

[Music]

Okay. Welcome to lecture number eight. We are going to be going back, not nearly as far as we have been before, but to the medieval period in England. That might have seemed very old to you before, and it is. We're going back 800 years into the Christian era, but the fact is, it's not very old at all, given how far we have gone back. We're going to be doing eco theology and eco criticism today, and eco theology, in an important sense, because if you remember with Lynne White Jr. Lynne White Jr. argued there was this danger in Christianity, and the fact that it would, and had according to him, erased older earth-based religion when it encountered them. The thing about that is, Lynne White Jr. didn't give us a lot of examples of it, and you could be kind of skeptical, I mean maybe he was sort of an inherent danger, especially the way we encountered it, an inherent danger in the way that you could read the text that we did, Genesis, but would that mean, in fact that people actually acted upon it? Well they did, but you might think that would have been other places across the Earth. What I mean by that is in the Americas, the North America, South America, when Christianity moved into there, or the global South more general, like Africa, well and of course Asia. Well that is true, but I thought it would be interesting to look at how Christianity encountered earlier earth-based religions in Europe, how this process was happening 1,200 years ago, not just four, 300, 200 years ago, toward what we normally think of us the age of colonialism. It absolutely did during those periods as well, and all the places that I just enumerated, but it is also the case that one, and this is important to us, when Christianity moved into England, which gives us, of course the English-speaking literature that we ultimately will be looking at, in the literature that forms the foundation of our language, and our culture, and more modern sense, it also encountered earth-based religions, and had to eradicate those as well. So, we're gonna be looking at that today with the

work called *The Dream of the Rood*, and then we're also going to be looking at medieval literature more generally in the form of Chaucer, and we're doing that, because literature that focused on animals was actually very common during the medieval period. You might presume then that there was really that insights into the inner lives of animals would have been gained through that. People are writing about animals so much, what did we learn about animals? Well the answer to that may be a little surprising. So we'll see. But I think the first thing we need to do of course, is jump into our Prezi. Note that we started way down here and we moved up to Hebrew culture, Greek culture, last times Roman culture, with Varro and Virgil, and now a big jump up to medieval. But just look where we are in terms of the whole course. We've traveled, done the immense amount of movement (let me pop on screen here while I'm talking) an immense amount of movement, to get to get up to here, and also we've traveled out of northern Africa across our spatial axes here, and now we're not only in Europe, but we're going to be in England proper with this course, so an enormous amount of movement (jump out for a moment). So let's see, pop here to medieval, jump in. Note that I did say that we're gonna be doing eco theology and eco criticism here, so we're gonna be looking at text, but the first part of it is going to be eco theology, and we have that here with this text *The Dream of the Rood*. It's a relatively short work that's for sure, but it covers an enormous amount of material in that short amount of time here so, pop back on screen if I fit, yeah. Basically, so *The Dream of the Rood* is one of the oldest texts in English literature. It's inscribed here on this, which is called the Ruthwell Cross, which is a stone cross which still exists in northeast England. And this is the same way had the Epic of Gilgamesh, the same way I've told you about the Iliad, the Odyssey, and Beowulf, which is sort of a contemporary work to this. This is a work that predates English, really being a written language. So it's originally inscribed on this cross, and in little drips and drabs, but the story

is kind of, it is bigger than just this, so what happens is, it gets into, gets written down in a book and why this is partly a European thing, is that that book was found in Italy. I'll show you a picture in a minute, but I just want to show you where the chronology is here, so you're familiar with the jump. Ruthwell Cross is coming roughly 800 years after Virgil. So we just made a very big jump, but I also wanted to underscore that that whole Greco-Roman thing was a similarly big jump. What I mean by that is Hesiod, from Hesiod to Virgil, from the earliest Greek works that we look at, to Virgil, about a seven hundred year jump, and then just a slightly bigger one to the medieval period.

So major jumps happening here, and there is not a lot happening between Virgil, and well there is initially, but of course what happens here. We're not dealing with it, is the Roman Empire collapses, and that's important from our point of view, because the Roman Empire was initially in Europe, and you're in Europe in a big way, and it was actually in England, and they got there very quickly, like in the first century of the Christian era, but what happened was, of course the Roman Empire collapsed, and when it collapsed, it sort of pulled inward. It wasn't able to police or enforce the sort of outer boundaries of the Empire, and England would have been of course, part of that. So even though there was a big Christian presence there, that came with with Christianity, when the Empire collapsed, it collapsed too. So, for hundreds of years, Christianity, although it had on their initial hold, fell back and collapsed, and it's only about this time we're talking, well it's happening a little earlier, but around the eighth century, where the Roman Empire is coming back again, but now of course it is the Holy Roman Empire, it is Christianity that is now moving out into Europe again, and it's getting to England, certainly before the Ruthwell Cross in the 8th century. And that's important because, even though there had been a Christian influence on this earlier culture, and in the original British culture earlier, it

had pretty much gone away, and now we're seeing Christianity encounter the original religion, and original culture, original in the sense, at least of at this time in England, and that culture was, that religion was earth based religion. So that's why it matters to us. So this is written in Old English,  
"Christ was on the cross, yet the brave came there from afar to their Lord." So if you're wondering why, even though this is an English text, where we have to read it in translation, well there's your answer. We're going back so far and then English is kind of unrecognizable as English. You're gonna get some words there, "Krist," that looks kind of similar, "was," "Rodi." We'll talk about what the rood is in a moment. Sure enough but, it in fact has more in common with rural German than it does with English. Those two languages actually are pretty similar early on. By the time we get to Chaucer, and beginning Chaucer during this lecture, Middle English looks a lot more like Modern English, so much so that you're able to read it, and although I understand it's gonna be a little difficult, and I know it's gonna be tough initially, but here we are with this very very old English, so old it's hardly recognizable. The version that we have is long of *The Dream of the Rood*, longer than the version that you have on the Ruthwell Cross, and it comes from this book, which is the 10th century book that was found in Italy, Vercelli Book. And this is where it was actually written down as far as we know, well the first time that we have a copy of it. Maybe it's written down earlier. So we're very fortunate with some of these older texts, and *The Dream of the Rood* would be an example, but there aren't a whole lot of versions out there, so some of other texts we have a lot of, but and like the problem for scholars is there's so many versions and they all kind of disagree or they're not identical, so you have to figure out what would the real version be, if there is a version. It's kind of the wrong way to look at it, but anyhow with this we don't have a whole lot, so we're fortunate we do have this version. So what is a rood?

I say, it's pronounced was a long O but it's kind of, it's not road, it's rude. It's a pole or a cross. This word continued for into use for some time, even into Shakespeare's time, which is basically four hundred years later. So in Hamlet, "not by the Rood, not so," is a phrase that's there, but it's one of those words, and you can kind of guess this sense Old English looks so different, and it's also got Anglo-Saxon, for our purposes looks so different from modern English. Some of the words would change, like remember Christ was a krist. Well that's going to change, the spelling at all, but here what happens is this word just falls by the wayside so, if you didn't even know what it was, you might be a little confused. Its a pole or a cross, so in our particular, for us here, in this example, it's a cross, and so this is the cross, so this is a dream of the cross. So that's, I'm kind of going through the title here, so that's what the rood is. Now it's a dream of the Rood because it's a religious mystic, and in this case that's the dreamer. So who is having this dream? It's a religious mystic, has a vision of the cross. So before I go further, let me explain that. This is not a dream in the sense of like, haven't you have a dream at night or a nightmare or something. This is a religious vision, so the title could just as well be the religious vision that's had by a mystic of the Rood. We just call it *The Dream of the Rood*, but it's important because what's happening here is, this time you had people, religious mystics, and this includes, and in this case is, a Christian mystic, purporting to have an actual vision, where they see something, where something comes to them. This is pretty common at the time, common for religious mystics. People would not have thought this was odd. If we today, if someone, say Pope Francis said he had a vision and God had come to him and spoke to him or something, had come to him and spoke to him, I think we would be a little dubious of that claim. No one would have been dubious at the time. People just assumed that this is how God communicated to people, and how important knowledge was communicated to people, to

mystics. So what is the dream of? The vision is, the dream is the cross that Christ died upon comes to the dreamer, the religious mystic, and speaks to him, so this is not God speaking to a mystic, this is the cross that Christ died upon speaking to the mystic, and what is he doing? He explains how it is that he, this simple tree, became the sacred cross, so it's an explanation of sort of the birth of the cross, and why the cross is important.

So first off, two technical things on how the work proceeds is that there are two speakers then, and we call this like a frame story. Initially you have the dreamer, the mystic speaking, and he is explaining how he had the vision of the cross where the cross comes to speak to him, so that is kind of like a preamble. Then you get to the main thing which is him relating the story, but when he relates it, he's speaking for the cross. The cross is in there speaking. If you have two speakers, you have the mystic speaking, the dreamer, explaining the dream, then you have the dream where the cross is speaking itself, and then, why it's sort of a frame is you have like a bookend at the other end closing, which is the mystic closing the story afterwards. If you read it straight through and if you've already read it, you might have been a little confused by that. If you haven't looked for that, look for the switch-up,

where it goes from the dreamer saying he's gonna talk about the dream to the actual dream happening itself, or being recounted itself, in which case you have the dreamer speaking, you have the rood itself speaking, and this is important, by the way in Christianity if you're not too familiar with the religion, and the cross is incredibly important. In fact, the Reformation is gonna have a major initial beginning. This is a few centuries later, quite a few, like four centuries later, with Martin Luther. Martin Luther literally going to proclaim that his theology is this theology of the cross. Why that's so important is the cross is where Christ died, and everything that happened before him, before that, is important, but

according to Luther and others, the crucifixion is the main thing. And just to clarify terminology there, I actually said it incorrectly. It's not really where the Christ dies, it's where Jesus dies. So, and Christian thinking, before Jesus was even born, many people argue that he probably existed, that he did exist in heaven with God. He's usually called the son, the son of God. If you read Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which you will before long in this course, that's how Milton talks about him. So that's number one way of describing this individual son of God. Number two, for the period that he's on Earth, he's Jesus, that's where he's a human being, and then he dies on the cross, and that's so important because three days later, he's resurrected. When he comes back and he's resurrected, he is no longer just the man, he is now the spiritual being again, and he's usually called Christ. Christ means Savior, Savior of the race. That's what the word means. So he is Jesus Christ, Jesus the Savior. He becomes Jesus the Savior rather than just Jesus the man on the cross. The cross is what brings that event about, and that's very important because he's surmounts death here, and we're gonna see, even in this story why that's important. So in focusing on this particular incident and the cross, the writer or writers, and we don't know who wrote this, of *The Dream of the Rood*, or focusing on, and what is arguably Martin Luther would argue is the most important thing that happens in Christianity. But it's immediately surprising I think, that we have an anthropomorphized and sentient tree that speaks. So anthropomorphic, you can see the word here "anthropo," is human beings, like the Anthropocene, and morphic, our word, we have a word like morph, with Morphos, means shape. So it is a human being. It's not really shaped like literally, as that word might suggest, like a tree, but it takes human form in the sense that it can talk and act like a human being, and it is doing that, and in one way that it is human is it sentient, it can feel. It can feel pain, it can feel emotions, it can think. That's rather surprising right off the bat,

because Christianity doesn't bring in things like deities that can talk and speak. We had essentially, an anthropomorphized, sentient tree with Humbaba, who is the protector of the Cedar Forest in the Epic of Gilgamesh. Humbaba isn't actually like a tree walking around with its roots and all, but he is very much like a tree, and he's tree like and he's toppled like a tree by Gilgamesh and all, but you might wonder then, why, since Christianity doesn't have anything like *genus loci*, and we'll talk about that directly, why that's important, why then this story has a tree walking around in it? A tree talking, and not walking. At this point, it's less surprising when you realize that the Celts, so remember we're talking about Christianity colonizing a place, not the places we normally assume like global South or something, but colonizing England, the people there. The Celts worshipped features of the environment, of the earth. They worshipped the Earth the sea, the sky. In particular features of the environment they paid homage to streams, lakes, hills, and trees, especially oak trees. So going back to the Epic of Gilgamesh again, remember how there's this regional figure, the semi-god Humbaba, who's there to protect a place, a *genus loci*, well the Celts had *genus loci*'s everywhere as well, as so many old, earth-based religions. So this tree, but trees themselves would have been viewed with sort of deity like status, in the same way that Humbaba did, and it is very clear that this is really an earth-based religion, that Christianity has an encountered, and that presents a certain problem. We're gonna see that problem actually negotiated here in this particular story. You may have heard of the Druids, and who are the Druids, and you may have heard of them and you can actually, like with Stonehenge or something in England. They are not the Celts directly, we can't call all Celts druids, but druids are like the priests class of the Celts, and they were given their name incidentally by Caesar, so everyone knows the story of Caesar and Rome, and many of you may.

But you may not know that Caesar actually spends quite a few years in England before he goes back and become a Caesar. And this is sort of one of his earlier campaigns, which is to see to, and enforce the colonization of England. So this is the first time around, right this is before the fall of the Roman Empire, and when he's there, he names these people Druids, and that word, and why he does it, first is, because he notices that this is a nature-based religion, and that they in particular actually are worshipping trees, and to him that's an unusual thing. So in Latin the word Druid means like, sorcerer, but he it still would have echoed, and Caesar would have no doubt known, that it derives from the Greek word "drus", which means oak tree, so why does Caesar call them druids? Because these are people who literally worship trees, oak trees, and he thought that was a particularly unusual feature of this group.

He'd encountered other people throughout Europe, but they didn't do what these people were doing, so they got the moniker of druid from Shakespeare.

And that's important to us because we're seeing a tree here, a big tree talking. So another word that you may be more familiar with than Druid is the word pagan. Pagan will often be used as a pejorative word from Christians to refer to everyone else, doesn't have to be pejorative but it can. So where does the word pagan actually mean? You hear it a lot, and there are like a lot of New Age pagans now, people whose self-describe themselves and fashioned themselves as pagans what does it mean?

Pagan, going back again we're looking at Latin words here:

"pagos" and "pangere". These words mean to stick something into the ground, to firmly put it there, like if you just put a stick in the ground, and that's to get well in the ground so it's there, like rooted in the ground.

That's what "pangere" means. So a perfect example of that would be a tree, because it is literally rooted in the ground.

It's connected in the ground. It's not easy to pull the tree out. You can't really pull a big tree out of it, a

lot of machinery and all to do it. So it's like the perfect example of "pagus," because it is a stick rooted firmly in the ground. To Christians, when they encountered all these Earth-based religions, they called them all, and it doesn't matter when and where they encounter. It was eight hundred years ago here, or 400 years ago in South America. All these people were to Christians pagan. Why were they pagan? Because they were all rooted in the Earth. They had these earth-based religions, and the important thing from the Christian point of view here, is that they are bound to the Earth, to the planet. So the thing about Christianity, and going back to our discussion of the physical and metaphysical, we looked at this in some detail. Christians, because they see themselves dualistically, as spirit and flesh. The time of death, the soul pops out of the body, and if you've been a faithful Christian, and you do everything right, your soul goes up and gets to be in heaven with God. These people, all these quote "pagan people," they and have that ability, because they are literally bound to the Earth. They don't have the ability to transcend the earth. It's not that they don't have souls, and in this view they definitely have souls, but their souls can't go up and be in the metaphysical realm with God, because, and this is important and we're focusing on it here now with Christianity, Jesus opened a door to heaven when he became the Christ, the Saviour. Now that he's the savior, there is a door to get to the metaphysical realm, but you have to go through Jesus, because none of these quote "pagan religions" had access to that door because they didn't believe in Jesus. They were all stuck here on earth. They couldn't couldn't get beyond it, so and that also describes those religions themselves. First, back up just a little bit. They weren't really stuck here on earth because Christians had various ideas were these people wound up, and it wasn't necessarily in hell, but these souls went somewhere. But the religions themselves were pagan, in the sense that they were rooted in the earth, and there was no

metaphysical realm. They were just earth realm, so in other words, you could call them physical religions, which would be accurate since there wasn't a metaphysical. You could call them not dualistic, but monastic religions. All that was true, but Christians called them pagans. They were the rooted to the earth people, and that's a reference to their religion, and the relationship that that religion has to their metaphysical religion of Christianity. So what you have here however, is a collision of this Christianity, this metaphysical religion, relatively early Christian, and Pagan worlds. So we have in fact, well first of, all this will happen all over the planet, as Christianity and evangelical religion intent on converting people into r Christian, encountered people all over the planet. It's just here, it's a particularly early example of it. By the time we get to the major colonial project for two or three hundred years ago, but this is the same thing happening but earlier. What's so interesting is we have two deities here. One is the primary deity of Christianity, which is Jesus, who becomes the Christ, and another, which is the primary deity of these Celtic druid people, druid priests, which is this tree, which is a deity, which is why Shakespeare called them druids, and they're superimposed upon each other, so they both are literally taking the form of a cross, and as Christ is nailed to the cross, the two of them are there. They're not side by side. One isn't looking at, one is in front of the other. Jesus was in front of the cross, the Rood, and they both take the same exact form. One is assumed to be metaphysical deity. Remember while this is all taking place, he is just Jesus. He is the son of God. He is God incarnate made into a man, but he's just a man, but he's on his way home to the metaphysical realm. This act, this event here, his crucifixion is what is going to get him from the physical to the metaphysical realm. This is what opens the door to the metaphysical realm, and this is the moment where Christianity becomes, where the Judeo-Christian tradition becomes metaphysical. So in Judaism, it's a

question of whether there's heaven or not. I think probably not in most readings, but here we have a metaphysical realm being opened up and this pagan deity, of course, who is connected to the earth, it's part of the earth, and he will not be able to transcend, and that's really important. So because I mean, you have not just two deities superimpose, but two fundamentally different deities. One is a deity and a metaphysical religion on its way to becoming metaphysical, in the sense of full spirit beyond the body, bodies being, not part of the body, being part of the earth. But then we have this other deity who doesn't have that ability, who's just part of the earth, and we'll see how that plays out. Again, it's an important text to consider because we could look at hundreds, thousands, of different examples of when this happened throughout the Christian history, as an encountered other so-called pagan religions. It happened in Europe and Asia, Africa, Americas, all over the planet, that was the goal. In fact, if you read in the New Testament, it said that Christians should go to the four corners of the earth and spread Christianity there. That was the project. It was an incredible project. I don't think at the time the New Testament was written, they realized just how big a globe it was, but Christians took up that mantle and did travel all over the planet spreading Christianity.

Lynn White Jr,  
to his view, everywhere  
it went it encountered, he doesn't call them that, but now we have the word, pagan, it encountered these pagan earth-based religions and was intent on converting those people into Christians. We're seeing a conversion text here, because this makes a compelling argument why they should convert, so we'll see that. So it's a transitional text, (so I know what I'm doing, I want to pop back there and I wanted to go here) It's a transition takes, why because it's intended to transition pagans into Christians. It's able to do so by this technique that we've seen, this doubling, that we saw in Gilgamesh, where Gilgamesh and Enkidu were kind of

doubles, and who had the true doubles here, and not Gilgamesh and Enkidu, but the Rood and Jesus. Consequently, just as we saw in the Epic of Gilgamesh, the the Rood takes on some of Jesus's qualities, and Jesus surprisingly takes on some of the Rood's qualities. So, two deities superimposed on each other, literally both taking the form of a cross, but now we see that they're not only both deities, they both have similar qualities, which should be surprising. So let's look at this. Jesus is described in surprisingly heroic terms. He's a young hero, the warrior, a mighty king, strong with a stout heart. More ever he's active. He's climbing the cross himself. He's not being carried up there. He's not being stripped, and he really strips himself. He's not a passive guy. Jesus clearly, he's here taking on characteristics prized by a warrior culture, so what's going on here? You have this older Celtic culture, and it is not unlike, in some ways the culture we saw, in Gilgamesh, certainly not unlike the one we see in Iliad and the Odyssey and Homer, it's a warrior culture. So what are you going to value in a warrior culture?

You're not going to value weakness in passivity. You're going to value strength, and courageous, heroic, having a stout heart here, and being active, so if you're familiar with Christianity, you know that especially at this moment in the history of Christianity, Christ is abject, Christ being humiliated. Jesus is being humiliated here. He is not strong, he is passive, and he is allowing this to happen right, so Jesus is God come to earth, and this is the god that we met in Genesis. I mean this is the God to created the whole universe, this is not a little demigod here, this is the most powerful being ever in this view. And in Christianity, he is intimately connected in this sort of mystical way with God. Jesus is insofar as, there's a Trinity of the Father at the Sun and this other figure, the Holy Ghost, who we don't have to worry about. So the point is, this is the most powerful being on the planet, in the universe, connected with God, and to allow himself to be killed, is a striking thing. Yeah it's very important for this religion that he

does that,  
but at that very moment, when he's the  
most vulnerable, most humiliated,  
here he's being described this way,  
and why? Because, if you're  
coming into a new culture and you want  
to make this religion appealing, you have  
to make the people interested in this  
deity and respect him. Arguably a warrior  
culture is not going to respect this  
weak God who allowed himself to  
be killed, so they described him here, the  
author or authors, as being like a  
warrior. He is a young warrior, is strong  
and powerful. And the whole reason, is of  
course tell us to put it, to sort of sell  
the idea of this deity on award or  
culture, and he's kind of was necessary  
to describe him that way, as I put here  
and ways prized by  
warrior culture. So you have this  
powerful deity of place genus Loki, and  
in this warrior culture, he would have  
been described as very strong, and  
powerful. Oak trees are a great  
example the strong tree. They're not  
like a pine or fir. Oak  
is incredibly hard wood, strong wood,  
prized wood, used for everything. Trees  
are big and powerful.  
So he allows his own crucifixion  
here. He again, think of him like  
Humbaba, he's not exactly like it, but  
men should not, would not be  
foolish enough to mess with Humbaba.  
It's only that you had these  
incredibly powerful guys, Gilgamesh  
and Enkidu that they could undertake it  
in the in the story.  
Normal people could not topple  
the genus Loki. They were just too  
powerful. So here you have a genus  
loki, and he is powerful and he  
says, "I might have felled all  
foes, but I stood fast."  
He could have, he could have killed them  
all. I mean Humbaba could have killed him,  
bunch of Roman soldiers, that  
would have been nothing for Humbaba.  
Sorry, I know that's mixed in time and  
all, but it was. But he follows Jesus's  
example, so just as Jesus becomes  
portrayed as the strong  
powerful character, then here we had the  
rood, a strong powerful character being  
portrayed as allowing this to happen.  
"Nor did I harm any of them." Even  
when he's being crucified, I mean at this

point, he could have, in terms of The Epic of Gilgamesh, it would be like Humbaba allowing these people to come cut him down and humiliate him. He could only do that if he allowed it to happen. So it's making clear to the people there who, hearing this story, that yes, these are both incredibly powerful characters, and yet each is willing to allow themselves to die for the sake of another. Jesus died for the faithful. The cross is dying for Jesus here. And in terms of what we've said, this is perfect doubling, even though it's like a flip side right. One is incredibly weak and vulnerable, being portrayed as strong. What is incredibly strong and yet allowing himself to be manifestly weak, insofar as he's not deploying any of that strength. The tree describes his own crucifixion. "They pierced me with dark nails, the wounds are seen on me open gashes of hate. I was all drenched with blood," and that's the blood from Jesus's side, which is, if you're familiar with the biblical story, that's very important scene, where he's gashed by sword. It's not a sword, but a pike from one of the Romans. But look at that description, that could just as well be Christ talking. Christ could say, "they pierced me with dark nails," which they did. They nailed through his hands. The wounds are seen on him. Those wounds, of course will be very important in the history of Christianity. They're equally open gashes of hate, and Christ too is all drenched with blood, so it's a perfect superimposing, a perfect doubling at the moment of crucifixion, and they're both taking the same form. If you didn't know who was speaking these words really, one matter could be either of them. They're the common enemies of both by the way, the Romans, the "strong foes" who "seized me," the rood here, they they cut him down. So first Romans, in the cultural memory of the Celts, Celtic people at this time, they would not have been well remembered. So recall that the centuries before Romans had come and conquered England. They kind of do a nice form of conquering, arguably its Romans, but it's still conquering, and it would have been

in the memory of these people that these were formidable antagonists who defeated them centuries before. So, if you're telling this story in the eighth century, but again it's an oral story so it's even earlier, people would have remembered Romans as well, bad guys, as not likable guys, and they are the ones that are doing this to Christ too, so there's the old saying, the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

Well in this thinking, the enemy of Christ is the Romans.

They're the ones that did this to him, and the enemy of the Celtic people, the original people, the British Isles are Romans as well. So that's very helpful, I think in trying to convert people here, because you do have this common enemy, and if you're Celtic people, when you remembered that they conquered your Island, then you hear the story about what they did to this poor young warrior Jesus, then you might be a little sympathetic to Jesus and see yourselves kind of on the same side. But what they do of course, is to the tree, the rood, that becomes the rood, is like sacrilege. They're do they do the same exact thing that Gilgamesh did to Enkidu, which was so striking, is they cut it down. And then cutting it down, then they cut it up into shape.

The very thing, and when you look at a text like this, you might think back to the Epic of Gilgamesh, and be startled by what they actually did, because the same thing happens there. If you remember Enkidu is processing the trees as they cut them down, and hewn them into square pieces, just as this is being hewn into square timbers to be made into a cross. But here the full import of it would have been, the people listening to this story, and again, it probably would have been sung rather than having read it, as literacy was very very low outside of Christianity really at this point. But anyhow you would've been listening to this story, and they would have been performing sacrilege.

They're cutting down a sacred tree, and these people did not have Gilgamesh's transitional religion in play. They would have just been kind of

mortified by it. I mean what people come in and cut down your deity? And again, these are foreign people coming in. These are Romans. So you can see the antagonism against them. What is this all about? Well, this story is being told to try to assimilate people of the Celtic religion, druid religion, into Christianity, and this kind of hard thing to do because they're two very different religions. One is a pagan, is firmly rooted in the Earth's religion, and another Christianity is different. But by superimposing the two, coming with this common enemy, they're the people who are telling the story, or hoping that the appeal of Christianity will be so great that people will want to again, this is transitional text, transition away from their religion to Christianity. And you can see these two deities, they kind of line up here. That's the project. So it's important to think about because it's not that Christianity is coming in and holding a knife to someone's throat and saying, "you have to convert to this religion." I mean that's not what's being portrayed here anyhow. What's being portrayed here is making this new religion seem more appealing, making it seem similar to the old religion, so that you can transition over, but making it and in one key way, which we're going to get to directly, superior to the older religion. It would make why someone would want to do it. At this point, with what's going on here now, I don't know that one of these deities is clearly better than the other. So in other words, if the story just ended where this ends, with Christ on the cross bloody, why would you transition away from the cross? They're similar deities, but why abandon your deity? Well we're gonna see why, and it all centers on what happens on the cross here. So you can see the idea was to take features of the earth-based religions, and sort of graft them into Christianity, related to the worship of nature. But what happened is, because if you're familiar with Christianity, you don't have to be that familiar to know, that that's gonna be incongruous with

Christianity right. Christianity doesn't have genus loki figures. Christianity doesn't worship trees. Christianity has a metaphysical God and his son who was part of Trinity, and those are the deities, again, with the holy spirit of Christianity? So there's no way you can build those into Christianity. You can't just say, we're gonna have metaphysical, we're gonna have earth deities too. So even though initially, they're there, remember this is a transitional text, they will sort of fall away. That's the goal, to have the fall away. Now Christianity is always taking the long picture here. It might take a generation or two or more, but the idea is once people convert to Christianity, their children can be taught that these earth religions have to go, and by the time you get a generation, a few generations out, all those characteristics that you that you brought into Christian, they can fall by the wayside. If you look at different, I don't notice a denomination, I'll just say in a broad way, flavors of Christianity across the planet, so for example in South America, you'll see that and even Catholicism in South America, but some of those older features are still there, that they never quite got rid of them in the same way. They just held on, and we're that strong, because the cultures there were so strong, that people just weren't willing to abandon them so quickly. But in any event that was the goal, that they would be abandoned. So what's interesting here, is the story is so fascinating because if you follow, we're going here, not only do you have to get rid of all those characteristics of the older religion, you have to get rid of the deities too. You can't have these deities floating around. There's one thing to have people more reverent of trees and all, and in a Christian culture, in some places than others, but you can't have those deities still floating around. They have to go. There are no deities. There's God and the Son. That's it, Christianity. But here, you actually have in this story the destruction of the earth deity. This tree is

actually cut down and destroyed. The beauty of the way it's told is, because if you think about it, who's actually eradicating the earth deity here, well it's Christianity. Christianity has come to, I don't want to say destroy, well, that's not an accurate, but supplant those deities, it's going to replace them with a new deity. So, the point of view of faithful people, they're worshipping the earth, these Christians are the bad people, because they've come to destroy your deity, but in the very clever way, this is written and only a few pages long, but so clever isn't it? It is the common enemy of Christians and the Celts alike, which are the Romans, which are the one destroying the earth deity. Those are the bad guys in this story, but nonetheless the story of that deity being destroyed is incorporated in here, because he must die, this tree, and why, and here's why it works so perfectly. He is as pagan connected to the earth, you cut him off. You cut his connection. You cut him off from the roots and all, and just like Humbaba, he will die. He has to die because this connection to the earth is there. That's, so you see him, it is his most vulnerable and where he would be dying, because he's lost his strength, which is connection to the earth. Christianity has it a little different. Jesus in this story, and in the story of the crucifixion, in the New Testament story is also killed, but Christianity has a unique innovation here that trumps anything that any pagan religion and generally has, or often has, and that is he can be reborn in a metaphysical realm. Why? Because this is a metaphysical religion that postulates a metaphysical realm. Heaven and a metaphysical God, the Christian God, Jehovah, and the problem is the tree can't do that, and by extension, the religion can't do that for people, because, in most of these so-called pagan religions, these people are connected to the earth, and they are pagan in the sense that they only have that connection to the earth. Christianity, on the other hand, (I'm sorry I get out of shot,) has this metaphysical realm. So in order,

it's not quite fair to characterize it as a selling point or a marketing plan or something, but look at it this way. Christianity encounters all these earth-based religions where people just live and die in the physical form, and all it has to do is keep pushing this one selling point, and that is, you can live eternally. You can live in eternal bliss with Christianity. Your religion does not allow that, and your religion, you have to be here on earth and, for most pre-modern people, and a lot of people today, still life involve suffering. That's right, that's the Buddha's great revelation. And life is hard, but there's a wonderful life beyond life, a metaphysical realm. So the fact that Christianity is this metaphysical religion, again you don't have to force people necessarily to go along with it, you just have to hold that out to them, that they're going to die, and maybe, depending on how you sell it, they're gonna live on in a metaphysical realm that won't be heaven. So from the point of view of, and you can see it with what's being enacted by *The Dream of the Rood*, there's the death of metaphysical religions. Metaphysical religions involve I mean, I'm sorry, earth based religions involve death. It's the death of those religions, where a metaphysical religion has something new to offer, and again and again and again and as Christians encounter so-called pagan, earth-based religions, this will be what happens. Lynne White Junior, in a very broad way, said well, this is the history of Christianity. It's Christianity doing away with these earth base religion, in particular, the way they protected the earth, the way Humbaba, protected the earth, the way that and you can see it's not just that was a feature 5,000 years ago as a religion, it was a future twelve hundred years ago, and before, in England as well, and all over the planet that you had all these earth-based deities like Humbaba and the tree that becomes to cross here. Christianity will supplant them all. Precisely because it is a metaphysical religion that postulates a beyond physical realm, a metaphysical,

a meta-nature realm.  
It's not to say that  
Christianity must be at odds with nature,  
earth-based religions, but the  
fact is, and this is Lynne White Junior's  
argument, and look at the history of  
Christianity, White argues, and you'll see  
that again and again. This happens again,  
people aren't necessarily forced into  
converting over to Christianity, but the  
appeal of it as a metaphysical religion  
offering access to the metaphysical  
realm, and that the only way you can get  
access to it by the way, you may know, is  
by way of Jesus. You have to accept Jesus. He  
is the doorkeeper. Doesn't matter, you can  
you can believe in another  
metaphysical religion and all,  
doesn't help you here, because in this  
view, it's only this religion  
that gives you access to it, and it's  
only by way of Jesus. But again  
this is all hermeneutic  
question, and there are so many different  
sects and types of Christianity because  
they read this text differently, so and  
not all them are as openly  
evangelical, wanting to convert people to  
Christianity as others, so it's a  
complicated issue, and I don't mean to  
oversimplify it, and in some sense Lynne  
White Junior gives a vastly simplified  
version of it, but I do mean to draw  
attention, as White did, that this  
encounter that we see here with  
Christianity and the earth-based  
religion, the original or former  
earth-based religions of the British  
Isles, that will happen again and again,  
and you might just again assume it's a  
relatively recent thing, last two or  
three four hundred years ago, but  
it goes back very far. It goes back to  
the very beginning of Christianity, and  
it's been central and I  
would argue very cleverly thought out.  
This text is very short, but look it's what  
it's done here by way of doubling, by  
the way of actually destroying the  
Earth's deity, by coming with a common  
enemy and all. This is very cleverly  
constructed and laid out. So it's not too  
surprising it would be very effective  
historically. Okay so Canterbury Tales, so  
if you haven't read the Canterbury tale  
that we read, I'll let you know here that it  
is written in an English that is going  
to be difficult to read.

It's Middle English. It's readable, and this has always been a rite of passage for English students, students studying English literature, and for you too, you'll be reading it in the original. If it's incredibly difficult to read, you can, if you like, you will find that there are online translations of it into modern English. If you have to do that, fine.

But you should at least try, and I believe if you put your mind to it, and maybe it'll be, I just because you'd like the challenge or just read it through, you can read it. Now I would give you one or two little tips. One of them is, if you live with other people this might be kind of a problem, but read it out loud, because, if you read it out loud and just pronounce things the way you would pronounce them. So remember even when I did that Old English, when I read it from *Dream of the Rood*, those words when you say them, Christ Christ, was, it'll sound maybe more like words that you know, but the translation we have, but the version we have does have the important words that you wouldn't necessarily know. They're for you so give it a try, but a forewarning though it's a little difficult. They were written, *Canterbury Tales*, by Geoffrey Chaucer in the late 14th century before the advent, the printing press. So this is an actual page from an early version of the *Canterbury Tales*, beautifully written, illuminated. This is not done with the printing press. Someone wrote that text there, and someone did the illustrations, and then color the illustrations all by hand. By the way, you can see why the printing press was such an innovation or movable type. The type of printing press do we have that become so popular because it's so vast, and so much easier to print hundreds of copies, but look at how, this is, more than just the writing on the page, books, especially books that were valued like this for were complicated things. This is still the Middle Ages, and that tells you something about the Middle Ages, the so-called medieval period in England, especially it's very long. This is from what we just had,

*The Dream of the Rood* on the Ruthwell Cross, that original/early version - Chaucer we have six hundred years, so our chronology, again we have big spans here right from Hesiod, Virgil, we have seven hundred years then eight hundred years after that, the Ruthwell Cross, then six hundred years here. We're making big jumps here even though this jump is unusual because it is still considered in the Middle Ages. His language, even though it's six hundred years away from us, so there's yet another big jump, which is in the six hundred years to modern time, which by the way, should underscore just what a gulf there is between *The Dream of the Rood* from the Ruthwell Cross and Chaucer, because this biggest one that we have, you should be able to read it with some difficulty. The Nun's Priests Tale, which is what we read, is an example of a beast fable. And why we're reading it, and I'm putting it out here, you may not be as intuitive issues think while we're reading it, but it's because during this time, people love to tell stories about animals. Animals were incredibly popular, so we kind of have to, what we should address, and what we are doing is addressing, why that's the case. What was the preoccupation with the animals here? They depict animals, as not only sentient but surprisingly human-like, and this is another one where you can see just beautiful illustrations of animals, and by the way, we think of books as being, this kind of book like Chaucer, we read Chaucer today without any illustrations, and these beast fables but, the amount of text of pages, it's like a third of what the illustration is there so, it's not even fair to say was fad to have all these animals described, but it was it was it was a huge feature of text at this time. When we do that, we use, had this word once before, but I'm gonna put it again: we call that anthropomorphism, and again human, taking human shape, morphosis shape. So don't confuse that with anthropocentrism. So, Lynne White Junior was very concerned about Christianity being anthropocentric. What that means of course is

centered on human beings. It's in that sense all the animals and everything revolves around human beings. This is different. The animals and all are taking on human shape. So, in that sense, *The Dream of the Rood* is also an anthropomorphic text, because the rood is taking on human characteristics, and it's like a human being. In these beasts, is these beasts fables, you're gonna see anthropomorphism all the time. Okay, so *Canterbury Tales*, so you understand, it's 24 except for tails and they're actually meant to be a lot more, but they were never written by Chaucer. And it's a story of religious pilgrims, and pilgrims are people who are on their way to a religious site, and if you had a lot of money at this time, you could you can take a pilgrimage all the way to like Jerusalem, which people did. If you didn't have a lot of money, you're in England, you could go somewhere locally, like the shrine of St. Thomas Becket in Canterbury, England. So why is it the *Canterbury Tales*? Because they're going to Canterbury, a town in England. Why are they tales? Because the people who are on this trip, they're traveling all day, and at night they stop like at a tavern or pub, and then they spend their time by telling their stories, and that's the premise of the idea we're gonna be reading. We do read this one story. There's a general prologue, then which describes everyone, sort of like a narrator says, here's all the people and gives a little brief description of both, and then someone, and this is a nun's priest. Who is that? It's a priest traveling with a Prioress and a nun, they further introduced their own story, so this is general introduction of like a narrator. Then before everyone tells their story, their tale, they give a little prologue. We don't read the prologue for the Nun's Priest's Tale. I just wanted you to read the tale, but I want you to know that that does exist, and that's how this fits in the larger *Canterbury Tales*. This were an English course on the *Canterbury Tales*, you would have read the whole general prologue and each of the introductions, but here I just wanted to give you a taste of what one of these beast stories is like, and why

not from Chaucer, because he's an incredibly important writer. In fact when the printing press appears in England, the first book that is printed is, you might not be surprised, the Bible. But next year, the next book printed is the Canterbury Tales, which are I guess around 100 years old or so at the time when they're printed. So enduringly popular in England, and today too, so it's very important. So even it like UCSB, a while back there, would be requirements that every student studying English would have to read something of Chaucer, or something of Shakespeare, and something from Milton, and I think CCS, which is our College of Creative Studies has a similar require, and still intact all these years later. Now we've kind of become more diverse, and I'm looking at a range of other literatures, and don't require you to read them. Although in this course you read a little Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton. So an incredibly important text, and if you're interested in how animals are portrayed, it's as good as any to want to look at. This one, which we do read the actual tale. So The Nun's Priest's. This priest is telling this story and it all involves barnyard animals. It's meant to be read however, allegorically not literally. It's for the most part, it's not about animals, but about human beings. So what do I mean by that? Well, remember it's anthropomorphic. Its animals described as human beings, but what's important here, is the human characteristics. Let me explained a little more about it though this all makes sense. So you have to the main character at Chanticleer, who's sort of the main character, the protagonist and he's a rooster, and then Pertelote is his wife. And the words used to describe Chanticleer, especially as "asure," "paramour" and she's described "damoisele". He's described as "debonaire". These are in fact, French words being used to describe him, and he's described in his physical description as looking like something, not just a person, but like French aristocracy. So what's going on with that, and what's Chaucer up to here? Well first, you have to know that England, at this point in time, 600 years ago, I think it's pretty fair to say it was the backwater

of Europe. What I mean by that is at this point in time, and Italy for example, the Renaissance is alive and well, and a big deal and then it'll move slightly later to like Paris and all as well, but all that sort of rebirth of knowledge and all, which we're going to talk about subsequent lectures coming up pretty soon, all that has not hit England yet, and in fact, England is such a backwater that the court and this is the government and the king and all, they don't speak English. They speak French, and they modeled themselves on French, and particular Parisian style. So if you were to walk into the British Court at this time, you might think you'd stepped into Paris. People would have dressed that way. They would have been speaking French. They would have been adopting French culture and all, because it was just considered the superior. Chaucer is actually important figure and we're not going to deal with them in that way, but just so because he doesn't like all this, he believes that there should be an indigenous English language and literature and culture, and it should not be just something imported from France, and he's part of a movement to bring that about. And you can see here that he doesn't like this French Court thing because he's really doing a send-up here and a parody of it because he has anthropomorphic animals. He has anthropomorphic animals to work with. He is portraying in French aristocracy, but in particular, British aristocracy that are emulating French aristocracy, as sort of overblown roosters. So roosters are kind of fancy right, their plumage and all, and they look kind of fancy. He's saying that that's what these people looked like. They looked like overblown roosters decked out in their fine plumage and trying to be what they're not. And why that's the case is because Chanticleer is not aristocracy, but he's a rooster, and he thinks he's so full of himself. He's walking around like he's some sort of aristocrat. That's what Chaucer is saying. British aristocracy, they're trying to be something they're not. They're just, they look as silly as a rooster,

trying to be a French aristocrat,  
and  
that's in part what this story is about.  
It's very sort of biting attack on  
aristocracy. But what's important,  
from our point of view,  
something to think about in the  
in the last few decades, like  
five decades, we literary critics have  
looked at how disenfranchised  
groups of human beings have been  
depicted. So early on, I think  
credit has to be given to early feminist  
critics. We're really interested in how  
women who have been disenfranchised  
throughout the centuries have been  
depicted. Right around that time, people  
also were looking at how people of lower  
classes were depicted, so these were not  
feminist critics, but usually are referred  
to as Marxist critics, as a form of  
cultural Marxism we call it. They're not,  
it's not saying they subscribe,  
they want to change their politics, but  
it's a view of they kind of do want  
to change for politics, but it's a view  
that takes into account the  
treatment of the proletariat and people  
of lower classes and how an  
economic groups prosper, but  
we've looked at all sorts of things now,  
so not only in the register of  
sex and all, but also class. Race will be  
important things, so literary critics  
will look at how people have  
been disenfranchised because of race or  
religious conviction, nationality, sexual  
preference, sexual identity. You  
may well be aware that not only are  
there feminist critics, but there are  
queer critics. We call them and queer  
critics works with lgbtqia+ texts and  
individuals in text. So in all these  
cases, you have literary critics really  
wanting to understand how marginalized  
groups are treated in literature. The  
interesting thing about this project and  
at first, it's obviously great that this  
was done, still being done, still needs to  
be done, but it only considered people,  
human beings. It didn't consider other  
beings, so all these are human beings.  
What about beings that aren't human. They  
we're not really taken  
here. So in this project, and that's  
something to think about, and it is the  
case however, that in the 21st century  
people are increasingly looking at

marginalized beings that are non-human beings, such as animals.

That's only recently being done, and one of the reasons I would argue for that is the representation of non-human beings in text is not necessarily, does not yield a whole lot, and a lot of text, some do. Animal theorists would heard me say that there would kind of cringe, but an example would be Chaucer. So I gave you this because there's this incredible preoccupation with animals in this period, and yet they're not animals as much as they are people, or ways being critical of people, or illuminating things about people as Chanticleer does about the British aristocracy. So, if you want to look at something, and this is what's so interesting, if we go back to the text we looked at last time, one of the texts, Varro's that "On Agriculture," you can learned a great deal about her Romans conceived their relationship to non-human life. Obviously, Varro acted violently towards non-human life, so if you were an animal theorist and you wanted to look at a text, you may not necessarily be intuitively the one you would think, so you would think, let's go to the medieval period, because there's this incredible interest in animal text, and they're writing about animals all over the place, like the Cahucer is, but it may not be that fruitful for you. I'm gonna give it to you, I mean it's like to vex you, because you thought you're going to learn a lot about animals from the text, but you do learn something about them, not in the specific way that you do, and Varro's "On Agriculture," because specifically that Varro, for example, knew that animals, that the birds he was talking about, pigeons, were sentient and could think and could feel.

That's why you have to kill him in a separate building and all that. You also learn that he thought nothing about their pain and suffering, because he's going to break their legs to make a bigger profit, but here you learn something that in this period in time, and I should note, we're gonna get into a detail here, although it's going to come back again. This is now, remember were 600 years after *The Dream of the Rood*. *The Dream of the Rood* is a text intent

hoping it helping transition so-called pagan religions into Christianity, well 600 years later this is a Christian culture in England. England is entirely a Christian culture, and that's just it, the way it is, and during that time, animals were not, I'm not connecting up necessarily because of Christianity, but I'm just saying it's this culture at this time, animals are not given the same treatment, even then you'd have it Varro, as far as thinking about them, they're there, but they're not humans. So here's then the question. So compared to you have two farms here that we've seen now right, one is in Nun's Priest's Tale, that's all about a farmyard, and the other is the farm depicted by Varro. Obviously, this is far more pleasant than Varro's but here's the question. Does depicting animals anthropomorphically do them any sort of service or not? So the argument could be made if it's natural enough to depict them so much like human beings, that you can have a character or like Chanticleer, or Pertelote, especially Chanticleer, you'll act like a person, walk like a person, be seen like a person. Does that mean, if you have the wildering array of this literature and art out there, which you did in the medieval period. Does that mean that you look at a chicken and think of them more like a human being? They're not, but are you more sympathetic? In other words, Varro knew that those animals on and his farm we're sentient and could feel. Does depicting an animal's being able to feel and to think and all make them seem more human-like? That is the project right. Your anthropomorphizing, you're making them work human-like, but just this create greater sympathy, greater understanding. Does it do them the service? I want to leave that up to you and reading it, but I'll suggest that it may not do them as much a service as you would think, but I would raise this question and let's just jump to the conclusion here, because this project, of doing this, and this is why you were so important to deal with it, I think in Chaucer, is alive

and well today everywhere. So, I said that was the medieval period. It's sort of one of the ways was characterized by all these beast stories and all, but it's not only there. So first, before we move ahead, moving back, Chaucer, is not the first person to do this. Medieval period is not the first. Aesop's fables or are not quite back as far as Hesiod, but a couple hundred years from him in Greece they tell the story. So you may know these, some of these stories like the story of the country mouse and the town mouse, that's one of Aesop's fables, and which case these are anthropomorphize sentient beings. So it's not like it emerges as something new in the medieval period, and furthermore it's not that it's connected with like Christianity, I mean maybe you can draw connections, well no one deny that, but I'm just saying it's not like a particular Christian innovation. It's not like Christianity has features that would make this sort of stories popular.

They've existed long before them. What do we actually learn about the animals though, and when you use them to tell human stories, so you read The Nuns Priests Tale, well now

you've learned something about British aristocracy, and the way that some people, like Chaucer, perceived them. And my Chaucer thought there was a profound problem with the way they were behaving, but do you learn anything about chickens?

There are roosters in that story, and you learn anything about mice from Aesop's fables? The moral that story which you may know is that life in the country is better than the city, that's about human life, not animal life right. That's about human beings thinking the life in the city is better. So yes, in an anthropomorphic portrayal, and literature that it employs it, you learn a lot about humans. The animals teach you that and there are various reasons why you would want to do it. So Chaucer's Nuns Priests, he'll arguably wouldn't be nearly as funny or as effective arguably, if it had just the characters were British aristocracy, all being dressed up and like pretending they were British,

you could do that in pretending they were French, you could do that, and it would work, but here, I mean it's a lot more biting. I mean when you have them, just the sheer ridiculousness of the fact that the chicken is acting like French aristocracy, that's pretty funny, and I arguably it's, you could see why someone like Chaucer would use it, and you could see why even Aesop would use it. But does it really, and use it to tell a human story or make a human point, but does it really work as far as telling you something about the animals? The question is, do they make you more sympathetic toward the animal? So aside from like, telling you things about animal life or animal qualities or characteristics or something, do you become more sympathetic after reading it? Arguable you might become more sympathetic after reading Varro, when you see, and the way animals are treated and that mistreatment, you could work in effect. If you're familiar with the group PETA, People for Ethical Treatment of Animals, and I'm member and I get their material in the mail. That's one of their tactics. They take you into factory farms, inside of factory farms. I open up their literature, they send me some of the pictures are just horrific, because they want you to see what life is really like. They're in the hope that if you see what life was like, you probably won't be consuming animal products. In Varro I think works that way because it's an early factory farm and he takes us in there. I mean amazingly, Varro doesn't see anything wrong with it, because he's assuming that you're wanting to make a profit and you'll agree that he's got some good ideas, but in doing that, he may make us more sympathetic to animals, certainly with like PETA, that's what they want to do. So the problem is though, if you're doing this anthropomorphizing, does it make you sympathetic to animals in the same way? Do you, so again you pick up Peters literature, you pick up Varro's On Agriculture, and you may decide to stop eating meat because of it, but would you do that after reading the Nuns Priests Tale? Doesn't in any way sort of prompt you to

do it? It's a good question because if we have this literature everywhere, does it actually connect you up with animals in a way? You would think it would, right? If it's portraying them as human and giving them human characteristics, but it is a good question to raise. Anthropomorphically depicting animals can, to some extent, elicit sympathy for them, as it does make them seem more human, but it depends on the portrayal. I think that's, if there's a big takeaway from this part of the lecture, I think that's it, and I threw it out as a question, but I'll say, I don't I don't know. Chaucer does that here, elicit a lot of sympathy. It's not that you couldn't do it. In fact, there is a farm story, you may have watched, the film Babe, which is about a pig on a farm, and I think that tends to, that particular story, even though it's anthropomorphized, not in that it's like a cartoon but, you're seeing just a real pig, but you're getting insights into the pig's interior thoughts and all, probably does elicit more sympathy. I think it's set up too. And I would note too that, I forget his name now, but the actor replaced the farmer there, is actually an animal rights activist, and if you go online you find out his name, and you research him, in fact you go on YouTube, you will see he's done other videos where he actually does what PETA and Varro did. He will take you inside of a factory farm to see what it's about, in particular pig farms, I recall one video I've seen. So in that sense, he was an animal rights activist and he took part in that project and making up the film Babe, I presume because he was hoping that it would elicit sympathy for non-human life, for their farms, for animals, like Babe the pig. So, you can see how it could work, but it doesn't necessarily mean that it always will work, or there that's even its intention, so backing up to what we where we started, yes there's an incredible amount of literature in the medieval period and it depicts animals and all, you might assume that there is this sort of blossoming of greater awareness and understanding and caring

of for animals, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it is. It doesn't end. it didn't begin with Chaucer, and we saw before with Aesop, and it doesn't end with Chaucer, anthropomorphic depiction of animals are incredibly common everywhere. So, our go-to example here is Steamboat Willie, aka, as he is later known, Mickey Mouse. But look at that figure there. Acts likes, dresses like, talks like, and in most ways, is more like a person than a mouse, which he hardly resembles. You actually, I had a real photograph of a mouse here on all fours and all, doesn't look anything like that the expression, doesn't look anything like that. That's an anthropomorphic depiction. That's basically like a human being, was a few features that identify him as a mouse and the signature features of course, are those ears, which is why millions and millions of children go to Disney theme parks and they come home wearing a pair of Mouse ears, because that's the Mickey Mouse signature. Well, here's the question, and by the way, it doesn't just end with Steamboat Willie, I mean this starts the great Disney franchise, and so many others, and it's not the only depiction of animals, even at that time. I mean the Grimm's fairy tales and all. I mean it doesn't stop with Chaucer and then emerge again later. It never stopped. So there's the question, and whether we're talking about Chanticleer or Steamboat Willie, Mickey Mouse, do anthropomorphic depictions of animals make us more sympathetic for them or not? And given that we live in an era not that different than the medieval in the sense that there are depictions of this of animals everywhere anthropomorphically, what does that actually do? Does it make us more sympathetic? Doesn't make us see them as more human? I'm not sure it does, and I guess maybe a question here would be to ask, not of Chanticleer, but of Mickey Mouse. Do you feel differently about mice because of Mickey Mouse? Do you, are you more sympathetic to them? Would you be less likely to put a mousetrap in your house because of Mickey Mouse? I'm not

sure, but it, I don't know that I would be actually. I mean I don't know that he makes me think that differently a mice if I'm completely candid. But it's important to realize, because when we think about the depiction of animals, we have to think about what it actually does, how effective it is, whether it makes us care about them, or does it change anything about it, and it's just a question I'll leave you with, and not really in terms of Chanticleer or Mickey Mouse, but of any depiction of animals that you'll see. What exactly does that do? So, here's a question, do you think it, and I'm not really talking about Mickey Mouse or Chantecler here more generally, do these depictions make you more sympathetic to these animals? I'm not sure that it does, but maybe there are many cases where it does, cases that you are familiar with, so it's just something to think about, and it's it's interesting because we have been preoccupied with animals for so long throughout this whole history. This course could very well have been the portrayal of animals in literature and art, but it may not have been a very fruitful course in the sense that, if you had hoped and you would have get a better sense of animal awareness, and how this played into animal rights and all. That may not have been so interesting that will become more of an issue once we hit the Renaissance, and there's a book I'll try to mention at the time, but if you're interested in this, called The Bloodless Revolution, that's revolution without blood, that actually deals with vegetarianism and animal rights from principally from the Renaissance onward. That's where vegetarianism actually becomes an issue in the West and European culture. It's important in part from the East, in fact it is often called during the Renaissance, the Hindu diet, because people are in England just been so used to consuming meat, they didn't realize that you could actually live on a plant diet, and when they encountered certain Eastern cultures, they became aware of it. So that becomes an issue then, but again we're 600 years ago and that was like 400 years ago. So even

though animals have been the sort of preoccupation with us for a long time, we haven't really thought of them and their rights and as sentient beings in their own right, rather than just stand-ins for us. And I should also tell you that while animal rights have become, an animal theory, representing animals has become an issue in the same way that feminist theory comes on the scene. It's also the case that plant theory is one of the most cutting-edge things right now as we entered the third decade of the 21st century. And you could look at a representation of a plant, we had one today with *The Dream of the Rood*, but people are thinking a lot about plants and their particular status in our culture. It was a very popular novel from last year, I guess *The Overstory*, if you want to read a story about trees, I don't know why I've recommended two books, *Bloodless Revolution* and *The Overstory*, but it is interesting to think about how we, as human beings consider other non-human beings. Okay so we're gonna be making a big jump in the next lecture because we're going to be in the early modern period, also known as the Renaissance. So I'll see you soon.