

UNRAVELING THE ENIGMA OF ECOLOGICAL EMBLEM IN ANDREW MARVELL'S POETRY

Rabby Imam

Lecturer, Department of English, City University Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh

<https://doi.org/10.54922/IJEHSS.2023.0622>

ABSTRACT

In light of the widespread deforestation and environmental deterioration, critics were forced to adopt new perspectives and analyze the art from unique aspects. Because of this, Ecocriticism became a distinct literary genre in the 1990s. It looks into how humans relate to nature as described in writing. In this sense, much Ecocritical writing by the Romantics overlooked how important environmental issues were to 17th and 18th-century English literature. Even though he was ignored, Andrew Marvell fought for the protection of nature back in the seventeenth century. He urged people to reach a more profound emotional state when engaging with all things natural. Therefore, this essay aims to critically evaluate a few of Marvell's poems to assess him as an ecocritical poet.

Keywords: Eco-criticism, English Literature, Emotional State, Nature, Environment.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are many deep connections between the history of humanity and the natural world. The human civilization and nature are inextricably linked; it is a truth. This fundamental fact states that life is inextricably linked to nature. Although nature served as the foundation for human civilization, technological advancements have ignored this role in the last century by destroying portions of it, which has alarmed environmentalists greatly. Furthermore, as these destruction become more frequent, they may pose a considerable risk by citing the natural world as depicted in literary writings. Lawrence Buell (2001) points out literary texts function as "acts of environmental imagination" that may "affect one's caring for the physical world." Finally, these efforts of literary critics culminated in the emergence of a new literary discipline called Eco criticism.

A relatively new literary discipline, "ecocriticism" seeks to reflect on and influence how people react to their surroundings. One of the leading critics in this discipline, Cheryll Glotfelty, states, "Eco criticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment" (1996, p.18). It considers how the real world is reflected in literary works and the societal setting in which they were produced. In addition, it looks at the attitudes and behaviors that have contributed to today's ecological issues while exploring different ways of thinking and acting that uphold the rights or values associated with non-human animals and natural processes. Application of ecocriticism is like a new "philosophical and critical discourse and theoretical approach to literary phenomena" (Wang, 2009, p. 290).

There is no assurance of the appearance of Eco analysis. The advancement of Eco analysis in English Heartfelt examinations can be traced back to Jonathan Bate, frequently viewed as the first to have prospered in this development in the mid-1990s. This new field of study was not restricted

to English Heartfelt investigations, and it was likewise extended to the American text because of the regular biological and ecological issues during the 1970s and 1980s. This cycle urged the start of Eco analysis in the US. Nonetheless, it should be noticed that it was exclusively during the 1990s that Eco analysis appeared as a different discipline of study, even though the association between man and his environmental elements had forever been a subject for conversation by scholarly critics.

However, Rueckert has assumed the praise for begetting "Ecocriticism" as a scholarly movement; Cheryl Glotfelty spread the word about this movement for the most scholarly critics. Glotfelty tenaciously attempted to put Ecocriticism as a regarded individual from the group of academic examinations at the 1989 Western Writing Affiliation meeting (Dorbrin and Weisser, 2002, p. 569). At last, with the joint distribution of Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology* in 1996 and Lawrence Buell's *The Environmental Imagination* in 1995, critics significantly impacted their points of view and battled for achieving unification of man and Nature with with "one foot in literature and the other on land" (Glotfelty, 1996, p. 19).

Even though Ecocriticism had been broadly utilized by countless scholarly pundits all over the planet, they couldn't arrive at a specific definition of it. Thus, various researchers, including Buell and Glotfelty, have attempted to arrive at a typical report regarding Eco analysis. Buell has recommended two marginally different meanings of Eco analysis. He characterizes Ecocriticism "as study of the relation between literature and the environment conducted in a spirit of commitment to environmentalist praxis" (Buell, 1995, p. 430).

His second meaning of Ecocriticism is defined as "a multiform inquiry extending to a variety of environmentally focused perspectives more expressive of concern to explore environmental issues searchingly than of fixed dogmas about political solutions" (Buell, 1995, p. 430). Later on, Cheryll Glotfelty proposes another definition to this new term in literary studies:

"... the relationship between literature and the physical environment. Just as feminist criticism examines language and literature from a gender conscious perspective, and Marxist criticism brings an awareness of modes of production and economic class to its reading of texts, Eco criticism takes an earth- centered approach to literary studies" (p. 18).

Both Glotfelty and Buell intended to give writing another spot other than the one to which it was allotted to consistently. They are arranging writing out of the stylish understanding and more towards a spot in complex framework, "literature does not float above the material world in some aesthetic ether, but, rather, plays a part in an immensely complex global system in which energy, matter, and ideas interact" (Glotfelty, 1996, p. 19).

Likewise, the artistic critics are crafted by authors with a greater propensity with nature. During this time, the investigations of Romantic poetry pulled in a lot of consideration. During the Romantic period, a sharp ascent of metropolitan populaces happened in an undeniably industrialized economy, and ecological issues turned into a fundamental issue. Subsequently, it is no big surprise to see William Blake grumbling about the "cities turrets and towers and domes /

Whose smoke destroyed the pleasant gardens and whose running Kennels / Choked the bright rivers” (lines 167 –9). In this regard, the Romantic poetry became the fundamental focal point of Ecocritical studies. Nonetheless, this centralization of Romantic poetry checked the sort of verse composed before this period, explicitly the finish of the seventeenth century, which was the appearance of Western logical ideas and the time during which such extraordinary scholars as Descartes, Galileo, and Locke were taking care of their most significant responsibilities.

In this way, little consideration has been paid to writers like Andrew Marvell, who is more viewed as a supernatural writer than a writer of nature. Marvell lived from 1621 until 1678, at a defining moment throughout Western logical ideas. At this crossroads, it is nothing unexpected to see Marvell's sonnets managing the human circumstances and their divisions, which oppose the helpful goal. Notwithstanding, in a portion of his sonnets, he has taken an alternate point of view by captivating his consideration of nature. For instance, in the poem "The Nursery", he has turned his concentration toward nature and its polarity with workmanship. Likewise, he has put a lot of intriguingness in the expression "green" in the expression "To a green thought in a green shade" (Abrams, 1986, p.1711, lls.48). Marvell has embraced a natural point of view and, surprisingly, Marvell's view sound revolutionary in Cutter sonnets. He applauds the unadulterated nature removed from the debased culture of individual and uncovers his resistance to the human-centric Renaissance man. This unconventional thought of Marvell is so near the possibility of wild advanced by William Cronon in 1996. Cronon's philosophy of wild addresses the unadulterated nature immaculate by the social and political history of individual. Essentially, Marvell addresses nature as the sharp absolute opposite of human culture. Additionally, Marvell's Eco basic view is extended to deny common liberties' to think about nature at his disposal. He considers human as a piece of nature not as the better power than rule over it. From this point, his view is like profound biologists who trust that “Nature does not exist to serve humans” (Bari, 1995, p.22). Subsequently, the current paper is a work to furnish the reader with an Eco critical reading of Andrew Marvell's chosen sonnets from various Eco critical critics' viewpoints and revealed insight into this fairly uncovered element of his verse.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this research, the qualitative research method has been followed. An intensive study of the primary and secondary sources has been carried out to analyze the content. An attempt is made to investigate the poet's works by involving explanatory interpretation and content analysis of the available primary sources.

2.1 The Enigma of Ecocriticism in Marvell's Poetry

As ecocriticism arose as another essential field of concentration during the 1990s, researchers of scholarly ecocriticism turned an impressive measure of consideration for authors whose works are loaded with normal pictures and topics. Because environmental issues have become integral to our existence, ecocriticism aims to demonstrate how humans and nonhumans can coexist in various ways by finding common ground. Like this, with the distribution of Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm's joint assortment, *The Ecocriticism Peruser: Milestones in Scholarly Biology* in 1996 and Lawrence Buell's *The Ecological Creative Mind* in 1995, pundits changed their holy messengers of vision and strived for achieving solidarity among man and Nature with “one foot in literature and the other on land” (Glotfelty, 1996, p. 20).

What ecocritics do incorporates re-perusing the works utilizing a nature-based approach, with explicit thought of the portrayal of nature and laying a significant accentuation on the job of nature in making solidarity between human personalities and nature. As a result, romantic poetry emerged as the primary icon of ecocritical research. It is handily envisioned that numerous ecocritical studies have been embraced on Sentimental people at the expense of ignoring the significance of seventeenth hundred years and eighteenth-century English writing in the advancement of ecological concern. Maybe the explanation for dismissing the eighteenth-century works over Renaissance and Heartfelt texts lies as Bate would like to think. He accepts that by the start of the Sentimentalism, "an imaginative reunification of mind and nature"(p.245). In other words, Sentimentalism lighted the characteristics of the green cognizance, which was lethally killed by the cruel edification time of Bacon and Descartes.

In this regard, little consideration has been paid to writers like Andrew Marvell, who is more viewed as a magical artist than an artist of nature. Marvell lived from 1621 until 1678, at a defining moment throughout the entire existence of Western logical idea, during which incredible scholars like Descartes, Galileo, and Locke were taking care of their most significant responsibilities. At this point, nothing unexpected Marvell's sonnets manage the "human conditions and their dichotomies which resist the desirable resolution" (Abrams, 1986, p.1696). If one takes into account the prevalent view of the Renaissance period, this would be simple to justify.

Renaissance perspective on the world created out of the middle age idea of Thomas Aquinas. His works depends on the union of prior Aristotelian and Augustinian originations of a characteristic order. In this arrangement of order, human is the ideal production of life and positions the most highest level "as the perfect and the less perfect; just as in the order of things, the animate are more perfect than the inanimate, animals more perfect than plants, and man more perfect than brute animals" (Aquinas, 1999, p.87).

Accordingly, man has turned into "the creature who epitomizes the physical and spiritual aspects of the universe, the only animal creature with powers of understanding and of contemplation" (Heffernan, 1992, p.540). This well-established belief that there is a fundamental difference between human and nonhuman life was also helped along by Cartesian philosophy. This distinction caused an "absolute break between man and the rest of nature" (Thomas, 1983, p.32) and prepared "for the uninhibited exercise of human rule" (Thomas, 1983, p.32). As a result, the Renaissance's dominant conception of humanity and nature was anthropocentric, an anti-ecological paradigm in which humans are placed outside rather than within the rest of nature.

Subsequently, it's undeniable that one doesn't find Marvell managing everyday peculiarity as broadly as the better-known "nature" artists like William Wordsworth. However, as Garrard makes sense, "it seems likely that any given concerned individual will probably have both eco- and anthropocentric attitudes at different times, under different conditions"(Garrard, 2004, p.20). Thus, in a portion of his sonnets, one might see that he has taken an alternate point of view by captivating his consideration of nature. His verse isn't predictable; however, it now and then resounds with environmental opinion. Subsequently, he could be viewed as a biologically cognizant early present-day writer and a commendable supporter of the conversation of the environment.

In his poem "The Garden", Marvell moves toward nature as a positive sanctuary for people. He endeavors to convey visions of possible harmony between humans and nature. He thinks inside a particular procedure for thinking in which individuals are seen to be personally associated with everything around them, from the most minor bug or rock on earth to the most unprecedented groups of stars or runs of birds in the skies. In his view, People are not distinguishable from different structures; everything is connected and counted inside this framework.

In the second refrain of "The Garden", the poet relates the holiness of the everyday world with the honesty of the dearest and second thoughts the time he had been looking for his adored in the organization of men. Later on, he completely faults society for all the frightfulness that besets the existence of individuals.

Fair Quiet, have I found thee here,
And Innocence, thy sister dear?
Mistaken long, I sought you then
In busy companies of men.
Your sacred plants if here below,
Only among the plants will grow;
Society is all but rude,
To this delicious solitude. (Abrams, 1986, p.1711, lls.9-16)

If one thinks about the outer world from an instrumental worth perspective, it is considered valuable When an object or phenomenon serves humans. Thus, it will be effortlessly seen that people are lost in a daily existence that is a hostage in the walls of urban communities to the detriment of dismissing nature. In this regard, the character has lost its need for worthless things. Marvell is persevering against this self-centered and instrumental mentality toward the heart. According to his perspective, each everyday peculiarity has "value in its own right, without reference to human interests" (Garrard, 2004, p. 183) and "the value of non-human forms is independent of the usefulness these may have for narrow human purposes" (Rothenberg, 1989, p. 29). Subsequently, he gives the most noteworthy need to nature and upbraids the individuals who deprecate this spot of nature. In the accompanying model, he represents this point by making a correlation between the magnificence of beloveds and those that nature can offer us:

No white nor red Was ever seen
So amorous as this lovely green.
Fond lovers, cruel as their flame,
Cut in these trees their mistress' name:
Little, alas, they know or heed
How far these beauties hers exceed!
Fair trees, wheresoe'er your barks I wound,
No name shall but your own be found. (Abrams, 1986, p.1711, lls.17-24)

The above model can uncover the peak of the poet's applause of nature. He bends over backward to make people mindful of the worth of nature. How the character is depicted in the past lines can suggest the artist's closeness with nature and the elevated place of nature in his

philosophy. He has confidence in natural worth contrary to instrumental worth and perseveres in biocentrism. Considering the people who are agreeable to biocentrism, the everyday world has natural qualities that should be safeguarded and regarded for the well-being of their autonomous mankind. His verse is an evaluation of the people who characterize the worth of nature “only in relation to human interests, usually narrowly Economic” (Garrard, 2004, p. 183).

The poet tries to reaffirm his belief that the universe is in an alive and continuous state of pleasure in the following stanzas, feeling so connected to nature. He finds natural objects with human senses because the character is so fresh and alive to him. He is partaking in his life however much he is encircled in heart:

What wondrous life in this I lead!
Ripe apples drop about my head;
The luscious clusters of the vine
Upon my mouth do crush their wine;
The nectarine and curious peach
In to my hands themselves do reach;
Stumbling on melons as I pass,
Ensnared with flowers, I fall on grass. (Abrams, 1986, p.1711, lls.33-40)

The sight of these apples and vines brings joy to Marvell's heart. His verse uncovers a faith in the inescapability of regular pleasure. He tries to draw parallels between the emotions and perceptions of specific humans and plants. He knows the association between delight inside oneself and joy drawn from the outside world. Strangely, it should have been visible that Marvell has moved his satisfactions onto objects of nature that encompass him, like blossoms and trees.

For Marvell, nature is animated, and he is brought together with it. Recognizing ecological composition and ecocritical composing, Glotfelty (1996) expresses "the former supports the binary opposition of humanity/nature, whereas the latter unifies the two, or at least questions the relationship between them" (p. 20). Marvell also holds the same view that the human and nonhuman worlds are interdependent on one another. He attempts to make an extension between nature and human, and he prevails in his endeavor to limit the distance between nature and human as he says:

"The mind, that ocean where each kind
Does straight its own resemblance find;
Yet it creates, transcending these,
Far other world sand other seas,
Annihilating all that's made
To a green thought in a green shade." (Abrams, 1986, p.1711-1712, lls.43-48)

This piece of his poem alludes to the unification of the psyche with nature by referencing the agreement between the human brain and heart. Right now, Marvell, like the heartfelt writers, has underlined the inventive force of the human brain. It appears to be a discussion between the human brain and nature, bringing about the writer's green idea. The person, mainly the Renaissance man,

has uninhibitedly used nature in his particular manner while never regarding nature; in other words, he has attacked the sacredness of the wild. The possibility of wild connotes the unadulterated nature in an uncontaminated state by development. Marvell is by all accounts aggravated and goes after the Renaissance person for this sort of conduct. He is zeroing in on the immaculateness of the wild and its fundamental resistance to the dirty domains of man.

In his poem “The Mower Against Gardens”, he brutally rebukes the people for this sort of acting. He is in the blessing of the wild nature while it is diminished to a few explicitly characterized districts by man:

Luxurious man, to bring his vice in use,
Did after him the world seduce,
And from the fields the flowers and plants allure,
Where Nature was most plain and pure.
He first enclosed within the garden's square
A dead and standing pool of air, (Abrams, 1986, p.1706, lls.1-6)

William Cronon(1996) has fostered a devout ecocritical point of view; He argues that wilderness is constructed rather than human-created impure culture:

Wilderness is the natural, unfallen antithesis of an unnatural civilization that has lost its soul. It is a place of freedom in which we can recover our true selves we have lost to the corrupting influences of our artificial lives. Most of all, it is the ultimate landscape of authenticity. (Cronon, 1996, p.80)

This vision advances a few viewpoints for our origination of nature and ourselves as it considers nature a real source if we are entirely missing from it. Such virtue is accomplished at the expense of a complete end of a person as exhaustive as that embraced by peaceful writing. It is effectively seen that Marvell is against a human-centric strategy and second thoughts the hint of the person in the wild. He depicts how the person benefits from the earth: “And a more luscious earth for them did knead, /Which stupefied them while it fed” (Abrams, 1986, p.1706, lls.7-8). Wild is a philosophical sense that targets deleting the social and political history of the person. The experience of wild philosophy has a few standard elements with a profound biological way of thinking. These two are connected to the degree wherein deep biology lauds the possibility of the wild and the scholars investigating it. In this manner, profound nature advances a poetics of validness for which wild is the standard. Arne Naess (1912–2009) was the first person to develop the idea of “Deep ecology.” He coined “deep ecology” to describe this brand-new movement in 1973. He was a Norwegian scholar considered a significant figure in the natural development of the late 20th 100 years. He unequivocally stresses the job of nature by recognizing the difference between “deep ecology” and “shallow ecology.” He proposed that “shallow ecology” is concerned with the earth's utility to humans; to put it another way, it is a human-centric technique, while “deep ecology” is introduced instead of this strategy. It is the conviction that nature doesn't exist to serve people and supports a bio-centric strategy. To profound scientists, people have no more prominent worth than different animals. Judi Bari expresses:

“Nature does not exist to serve humans. Rather, humans are a part of nature, one species among many. All species have the right to exist for their own sake, regardless of their usefulness to humans” (Bari, 1995, p.22).

Deep biologists require the cutting-edge man to pose deep inquiries about his own way of life. They accept that by posing further inquiries about himself, man can find his actual spot in nature. In this regard, Marvell is scrutinizing the person for his harmful situation over nature. He is enraged at Renaissance man for seducing nature and shaping it his way. He is telling us of a standing dead pool of air while it ought to be vivacious and new anyway the harmful idea of the individual has torn this open door away.

In his view, nature has lost its creativity insofar as man has begun to interfere with it to profit from it in his own particular manner no matter what the significant spot of nature in the ecology. Marvell makes reference to that everything has become fake and lost its unique taste:

The pink grew then as double as his mind;
The nutriment did change the kind.
With strange perfumes he did the roses taint;
And flowers themselves were taught to paint.
The tulip white did for complexion seek,
And learned to interline its cheek; (Abrams, 1986, p.1706, lls.9-14)

Marvell is disturbed to see a spot that is cleaned of its local and wild greenery. However the man has not destroyed the plants to pieces, he has grabbed away their enthusiasm and creativity by mishandling it. In his view, a human voice has turned into the voice of the spot and it is administering over nature as though nobody can feel the spirit of nature on the grounds that the people have been the cardinal deterministic component of the beginning's vegetation. He believes that nature, not humans, should create a landscape.

Finally, Marvell closes this sonnet by rehashing what is going on happening to individuals. He accepts that the unadulterated feeling of nature is neglected till man has attacked the holiness of nature and demolished it:

While the sweet fields do lie forgot,
Where willing Nature does to all dispense
A wild and fragrant innocence;
And fauns and fairies do the meadows till
More by their presence than their skill.
Their statues polished by some ancient hand
May to adorn the gardens stand;
But, howsoe'er the figures do excel,
The gods themselves with us do dwell. (Abrams, 1986, p.1707, lls.32-40)

Marvell challenges anthropocentrism with wit and incisiveness. He contends while "fauns and fairies" effectively defend themselves by apportioning themselves to people; they are not pre-

assembled for human use and solace, and that each living thing has inborn worth. Finally, he is frustrated by the presumption of people and upholds a more comprehensive other worldliness in nature. He attempts to support himself by referencing the presence of divine beings inside the glades.

3. CONCLUSION

As the undeniable conditions of the regular world perpetually press into our educating and composing, an acknowledgeable need is felt to fill the hole and hold the implied discourse between the text and the ecological and environmental elements. Ecocriticism has created a suitable primary reaction to this unheard exchange, an endeavor to raise it to a more significant level of correspondence between humans and the everyday world. Since educating and concentrating on writing with no reference to the regular states of the world that underlie all life appears to be progressively limited and disjointed.

Because of the focal point of English sentimentalism in the regular world, many ecocritical studies have been sent off on Sentimental people at the expense of ignoring the significance of the seventeenth 100 years and eighteenth-century English writing in improving natural concern. However, Andrew Marvell isn't locked in with the regular world; many better-known "nature" artists, like William Wordsworth's verse, should be visible to reflect environmental opinion.

Marvell accepts that nature and individuals are interconnected. As a result, he opposes a self-centered approach to nature. According to his perspective, each everyday peculiarity has esteem by its own doing, with next to no reference to human interests. Marvell finds fault with people for all the grotesqueness made on the earth and appears disheartened to see that nature has lost its need for man's requests. Marvell wants the inventiveness of nature and hates to screen humans' overwhelming effect on wildlife. He can't bear the control of human voice over nature, which makes it accessible for its inventiveness.

As a result, he endeavors to elicit human feelings toward the heart to cultivate a caring attitude, which is crucial to preserving nature. In his sonnets, he fosters the view that the person should live together as one with nature without the unpredictable obliteration of its virtue. His resistance faces the materialistic disposition of men, which makes them obscurity of their excellence and appeal. Subsequently, Andrew Marvell deliberately praises nature and offers back its needs as he trusts in the characteristic upsides of nature. In the long run, he builds another artistic ecological language amid the human-centric perspective on the everyday world in the seventeenth 100 years.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Judi, "Revolutionary Ecology: Biocentrism & Deep Ecology," A Journal of revolutionary ecology, 1995.
- [2] L. Buell, *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*, England: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- [3] L. Buell, *Writing for an endangered world: Literature, culture and environment in the US and beyond*, Belknap Press, 2003.
- [4] M. H. Abrams, *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, New York: Norton, 1986.

-
- [5] C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm, *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1996.
- [6] B. Judi, "Revolutionary Ecology: Biocentrism & Deep Ecology," *A Journal of revolutionary ecology*, 1995.
- [7] T. Aquinas, "Summa Theologica (selections)," in *Theories of Human Nature*, ed. Donald C. Abel, trans. by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, revised by Anton C. Pegis, New York: McGraw Hill, 1992.
- [8] G. Garrard, *Ecocriticism*, New York: Routledge, 2004.
- [9] K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500 – 1800*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [10] W, Ning, "Toward a literary environmental ethics: A reflection on eco- criticism," *Neohelicon*, 2009.
- [11] N, Arne, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [12] N, Arne, "The Shallow and the Deep. Long-Range Ecology: A Summary," *An Interdisciplinary journal of Philosophy and the Social Sciences*, 1973.
- C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm, *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1996.
- [13] Sidney I, Dobrin and W. Christian, *Natural Discourse: Toward Ecocomposition*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- [14] C, William, "The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," in *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995.