in soleness it is possible to appreciate the magnificence of "power" and "things." To go further, Power can be accomplished merely by no-one noticing it; a true ecology is one without nature that shuns any joys at how involved we are in the natural world. The crucial word for natureless ecology is the 'ambience' — a dark ecology. The atmosphere is an abstruse "intermediate" that points to and also points to the environment. The moment you think it is environmental, it is not — a match between cat and mouse. 'The ultimate imagination of the environment is that ecology can genuinely be done without a topic. Ecological awareness is just like a rain shower immersively and persuasively. A subject-specific ecology would take the background to the fore — a pretty un-ecological task (say external nature). An ecology without a subject may, on the other hand, produce indirect visions of nature which would demonstrate its horrifying uniqueness, without distributing or teaching moral lessons about its mystery: doing so requires ecology to take an ecological approach. The aestheticized, blunt manner in which Shelley choose to evoke nature in the extract quoted above from 'Mont Blanc,' that is, as unnatural 'thingness,' is precisely intended to evoke the environment as an entity that is foreign to us, one which must definitely be left alone as every effort to protect it is devastating or distorting it. The simplistic sequence of nouns (fields, lakes, etc.) and the range of verbs (things that move, breathe, subside, swell) are linguistic entities which do not seek to represent an ideal or metaphysical nature; on the contrary, they should refer to processes in the background, while making something else (as nebulous as possible). Therefore, a real ecology, perhaps the dark form of it, would emphasise the necessity for educational and moral injunctions to stop emphasising (the value of) the environment.

The 21st century has brought us seriously to consider the need to keep nature away as a precaution to prevent it from destroying, thanks to harsh weather, frequent tsunamis, thunderstorms and heatwaves. Is it

therefore possible that the restoration of the natural world to earth in the 19th century was ruined by an effort to preserve the soul of the Romantic poet? For a variety of reasons, on the one hand, humanist ecology theories stress the need of maintaining nature; on the other, post humanitarian theories advocate against consciously tackling nature. The proposal for a posthumanistic environment policy appears to be the ideal platform to establish an ecological mentality that actually is useful. However, to speak freely about the possibilities of this attitude in Wordsworth and Shelley is to risk never really opening it up.

Conclusion: ecology as a posthumanist (non)politics:

While Europe's posthumanism was opposed to dark environment politics and ethics in this article, I felt more and more that there was a disagreement between the two waves, albeit going in that same direction. The Posthumanism certainly strives to tonalize the human presence to bring attention to all that isn't human, but it stays solid in its idea that humanity and nature can become a worldwide ecological symbiosis. When Cary Wolfe(2010) reflects the human with his non-human others and the non-human with the human, he creates a postanthropocentric view that flirts with a deep ecology that is not anthropocentric. On the other hand, the dark ecology is attentive to the possibility of the other one without humanity thinking. Even the smallest sign of human meddling could have an impact on the planet's future from a grim ecological viewpoint. However, presence indicates interference, necessary. Braidotti (2013) says that present methods are called intense farming. She unconsciously accepts the second term - farming – as a necessary evil and only criticises the first phrase – 'intensive' – for its lack of environmental sensitivity. On the other hand, for dark ecology, the second phrase is also problematic: it should be banned from a complete analysis of our un-ecological inclinations, or apparently 'natural' impulses that human beings continue to dwell on earth (and on it too...). So is dark ecology hostile to mankind? Would a posthumous environment be viable only if we were to perish from the face of the world? Not necessarily as dark ecology seeks to remind people of being guests rather than host on this world and of being rid of inhumane (or inhuman) non-minded – be they inanimate nature or another, presumably 'inferior' species, unless they are confined to themselves. This prospect would give a whole new meaning and dimension to the concept of "postanthropocentrism."

However, according to Callus, Herbrechter and Rossini, critical posthumanism or 'metaposthumanism' does not consider eliminating the humanist, or dispelling the Humanist. They're not anti-humanistic. They believe in human beings and seek to restore a relationship with others as a way of restoring a relationship with humanity's "true nature." Posthumanism is more like a mix of many discourses, and because of its flexibility, it can deal with the complexity and 'sustainability' of habitats in the face of natural disappearance. If posthumanism is a critical "hybrid," it can depend on profound ecology as well as on other approaches. It is not the purpose of posthumanism to consolidate its discourse and reflection through the use of a specific post-human model. Once it slips into that pit, it gets conventional by reverting to ordinary and completely humanist aims. We should strive for postanthropocentrism, but it's virtually hard to achieve because the human or humanist always lurks around the corner. Please consider the critical argument of posthumanity concerning animal rights. For example, 'a notion of subjectivity with an interest and a respect for rights extends to (some) non-human livestock' and 'results to their very similar 'normal' people.' (Callus, Rossini and Herbrechter, 2014). Anthropomorphic anthropocentrism again causes us to believe that overcoming anthropocentrism is exceedingly tough, but at the very least we should continue our working on it.

Dark ecology takes advantage of profound ecological prospects. I already showed how deep environmental ecology and dark ecology are twisted between Wordsworth and – above all, Shelley's policies. The reality is that dark ecology is not able to stand alone. It must employ profound ecology as a panel to convey its own post-humanist ethics. Dark environmental science can hardly be solidified as this is against its 'nature' or objective into a fixed, positive discourse. Morton (2007) argues himself that transforming the

environment into a subject and subjectivising it just reverses the humanist subject-object model – which is definitely not the answer to the ecological crisis. Dark ecology is also a hybrid, an impalpable posthumanist attitude that paradoxically stems from its vehement negation of ecology as a 'palpable' policy or positivistic discourse. After all, it is not the 'negation of humanism' that discourse of critical posthumanism (also dark ecology). Rather, [his] deconstruction may be regarded to be caused insofar as this speech stresses that paradox... and recursiveness are no difficulties ... but are instead productive for another sort of logic, one which reacts more closely to modern hyper complexity.' As this essay showed, Wordsworth and Shelley share an extraordinary concern for ecological concerns despite their supposedly humanist loyalty. While European romance is an endeavour to put humanity back to the forefront among its other demands, both poets have a significant posthuman interest in the effects of the human return indicated above. What is the influence on the so-called 'natural world' of a human presence? In contrast, does a genuine ecological attitude (instead of 'politics') demand that the nonhuman or inanimate be given priority at human expense? That would simply indicate that the two poets appear very aware of a polarity. Therefore (maybe unwittingly) take a posthumous, political and ethical stand on ecology and the environment — a gloomy ecological position — which does not forget that it must avoid becoming a real, palpable policy to live up to the issue of ecology.

References:

1. Oerlemans, Onno (1995). 'Shelley's Ideal Body: Vegetarianism and Nature.' *Studies in Romanticism* 34: 531–52.
2. Aretoulakis, Emmanouil (2012). 'Avoiding the Speed of Science: The Nonquest for the New in Literary Studies.' *Philosophy and Literature* 36.1: 17–36.
3. Capra, Fritjof (1995). 'Deep Ecology: A New Paradigm.' *Deep Ecology for the 21st century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications. 19–25.
4. Ferguson, Frances (1993). 'Shelley's Mont Blanc: What the Mountain Said'. *Shelley*. Ed. Michael O' Neill. London and New York: Longman. 43–55.
5. Haraway, D (1994). 'A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s.' *The Postmodern Turn: New Perspectives on Social Theory*. Ed. Steven Seidman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 82–116.
6. Linkin, Harriet Kramer (1994). 'Shelley's Power as Perceiver.' *European Romantic Review* 4.2: 151–62.
7. Bate, Jonathan (1991). *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition*. London: Routledge.
8. Capra, Fritjof (1995). 'Deep Ecology: A New Paradigm.' *Deep Ecology for the 21st century*. Ed. George Sessions. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications. 19–25.
9. Haraway, D (2006). 'When We Have Never Been Human, What is to Be Done?: Interview with Donna Haraway'. Interview by N. Gane.' *Theory, Culture and Society* 23.7–8: 135–58.