


Nature's Affable Voice in Wordsworth and Sepehri: An Ecocritical Study			Literature
		Keywords: Wordsworth, Sepehri, Water, Lines Written in Early Spring, Ecocriticism, deep ecology.	
Raheleh Bahador	Department of English Literature, faculty of humanities, Vali-e-Asr University Vali-e-Asr University of Rafsanjan, Main Administrative building, 22 Bahman Square, Rafsanjan, Kerman, Iran.		
Sohila Faghfori	Department of English Literature, faculty of humanities, Vali-e-Asr University Vali-e-Asr University of Rafsanjan, Main Administrative building, 22 Bahman Square, Rafsanjan, Kerman, Iran.		
Abstract			
<p>Similar subjects in the world literature and other fields of study can be traced. Nature as an interdisciplinary field of study connects literature to Ecocriticism. The widespread influence of modernism and industrial progress results in pollution and destruction of nature which forms the main concern of Ecocritical studies. It is a shared concern of literature and ecocritics. In the modern age, man has not self-awareness towards nature and literature's aim is to awaken human being. To warn against the danger which threatens human life, man ought to stop threatening nature. This is what is mirrored in literature. This comparative study is a deep ecological analysis of William Wordsworth's "Lines Written in Early Spring"(1798) and Sohrab Sepehri's "Water" (1961). It shows that the common purpose of literature is leading in different ages, languages and poets. Poet in this perspective has been defined as "seer" or "prophet" in its classic definition to lead people to virtue and right. The objective of the present paper is to enlighten the great Ecocritical contribution of two Romantic poets, Wordsworth and Sepehri. It indicates that one of the main poetic concerns of them is Nature. They depict the beauty of nature in their poems to remind man of what he has lost in the ado of the modern age. To heal the broken tie of man and nature is what will be discussed in Wordsworth's and Sepehri's poems. The term and theory "deep ecology" was coined by Arne Naess in 1973. Deep ecology endorses biocentrism and rejects the anthropocentrism. As guardian of nature, human being stands in equality with nature not superior over it. Accordingly, the "man-in-environment image" is condemned and "relational, total-field image" is encouraged. In this respect, Wordsworth and Sepehri suggest identification with nature as the resolution out of the dilemma of separation of man and nature. Identification results from self-awareness and leads to rediscover the interconnectedness of man and nature.</p>			

1. Introduction

1.1. Methodology

As an interdisciplinary field of study, Ecocriticism has emerged in the late twentieth century. William Rueckert coined the term Ecocriticism in 1978 in an essay titled "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism". Ecocriticism began in earnest in the 1990s. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm, pioneers of Ecocritical study in *The Ecocriticism Reader* (1996) define the term as "the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment" (p. xviii). Richard Kerridge in *Environmentalism and Ecocriticism: Literary Theory and Criticism* (2006) defines Ecocriticism as follows:

Ecocriticism is literary and cultural criticism from an environmentalist viewpoint. Texts are evaluated in terms of their environmentally harmful or helpful effects. Beliefs and ideologies are assessed for their environmental implications... Direct representations of environmental damage or political struggle are of obvious interest to ecocritics, but so is the whole array of cultural and daily life, for what it reveals about implicit attitudes that have environmental consequences (p. 530).

Newborn the Ecocriticism is, it tries to discover and highlight the links between ecology and other fields of study like film, ethics, history, psychology, women's studies, Native American Studies and literature. Ecocriticism emerged in the dawn of an era which environmental pollution and industrial destructions and decay is a serious problem of humanity. Glen A. Love in *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and Environment* (2003) writes: "the age of Environmental anxiety has projected nature into the forefront of social and intellectual concerns..." (p. 69). Nature or Mother Earth provides human beings with its benefices and benevolences but the destructive deeds of men affects the natural sources and has destroyed the beautiful face of nature. To warn against this danger, Ecocritical study questions the relation between humankind and nature. The study of Ecocriticism ties a relation between a keen understanding of environmental crisis of the modern age and the necessity of saving nature. Far from the political aims of the previous critical studies, Ecocriticism addresses the relation of human being with his surroundings to solve the conflict between man who considers himself the superior over nature and nature which is the vital source of life on earth. According to Nurten Birlik in "Literature's Response to Ecology" (2011):

Environmentalists problematized the old root conflict between man and nature, culture and nature, human and non-human; and developed a more biocentric view which aims to go beyond the impasse of industrial modernity and hubris of humanism and which acknowledges both the independence and the interdependence between the human and the non-human. (p. 1)

Rise of capitalism and industrialism in the modern period after World War II and the rush of man to nature due to its vast economic resources bells the alarms of danger for human being in general and ecocritics in particular. To highlight the fast tie between literature and study of nature N. Wang in *Toward a literary environmental ethics: A reflection on eco-criticism* (2009) writes: "[Ecocriticism] one of the responses from literary criticism to the various consequences caused by capitalist modernity. For it has been a tradition for literature to deal with the relations between man and nature, both in the West and East". (p. 290). Literature had been the mirror of nature since the dawn of literature in folkloric songs, pastorals, odes, tales and stories. It reflects human preoccupation with nature. Among the literary eras, Romanticism is the favorite and prime source of literary scholars to deal with it in Ecocritical aspects. Rise in the mid of the nineteenth century and against the rationalism and restrictions of eighteenth century, Romanticism "herald the movement of liberating nature from the hierarchical domination and violence"(Hazarika, p:31,2012). Romantics dedicate their most important works to nature and Romanticism is the reflection of nature in poetry. A. Abjadian in *A Survey of English Literature*(2005) on the importance of nature for the Romantics states that "It sees in Nature a revelation of truth. Nature is the 'living garment of God', who has manifested Himself in man and Nature." (p. 205).

As a Romantic poet, William Wordsworth (1770-1850) is the prominent of Romantics in poetry of nature. His poetry can be regarded as a crowning example of ecologically oriented literature. Nature acts as a source of inspiration for the poet. In some poems like "The World is Too much with us" and "Lines Written in Early Spring", Wordsworth laments the separation of man from nature. In others like "Tintern Abbey" and "The Prelude" the poet records his evolving understanding of nature. According to Norton anthology (2010) "Wordsworth exhibits toward the landscape attitudes and sentiments which human beings had earlier felt not only for God, but also for a father, a mother or a beloved."(p. 1301). In his poem "Lines Written in Early Spring" (1798) Wordsworth compares the harmony of nature to the decline of humanity in community and laments the disharmony between Nature and man.

Among the Iranian Romantic poets Sohrab Sepehri (1928-1980) is a poet whose poetry is filled with images of nature. One of the most interesting aspects of Sepehri's poetry is the awesome and amazing pictures he depicts from the nature. In fact his poetry points to the natural elements like flowers, trees, bushes, sun, moon, sky, birds, frequently. Nature in the poems of Sepehri is sacred and the poet accepts it easily and simply. In fact nature for Sepehri is a mirror of God and His beneficiations. Sepehri has collections of poems depicting nature like *The Sound of the Water's Step*, *The Green Space*, *Torrent of Sun* and *The Life of Dreams*. In these poems Sepehri uses images to convey the pictures of nature to the reader. Images open the gate to the internal world of the poet and his artistic creation of the nature. As in his real life, he is the painter of nature in his poetry. To indicate the presence of nature we read that "there are some characteristics in Sepehri's poetry that does not exist in his contemporaries. Sepehri loves nature and is satisfied to speak of nature in the meanwhile of his poetry... Sepehri believes that nature does not belong to human alone."(Emmad, p:9, 1998)

Much critical works has been done on William Wordsworth and Sohrab Sepehri's poetry from Ecocritical aspect. Some of them are mentioned as follows. Jelica Tosic in "Ecocriticism-Interdisciplinary study of Literature and Environment" (2006) argues about the history of Ecocriticism and the evolution of the critical study. Tosic states that "the word Ecocriticism is a semineologism. Eco is short of ecology." (p. 2). He goes through different ecological theories and defines the related terms according to Ecologists' viewpoints. In "Two Green Poets: A Comparative Ecocritical Study of Sepehri and Emerson" (2010) M. Fomeshi and F. Pourgiv study the similarities and differences between two poets in their poems of nature. The authors of the paper believe that for Sepehri nature is animate but for Emerson nature has no intrinsic value. L.X. Polin Hazarika in "William Wordsworth and Nature: An Ecological Inquiry" (2012) like Tosic reviews the history of Ecocriticism and investigates the relation between Nature and literature. He then analyses some sketches in William Wordsworth's poetry regarding Nature and environment from the theoretical view of Lawrence Buell. Hazarika explains "in Wordsworth's poems, the sense of threat in the urban environment is juxtaposed with the peace and healing qualities offered in Nature." (p. 2). No comparative study has been done on Wordsworth and Sepehri yet. The significance of this comparative study is that two poets are embodiment of nature in their poems and they will be studied in similar outlook. The personal passion and internal feelings toward nature is so interwoven in their poetry that one cannot ignore the ethical responsibility they felt for nature. William Wordsworth ballad "Lines Written in Early Spring" (1798) included in the collection *Lyrical Ballads* has been studied from Ecocriticism aspect before. The ballad has the capacity to be analyzed according to deep ecology to discover the tie between the poet's concern for Nature and his rejection of anthropocentrism and his invitation to the "total-field image" offered by Naess. Sohrab Sepehri's "Water" (1961) has the same capacity to be studied from deep ecological aspect. It shows the deep concern of Sepehri for nature.

2. Discussion

2.1 "Lines Written in Early Spring" and "Water": Equality of Man and Nature

Originating from Plato's and Aristotle's morality, the poet should fulfill the ethics of the society and guide the individual to virtuous action. The importance of the poet's social role increased with the birth of Renaissance. In agreement with Plato, Sir Philip Sidney in his *Defence of Poesy* (1583) calls the poets "seers" or "prophets" to highlight the guiding role of the poet in society that leads people to virtue and ethics. With the rise of capitalism and industrial progress in the modern age, the prophet role of the poet comes in question that whether a poet can be of any use to society. The modern society is shaped with a shallow morality as a result from modern and postmodern views about life. The human being should return to a source to remind him of his role as an "individual" in the society. Literature could fulfill this purpose although at the first glance, it carries no political, moral or social role with itself. William Wordsworth as the leading poet of the "Lake School" during Romanticism has emphasized the mutual relationship between man and Nature in his poetry. Stephen Gill in *The Cambridge Companion to Wordsworth* writes (2006) "in Wordsworth's work 'the natural world' is always social, both in itself and in its relation to man." (p. 184). Gill believes that in Wordsworth poems Nature is a 'refuge' rather than an escape for the people. Wordsworth asserts the role of the individual in order to respect Nature. Industrial pollution has defected Nature and Wordsworth who "looks at nature as his home" (Abjadian, p. 207, 2005) mourns the decay caused by human beings. Juxtaposed with the sense of threat in the environment and peace and healing offered by Nature, Wordsworth poems are the mirror of Ecocritical worries in the modern age. Wordsworth poetic process is that which the internal makes external. In his poetry external nature is in connection with the internal feelings of the poet. This aesthetic process is highly important to reveal Wordsworth attempt to bridge the gap between Nature and man. The poetic persona whom we identify with Wordsworth himself, takes solace and peace at the bosom of nature. Wordsworth poetry is not only the reflection of poet's spiritual dimension but a fact that proves Wordsworth ties with Nature. Accordingly, the ballad "Lines Written in Early Spring" (1798) will be analyzed from Ecocriticism lens:

*I heard a thousand blended notes,
While in a grove I sate reclined,
In that sweet mood when pleasant thoughts
Bring sad thoughts to the mind.*

*To her fair works did Nature link
The human soul that through me ran;
And much it grieved my heart to think
What man has made of man.*

*Through primrose tufts, in that green bower,
The periwinkle trailed its wreaths;
And 'tis my faith that every flower
Enjoys the air it breathes.*

*The birds around me hopped and played,
Their thoughts I cannot measure--:
But the least motion which they made
It seemed a thrill of pleasure.*

*The budding twigs spread out their fan,
To catch the breezy air;
And I must think, do all I can,
That there was pleasure there.*

*If this belief from heaven be sent,
If such be Nature's holy plan,
Have I not reason to lament
What man has made of man? (Norton Anthology, p.1089, 2010)*

As one of the most influential theories of Ecocriticism, deep ecology was coined by Arne Naess, a Norwegian Philosopher, in 1973. The term deep ecology stands in opposite to shallow ecology which Naess defines as "fight against pollution and resource depletion... central objective: the health and affluence of people in the developed countries" (Naess, p.93,1973). In his popular essay "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summery"(1973) Naess defines deep ecology as follows: "rejection of the man-in-environment image in favor of the relational, total-field image" (p. 93). Accordingly, Naess wanted to go "beyond the factual level of ecology as a science to a deeper level of self-awareness towards nature" (Yang, p.3, 2014). Deep ecology emphasizes the importance of the role of individual in the Nature. In this perspective human being is considered as the "guardian" of the Nature. He/she stands beside Nature not against it. Neither superior, nor in opposing with Nature, the individual is

in equality with Nature. It is a kind of personal consciousness development towards Nature that is stressed here. From theoretical point of view, the human being is responsible to Nature which brings him peace and equilibrium. It rejects the anthropocentric view towards Nature in which the man is superior to Nature and affirms bio-centrism view in which man and Nature are in unity and equality. In *Beyond Romantic Ecocriticism Toward Urbanatural Roosting* (2011) Ashton Nichols writes: "nature does not exist for the benefit of humankind and that "nature" is often what humans make of it in their minds" (p. 87).

From deep ecology aspect, the poem can be studied from two viewpoints. Through the lines Wordsworth envoys the harmony that exist in the Nature and he laments the lack of harmony between Nature and the modern man. In the third quatrain, the poet describes Nature at its peak, in all its splendor and beauty. The Nature is filled with "thousands blended notes" (1). In the "sweet mood" and "pleasant thoughts"(3) the poet's mind turns to "sad thoughts" (4) While he watches the harmonious music of Nature and thinks of disharmony of man with Nature, he mourns the alienation of man with Nature. He tells about Nature's dynamic development when he describes how the periwinkle trains its branches through the grass. The poet emphasizes the harmony in the Nature. According to Nurten Birlik "he [Wordsworth] has unmediated relationship with nature and in nature he can feel the interconnectedness of things or the monism" (p.5, 2011). Wordsworth sees no distinction between him and Nature. They are viewed from one perspective. Richard Kerridge says "the opposite of dualism is monism, the belief that the world and its creatures should be seen as one substance, one organic body" (p. 539, 2006). Wordsworth invites the individual to re-define his relation to Nature; "humans should develop and practice the symbiosis between them and nature, and establish a harmonious relationship with nature" (Miah, p.6, 2012).

Stephen Gill in *The Cambridge Companion to Wordsworth* (2006) declares: "deep ecologists maintain, broadly speaking, that human beings can re-enter a state of union with nature, through what Arne Naess has called 'identification'" (p.188, 1973). Wordsworth states an opposition between what exist in the Nature and among its elements as 'harmony' and what has appeared in the relation between man and Nature as 'disharmony'. Wordsworth laments the former; "what man has made of man" (lines 8 and 24). From deep ecological opinion and according to What Naess has defined as 'identification', Wordsworth warns human being against the separation of Nature and bids him/her to rejoin Nature. William Rueckert in his essay "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism" (1996) writes: "in ecology, man's tragic flaw is his anthropocentric (as opposed to biocentric) vision, and his compulsion to conquer, humanize, domesticate, violate, and exploit every natural thing" (p. 113). Invited to reunion with Nature, Wordsworth rejects anthropocentrism resulting from industrial progress in which man is superior to Nature. He encourages bio-centrism in which man and Nature are in harmony and equality. Accordingly, the interconnectedness between man and Nature can save both:

Wordsworth places the speaker in the middle of Nature and shows that Nature is right and loyal to human being in its turn and it is man who should take the blame for the broken bond between him/her and Nature. (Ramazani, Bazregarzadeh, p:6, 2014).

This interconnectedness is what the poet asserts in the first two lines of the second stanza: "to her fair works did Nature link / The human soul that through me ran". These lines are eco-centrism reading of the ballad. The poet in harmony with Nature attains identification. After wishing for identification with Nature, Wordsworth laments the disconnection between individual and Nature. In the last two lines of the second quatrain we read: "And much it grieved my heart to think / What man has made of man". The poet is moved by the beauty and harmony of the Nature for "the least motion which they made / it seemed a thrill of pleasure" (lines 15-16). The great Ecocritical contribution of Wordsworth is man's invitation to biocentrism. Ashton Nichols emphasizes the importance of pleasure in Romantic view on nature: "...the Romantic idea of nature is often based on pleasure, pleasure in the natural world and pleasure ascribed to or derived from the natural world by humans and other sentient beings" (p.87, 2011). At the dawn of an era, with the widespread effects of industrialization, rapid increase of urbanization and the growth of factories and pollution, Wordsworth feels the alarms of disconnection between Nature and man. The biocentrism is what Wordsworth suggests. It redefines the connection of man and nature into a friendship union to overthrow the imposition of one over the other. Decentering the superiority of man on nature as the heritage of modern age, biocentrism amends the damage of the mutual tie of the pair. According to Greg Garrard (2004) "deep ecology identifies the anthropocentric dualism humanity/nature as the ultimate source of anti-ecological beliefs and practices..." (p. 21).

The second aspect of the ballad is that the poet invites to self-awareness towards Nature. In deep ecology according to Naess we read Ecocriticism is: "rejection of the man-in-environment image in favor of the *relational, total-field image*." (p.93, 1973). Domination of man over Nature followed by industrial pollution and destruction depicted a picture in the late eighteenth century which was terrifying for a conscious poet like William Wordsworth. Human being becomes a stranger to Nature for he has lost his union and identification with it. The alienation and estrangement caused by technological progress has separated man from Nature. Accordingly, the ballad reveals two

opinions by the poet. The poet is highly touched by every natural object and the beauty spread by it which is so strong that even the "least motion" (15) which they make, "seemed a thrill of pleasure" (16) to the poet. Simultaneously, the poet is terribly grieved and disturbed by the disaster caused by man. Man has lost sight and interconnectedness to Nature and becomes a stranger to this heavenly joy. He has lost his union with "nature's holy plan" (22). Objecting to anthropocentrism is the rejection of "man-in-environment image" proposed by Naess. Wordsworth sees human being as a part of Nature, rather than the master on it. Bio-centrism is what deep ecology has proposed to man in order to regain and re-state his connection with Nature. In parallel with "relational, total field image" and along with "identification", Wordsworth invites to reunion.

In the last stanza, Wordsworth raises the contrast between harmony of Nature and disharmony of man and Nature. Wordsworth respects Nature to the degree that calls it "holy plan" (22). The equilibrium and solace dedicate by Nature to human is so great that Wordsworth connects it to heaven. Not to be belittled and harmed, human being should redefine his connection with Nature again.

Poems of Sohrab Sepehri are filled with nature's images and natural elements. For Sepehri nature is the mirror of God and it reflects divine love. The depiction of nature in his poetry is so powerful that Sepehri stands in a specific and unique position in relation to his contemporaries. H. Emmad in *To the Garden of Co-Travelers: The Eight Books: Criticism of Sohrab Sepehri's Poetry and Thought* (1998) writes: "there are some characteristics in Sepehri's poetry that does not exist in his contemporaries. Sepehri loves nature and is satisfied to speak of nature in the meanwhile of his poetry... Sepehri believes that nature does not belong to human alone." (p. 9). Poet takes refuge in nature. "His depiction of nature is not merely for the sake of depiction itself, but he is looking for a secret which he does not find in civilized urban life" (Fomeshi, p.111, 2010). Born in Kashan, Sepehri lived in a rural world full of heat, color and tranquility. The respect and sacred view towards nature is not just a poetical device for Sepehri. The respect has roots in Sepehri's familiarity and belief in Eastern Mysticism and Hindu-Buddhism. The kind of divinity mirrored in Sepehri's poetry is ethical and moral. Suffocated by the chaos and terror of World War II, the poet dignifies the peace offered by nature. "Water" has been chosen from the seventh collection of his poetry, *The Green Volume* (1961). M.Shalooei in *I am a Muslim* (2012) states that: "... "Water" is a social poem. Consequently we can say that in the seventh collection Sepehri writes about people clearly." Accordingly, the poem emphasizes Sepehri's concern for the relation and connection between nature and humankind. Written in blank verse, Sepehri's poem will be discussed along with Wordsworth's poem.

*Litter not the water.
Down-stream a dove may be drinking,
Or in a far meadow a finch washing its feathers,
Or in the village, a jug being filled.
Litter not the water.
This water may be flowing towards a poplar's foot,
To wash away some heart's sorrow.
A dervish's shand may be dipping dry bread into it.*

*A fair came by the river.
Litter not the water:
The fair face has been doubled.*

*What refreshing water!
What sparkling river!
How serene the folks are up the hill!
Over-flowing be their fountains, milk-gushing their cattle!
Their village I have not seen.
Round their huts must be the footprints of God.*

*Moonlight there illuminates the breaths of words.
In the village up the hill hedges must be low.
The folk there know what flower is the poppy.
Up there, the water's hue must be blue.*

*A flower blooms, and folks will know.
Some village it must be!
Full of music be their orchard-lanes.
The folks upstream understand the water.
They littered it not.
Let us too litter not the water(Shalooei, pp.103.104, 2012).*

In contrast with Wordsworth's poem, Sepehri directly begs the humankind not to disturb the nature. The prologue of his poem is the simple and familiar pictures of rural life as same as what has been read in Wordsworth ballad. In

fact, both Wordsworth and Sepehri rely on the concept of beauty as an intrinsic value in nature. The prologue of their poems is the images that show the pleasure and "jouissance" of nature. Far away from the urban and crowded life of city, Sepehri like Wordsworth chooses the nature to enter into the realm of peace and life. He rejects the anthropocentrism view in nature raised in the modern age from the first line: "litter not the water" (1) and "celebrated the recognition that humans and ecology were deeply intertwined" (Merchant, p.1, 2006). To caution against the danger which threatens the nature, Sepehri speaks frankly. It indicates that his concern towards the disturbance and destruction of nature is serious. He defends nature against the threat of humankind who sees himself superior over nature. Catrin Gersdorf and Sylvia Mayer in *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies* (2006) state that: "Richard Kerridge characterized Ecocriticism as a project that seeks to evaluate texts and ideas in terms of their coherence and usefulness as responses to environmental crisis." (11). By implication, this definition rejects the aesthetic and moral autonomous belief of literary and artistic texts in modernist assumption. It defines a moral and cultural aspect for literature and art. Taking a set of values, Sepehri in the poem supports the interconnectedness or monism of humankind and nature: "this water may be flowing towards a poplar's foot (6)/ to wash away some heart's sorrow" (7). In line eight and nine, the poet completes the monism of the pair of man and nature in its most common pictures: "a dervish's hand may be dipping dry bread into it" (8). It indicates the need of humankind to nature. Consequently, man ought to dignify nature and not to pollute nature and everything that is connected to it. In line nine "a fair woman came by the river/ litter not the water/ the fair face has been doubled" Sepehri connects the beauty of nature to the beauty of human being. To have a beautiful human nature, one has to respect nature and support it. One cannot deny the mutual relation and need between man and nature. Lack of one, causes harm to the other and threatens its existence. Human and non-human, rural and urban, depend on each other and could not move against each other.

As it has been explained, Arne Naess defines "identification" (p.188, 1973) to depict the interconnectedness between man and nature. Sepehri invites people to biocentrism. S. Campbell defines biocentrism as, "the conviction that humans are neither better nor worse than other creatures ... but simply equal to everything else in the natural world" (as cited in Glotfelty, 1996:128). In the second part of the poem, Sepehri depicts a kind of utopia implicitly – "Their village I have not seen" (16) - in which the people know the importance and value of nature in general and water as the source of life in particular. In this imaginary utopia, there is no distance between man and nature. By implication, lines twentieth and twenty-second show that powerful interconnectedness: "the folks there know what flower is the poppy" (20), "a flower blooms, and folks will know (22). They are in equality and human being has reached identification with nature. In *Ecocriticism: the New Critical Idiom* (2004) Greg Garrard writes: "[deep ecology] identifies the dualistic separation of humans from nature ... as the origin of environmental crisis, and demands a return to a monistic, primal identification of humans and ecosphere." (21). Rejecting the solo of mankind, Sepehri like a "seer" begs the harmonious music of man and nature in a unifiable orchestra. Indeed, this is what creates beauty. The nature has inspired the poets to create a new awareness of it in the language of poetry. The Romantic view to nature takes the sympathetic side as well as the deep ecological perspective to nature. Raymond Williams in *The Country and the City* (1973) calls this poetic achievement the result of a "creative mind" (p. 127) which guide to consciousness: "there is also nature as a principle of creation, of which the creative mind is part, and from which we may learn the truths of our own sympathetic nature" (p. 127).

At the beginning of the poem, Sepehri delivers a "man – in - environment image" (p.93, 1973) in terms of Arne Naess. He repeats the key line "not litter the water" four times. Showing the imposition of man over nature the poem gives the reader a real condition of what has dominated the modern time. Early in twentieth century, the age in which Sepehri lived- like that of Wordsworth's Victorian era- were the dawn of industrial progress and its consequences. The widespread growth of factories has polluted nature and everything in it, including water. Showing the deep poetical concern of Sepehri, the poem is an early defence against the pollution and destruction in contemporary Iranian society of his time. Back to the Utopia described by the poet "they littered it [water] not" (26), Sepehri projects a "total-field image" (Naess, p.93, 1973). In Sepehri's view that fits the Ecocritical demand, when humankind is in harmony in nature and respects it, one could call it Utopia. Neither polluted nor muddy, in the village "the water's hue must be blue" (21) and "the folks upstream understand the water" (25). Without harming the natural elements, human being could live in a condition that saves both him and nature. The dynamic links among all living things and the interconnectedness of man and nature leaves no way other than biocentrism. According to C. Gersdorf and S. Mayer in *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies* (2006) for Laurence Coupe Ecocriticism ultimate objective should be to encourage resistance rather than conservation-"resistance to planetary pollution and degradation." (p. 11). Both Sepehri and Wordsworth declare that without the imposition of man, nature has an existence of its own. In *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature* Todd A. Borlik states: "the natural world has a subjective right to exist without being reduced to civility and to man's use". (p.6, 2010). Both Wordsworth and Sepehri speak of nature in a way that has an identity away from man's benefits. Wordsworth attributes pleasure to it and Sepehri describes its beauty. It proves that they attribute an essence specific to nature. It is defined and formed apart from man's advantage. Sepehri praises it: "What refreshing water" (12). Both poets invite human being to discover the beauty, harmony and

pleasure in the nature and they warn against the danger which harms these features. Deep ecocriticism view, removes the binary opposition of man/nature in which the first pair is superior over the second. It omits out the dualism and defines a kind of mutual friendship for man and nature. Greg Garrard in *Ecocriticism: the New Critical Idiom* (2004) states that:

whereas 'shallow' approaches take an instrumental approach to nature, arguing for preservation of natural resources only for the sake of humans, deep ecology demands recognition of intrinsic value in nature. (p. 21).

In Ashton Nichols terms, the "eco-awareness" (p.xvi, 2011) of William Wordsworth ties with Sepehri's "eco-sensitivity" to compose a union against anthropocentrism and total-field image (p.xvi, 2011).

3. Conclusion

Although Ecocriticism is in infancy and has developed newly in our age, literature has mirrored humankind's concern towards nature since centuries ago. In this comparative study, poems of two Romantic poets had been discussed from deep Ecocritical lens because nature is the main personal and poetic concern of them. Deep ecology emphasizes the monism of man and nature: "the shift from a human-centered to a nature-centered system of values is the core of radicalism attributed to deep ecology" (Garrard, p.21, 2004). The anthropocentrism is rejected and biocentrism is endorsed. William Wordsworth's poetry filled with spiritual worries of the poet about Nature result from human damages to and separation from it. His poem "Lines Written in Early Spring" (1798) juxtapose the sense of threat to destruction of Nature and poet's attempt to rejoin man and Nature. Wordsworth envies the harmony that exist between natural elements and he mourns disharmony in the relation between man and Nature. This broken and damaged tie is the poetic concern of Wordsworth as well as Sepehri. From theoretical aspect of deep ecology, Wordsworth demands human being to redefine its relationship with nature. He like Sepehri invites to self-awareness that leads to identification with Nature. It removes the superior position of man on Nature in the modern age and places him/her in an equal situation. The alienation and estrangement of man in the modern age is the core of Wordsworth's poem. Iranian Romantic poet, Sohrab Sepehri in "Water" (1961) begs people not to pollute the Nature. He like Wordsworth rejects the "man-in-environment- image" in favor of "relational, total-field image". The latter indicates the superiority of man on Nature. It originates from the anthropocentric view in which man dominates Nature and all living things. The former, eco-centered view sees human being as guardian of Nature and in an equal position to it. It reflects the biocentric view and interconnectedness of man and Nature is emphasized. The poets' contribution in defence of Nature is that both demand identification with it. The peace and tranquility of nature is what both of them had depicted. Both Wordsworth and Sepehri condemn the master-like position of man to Nature in the modern time and watch from the perspective of equality to it. The poets have an ethical and moral concern for Nature. Rejecting the solo of mankind, Sepehri and Wordsworth like a "seer" beg the harmonious music of man and Nature in a unifiable orchestra. Indeed, this is what creates beauty. In contrast with Wordsworth, Sepehri talks frankly. He cautions against the danger of pollution which threatens Nature. Beside this fear and warning, Sepehri describes a Utopian-like village in which people know the value of Nature. The sacred position of Nature makes everything splendid in the village. Both poets lament the disharmony between people and Nature. Although pleasure has been defined as the principle of Romantic view of Nature, none of the poets had stopped in this point. By implication, impartiality about the problems directed to the relation of Earth and man is rejected. In Ashton Nichols terms, the "eco-awareness" (p.xvi, 2011) of William Wordsworth ties with Sepehri's "eco-sensitivity" (p.xvi, 2011) to form a biocentrism campaign against the anthropocentrism view.

References

1. Abjadian, Amrollah. (2010). *A Survey of English Literature (II)*, Tehran: Samt Publication
2. Abrams, M.H, et al. (2010). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, New York: Norton Publication
3. Birlik, Nurten. (2011). "Literature's Response to Ecology", The 6th International Conference on Interdisciplinarity in Education ICIE'11, Karabuk/Safranbolu, Turkey
4. Borlik, Todd A. (2011). *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature*, New York and London: Routledge
5. Emmad, Hojjat. (1998). *To the Garden of Co-Travelers: The Eight Books: Criticism on Sohrab Sepehri's Poetry and Thought*, Tehran: Ketab Khoob publication
6. Garrard, Greg. (2004). *Ecocriticism: the New Critical Idiom*, London and New York: Routledge
7. Gill, Stephen. (2006). *Cambridge Companion to Wordsworth*, London: Cambridge University Press
8. Glotfelty, Cheryll, Harold Fromm. (1996). *The Ecocriticism Reader: landmarks in literary ecology*, Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press

9. Gersdorf, Catrin, Sylvia Mayer. (2006). *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Transatlantic Conversation on Ecocriticism*, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi
10. Hazarika, Polin L.X. (2012) "William Wordsworth and Nature: An Ecocritical Inquiry", RESEARCH SPECTRUM: Vol: 3, Issue: 2.
11. Kerridge, Richard. (2006). *Environmentalism and ecocriticism. Literary Theory and Criticism*, Oxford: Oxford UP
12. Love, Glen A. (2003). *Practical Ecocriticism: Literature, Biology and Environment*, Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.
13. Merchant, Carolyn. (2006) "The Scientific Revolution and the Death of Nature", *The History of Science Society*, 97, 513-533.
14. Miah, Mohammad Moniruzzaman. (2012) "Wordsworth's Nature Poetry: An Eco- Scientific Perspective", *Sino-US English Teaching*, Vol. 9:12, 1793-1800.
15. Naess, Arne. (1973). "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary." *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy and the Social Sciences*
16. Nichols, Ashton. (2011). *Beyond Ecocriticism: Toward Urbanatural Roosting*, U.S.A: Palgrave and Macmillan,
17. Ramazani, Abolfazl, Elmira Bazregarzadeh. (2014) "An Ecocritical Reading of William Wordsworth's Selected Poetry", *English Language and Literature Studies*; Vol. 4:1
18. Rueckert, William. (1996). "Literature and ecology: An experiment in ecocriticism", *Iowa Review*
19. Saeedpoor, Saeed. (2011). *Selected Poems of Sohrab Sepehri*, Tehran: Iranian Poet's Society
20. Shalooei, Mahmood. (2012). *I am a Muslim: Sohrab Sepehri and Selection of His works*, Tehran: Society for the Appreciation of cultural works and dignities
21. Ting-ting, Yang, Xiao Bin. (2014). "A Deep Ecological Reading of William Wordsworth's Poetry", *Sino-US English Teaching*, Vol. 11: 3, 188-195.
22. Wang, N. (2009). *Toward a Literary environmental ethics: A reflection on eco-criticism*, Neohelicon.
23. Williams, Raymond. (1973). *The Country and the City*, New York: Oxford University Press