



work shares a common motivation: the troubling awareness that we have reached the age of environmental limits, a time when the consequences of human actions are damaging the planet's basic life support systems” (6). Through this quotation, it is clear that the ecocriticism put its concern on environmental issue. Its domain is very broad because it is applicable to any literary genres. The relation between nature, ecological issues, ecosystems with human are the main concern of this theory.

Literature and environment truly can't be separated each other. Lawrence Buell argues in his book *The Truth of Ecology* as quoted by Dana Philip that literature would be environmental. It would evoke the natural world through verbal surrogates, and would attempt to bond the reader to the world as well as to discourse (Philip 7). It can be assumed that through the literary work, the reader will be brought to the environmental world and devastation of earth. Indirectly, literature causes the reader's interpretation of the environment. Thus, it is important to understand the relation between humans and environment through literary work. It needs to notice that ecology is not a slush fund of fact, value, and metaphor, but a less than fully coherent field with a very checkered past and a fairly uncertain future (Philip 45).

### **2.1.2 History of Ecocritical Movement**

The term ecocriticism was first introduced in 1978 by William Rueckert in his essay, *Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism* Rueckert intended to focus on the application of ecology and ecological concepts to the study of literature, which he introduced the word “ecocriticism” as a term of his subject. Since then, ecocriticism was in hiatus until it raised again in a meeting of Western Literature



## 2. Second Wave Ecocriticism or Newer Revisionist Waves

Second Wave Ecocriticism or Newer Revisionist Waves has closer alliance with environmental science, especially the life science. The biological-environmental-literary connection reached its first major critical expression in 1974 with the publication of Joseph W. Meeker (Love 564). Glen A. Love in his 1999 essay “*Ecocriticism and Science: Toward Consilience?*” points out that a line of biological thinking has been a constant and indispensable accompaniment to the rise of ecocriticism and the study of literature and the environment. Biologically verified evidence of environmental destruction and it was the natural connecting point, as the emphasized, which can claim a permanent and important relationship to human life (565).

Meanwhile, William Howarth seems rather to favor bringing humanities and science together in the context of studying specific landscapes and regions (qtd. in Buell 18), to which end geology is at least as important as the life sciences (qtd. in Buell 18). Ursula Heise, on the other hand, has recently turned to a branch of applied mathematics, risk theory, as a window onto literature’s explanation of the kind of contemporary anxieties (Buell 18). Then, others have also taken up the argument that ecocriticism’s progress becoming more science-literate.

Likewise, the Carson’s book *Silent Spring* is a great model. Carson had investigated a problem in ecology, with the help of wildlife biologists and environmental toxicologists, in order to show that DDT was present in the

environment in amounts toxic to wildlife, but *Silent Spring* undertook cultural not scientific work when it strove to argue the moral case that ought not to be. The great achievement of the book was to turn a (scientific) problem in ecology into a widely perceived ecological problem that was then contested politically, legally and in the media and popular culture. Thus ecocriticism cannot contribute much to debates about problems in ecology, but it can help to define, explore and even resolve ecological problems in this wider sense (Garrard 6).

Laurence Buell quoted in his book:

“Science’s “facts” are “neither real nor fabricated”: the microbial revolution hinged on a certain kind of orchestrated laboratory performance, without which science history would have taken a different path, but the discovery/invention was not fictitious, either. Bruno Latour ingeniously proposes the neologism “factish” (a collage of “fact” and “fetish”) to describe this understanding of the “facts” of science: “types of action that do not fall into the comminatory choice between fact and belief (Latour 1999: 295, 306)”

The discourses of science and literature, then, must be read both with and against each other (21).”

According to the former way of thinking, the prototypical human figure is a solitary human and the experience in question activates a primordial link between human and nonhuman. According to the latter, prototypical human figure is defined by social category and the “environment” is artificially constructed. In both instances

the understanding of personhood is defined for better or worse by environmental entanglement (Buell 23).

### 2.1.3 Ecocriticism as Literary Criticism

Regardless of what name it goes by, most ecocritical work shares a common motivation. The ecocritic wants to track environmental ideas and representations whenever they appear, to see a debate which seems to be taking place more clearly, often part-concealed, in a great many cultural spaces. Most of all, ecocriticism seeks to evaluate texts and ideas in terms of their coherence and usefulness as responses to environmental crisis (Kerridge and Sammells 5). All ecological criticism shares the fundamental premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affected it and affected by it (Kerridge and Sammells xix). An ecological perspective strives to see how all things are interdependent, even those apparently most separated. Nothing may be discarded or buried without consequences (Kerridge and Sammells 7).

Ecocriticism takes as its subject interconnections between nature and culture, specifically the cultural artifacts of language and literature. As a critical stance, it has one foot in literature and the other on land; as a theoretical discourse, it negotiates between the human and non human. Ecocriticism expands the notion of “the world” to include the entire ecosphere (Kerridge and Sammells xix).

The ecocritical movement’s primary publication, the American ISLE (international studies in literature and environment) and its younger British counterpart, *Green Letters*, are remarkable among scholarly association journals for









can be seen from the beginning of the novel. The date of the story in the opening is September 1, 182. However in the next pages, the date of the story is written backwards on August 21, 1823.

Cheryll Glotfelty makes an analogous ecocriticism's phases similar as Elaine Showalter's model of the three developmental stages of feminist criticism. The first stage is the "images of nature", how nature is represented in literature. But nature is not the only focus of ecocritical studies of representation. Other topics include the frontier, animals, cities, specific geographical regions, rivers, mountains, deserts, Indians, technology, garbage, and the body.

Second stage is to recuperate the hitherto neglected genre of nature writing, a tradition of nature-oriented nonfiction originates in England with Gilbert White's *A Natural History of Selbourne* (1789) and extends to America through Henry Thoreau, Mary Austin, Rachel Carson, Terry Tempest Williams, and many others. In an increasingly urban society, nature writing plays a vital role in teaching us to value the natural world. Another effort to promulgate environmentally enlightened works which examines mainstream genres, identifying fiction and poetry writers whose work manifest ecological awareness.

The third stage, analogous work ecocriticism includes examining the symbolic construction of species. How has literary discourse defined the human? Such a critique questions the dualism prevalent in Western thought, dualisms that separate



are capable of making efforts toward contributing to a solution or, at least, to show a desire to be personally engaged in the environmental matter. (3)

## 2.2 Review of Previous Studies

Ecocriticism study has been done by several researchers. The research found an undergraduate thesis by Rohmah Romadhon from Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta entitled “An Analysis of Environmental Issues Using Ecocriticism in James Cameroo’s Film Avatar”. She used descriptive-qualitative method. This research describes how the relationship between human and the environment and the non-human with the environment.

The second research comes from the journal written by Fahmi Leksono and Fithriyah Inda SS., M.Pd. entitled “Devastation of Earth: an Ecocriticism Study in Cormac McCarthy’s *The Road*”. The journal describes how the devastation of earth happened in the whole layers of environment; atmosphere, land and sea in Comac McCarthy’s *The Road*.

The third research comes from Nofrialdhi Arif with the title “*The Arrogance Of Geneticists Over Nature As Reflected On DR. Henry Wu Character In Michael Crichton’s Jurassic Park Novel*”. He uses qualitative method on analyzing the arrogance of geneticists over nature on DR. Henry Wu.

The difference between the previous studies with this study is this study presents the version of pastoral while the previous studies present the city as the second nature and science fiction. This study also represents the effect from the

