

[Music]

Welcome back to Ecocriticism 101.

So we're still in the early modern period today,

and note that I didn't call it the Renaissance because really, we are going to be looking at a number of truly early modern

texts, because they introduce, what will become, important modern innovations, with respect to the way that we look at the environment.

One of these will be the Christian stewardship approach. So you may have noticed ever since we were dealing with the

Hebrew bible in Genesis, that it Christianity presented a certain kind of challenge in a way. So the issues that had to be dealt with were, in a way trying to find a workaround

to it. I don't think that's unfair to say.

In other words,

if you read that text literally for example, then you pretty much have to buy

into creationism, which many people do, many devout Christians. So

if you didn't, if

you've been

persuaded by modern science and evolution,

then you have to find a way of making that

work. Well with what's going to be called Christian stewardship,

the opposite is in a way true.

It's an interpretation that suggests the

Christianity actually can be especially caring for the planet, that is sort of built into Christian thinking, into Christian values. Now we'll see how that is, but I don't think it's quite the same sort of challenge that you have with something like evolution, rather it's just an interpretation.

That interpretation however, doesn't really occur until around 400 years ago for the first time. We're going to see it with a writer Aemilia Lanier, and what she was doing, it's become incredibly influential however in the last 400 years really, in the in the last few decades.

The most influential, and I would argue, important Christian environmentalists, and I would even go further, some of the most important environmentalists of any sort are using that today. So we'll talk about the two of them.

So in that sense, this is an important lecture for us because of that.

It's also important, we're going to be hitting another milestone writer today.

So we've had some very influential big writers like Virgil and Chaucer, and today we'll hear from Shakespeare as well, and as a consequence, what we'll be doing in part today is eco-criticism, even though we're going to touch on eco theology for the first half. And something I've said all along, but I'll say it again,

and Shakespeare really brings it home, I think, is that you don't have to look far and wide to find texts you can interpret eco-critical, and they'll have significant interpretations that are useful for us. Even really big deal writers like Chaucer and Shakespeare, and we're going to get to Milton in the next lecture, you'll see that even folks like this can be read ecocritically. So just worth underscoring, now that we're halfway through the class and a little bit further that, you can, I'm not saying you can pick up every text and get a really meaningful eco-critical interpretation, but you can pick up many, many, texts and do that. And many writers that we may think about, and look to for other reasons like Shakespeare, well Shakespeare too is actually an important innovator as we'll see today, in the history of thinking about the environment. So let's get right into the lecture. So note something, ah what happened? We're missing all of our lectures that we've previously had. So you'll remember from the very first lecture I noticed there was a problem of fitting all the lectures that we had into the series, and getting them all in one Prezi. So we've just switched away from lecture

one,
lecture series one, Prezi number
one,
which had lectures one through nine and
now we're picking up
ten onward. Also, you'll notice something,
it stops here at sixteen.
This is where the lecture series stops
with respect to
the western tradition that we've been
considering. But you may have noted
earlier
in the series, I noticed that we were
going to take up a non-western religion
which is
Buddhism. The problem is those lectures
are still being written
as I'm speaking now. They're mostly
done, and I am
happy with the way they're turning out. I
should say as an aside,
but they're not up there yet, but by the
time we get there, as we get closer,
they're going to
miraculously appear on the Prezi, and if
you go
access the Prezi, you'll find that
they'll be there
by the time the course starts, or
the first
iteration of the course includes
Buddhism.
And of course note that we
are
way up here now,
as far as the course is concerned. We're
again, within the last 400 years of a
tradition
that we've looked at which has spanned
over 4000. So

let's jump right in here to number 10.
And our writers, let me see if I can move
this down a little for us,
note that with the Prezi, by the way, if
you happen to be working with it, that
you
can maneuver it around on your
screen that way. You can
also, I won't do it, but you can pinch,
if you have a track pad to get it larger
or smaller
as well. Yes, and that may be
important,
if you wanted to be more accessible for
whatever reason.
So notice that we're dealing with the
authors here, we're dealing with
four of them, and these are all literary
writers.
But what they have to say, may have
import
otherwise. So let's start with John Donne.
John Donne is a 17th century writer, as
are all the writers today,
and you may remember that when we had
Lynne White Jr
back in the day, what Lynne White Jr
really made a suggestion about
Christianity, and we
build upon it by thinking about the
metaphysical physical tradition.
Well again you may
wonder if that tradition that we saw
sort of contained within
the
Hebrew bible, or at least the possibility
for that tradition contained in the
Hebrew bible,
whether that was actually influential.
So just because you can

interpret that text that way, doesn't mean that people did interpret that text in the way we suggested, and in part by way of Lynne White Jr. So I wanted to give you an example, and I could have given you many, many, examples of this, of an interpretation of Christianity, and this is in the 17th century, and by an enormously important writer. John Donne's incredibly important, influential writer at the time, but he's more than a writer he's an Anglican minister. So he actually is very concerned about the interpretation of Christianity, and he writes many, many, sermons. In fact, we still read Donne from a literary point of view. We read his sermons because they're so important. So this isn't someone who is casually addressing the issue. This guy really thinks a lot about, cares a lot about Christianity. So this is Donne: "The world [that means the earth] is but a carcass [like a dead body], thou art fed by it, but as a worm, that carcass bread." So you are like a worm eating the dead body of the earth. "And why should thou, poor worm, consider more, when this world would grow better than before, then those thy fellow worms do think upon thy carcasses last resurrection? Forget this world, [forget the planet earth] and scarce think of it so,

as of old clothes cast off a year ago.”
Now in fairness to Donne, he also is very interested in the physical body and life here on the earth, and he's a sort of preoccupation with sex, and he's an interesting character in that regard, especially as an Anglican minister. But here he is articulating a view that is very common. The world is but a carcass, the earth is a dying body. Why would you say that? Well we've seen that if you think of the fall initiating this event, then everything on the planet in that view, is now decaying and dying and will ultimately go away at the parasia, the resurrection of Jesus. So everything is dying. Everything is in a state of irretrievable decay. As a result of the fall, the only thing that can be saved from this, of course is human beings, which can be sort of beamed off the planet at the end. But, so why, and you're just like your physical body is like a worm feeding on this dead body. So of course we, as human beings, and as animals, we all need to eat and all, but what is that like? In our life, it's like being on a dead carcass. And why should you think about when the world would grow better than before? So if the world is in a state of irretrievable decay, why in the world

you think about it getting better than before? It's not going to get better. It's just going to get worse and worse.

It's

dying. It's in decay. It's getting worse and worse every day.

"Than thy fellow worms, do you think about that carcass's last resurrection."

Now this is a really revealing line. It's not because of what Donne himself is saying here in his viewpoint, but he reveals that there are other people out there, other worms on the planet,

and they are thinking about the carcasses last resurrection.

What I mean by that, these are people that are beginning to think, well maybe the world isn't irretrievably decaying. Maybe we can make the world better? Maybe we can make the earth

better. Maybe that's something that we should be taking up.

We get to Aemilia Lanier, we're going to get right after Donne, you can see that there are people doing just that,

and Donne again, it's not his primary message here, is not his viewpoint.

But he is allowing another viewpoint to enter into his poem here, and that suggests that there are people, and especially in his period, the early modern period

in England and elsewhere, who are beginning to think about the idea that that maybe the world is not irretrievably decaying, in the sense that maybe we can actually

make it better.

So Donne will have none of that though and he ends here by saying forget this world, forget the earth, forget the idea of saving it, forget the idea of making it better.

Think of it like old clothes cast off a year ago.

Unfortunately, for a long time in Christian history, for many Christian thinkers, this was a pretty good indication of the view.

We saw that, it was inherent in a reading of the Hebrew Bible, and Donne shows that in 1611, that's certainly very very much alive and well. So the question I will ask is, how common do you think that is in the world today.

And I mean, that view taken by both Christian, Islamic thinkers, who go back to the Hebrew bible for their undergirding as far as the relationship of the planet to human beings, and what's going to happen to the planet, and maybe beyond that, because of something that people have done, and I'm not talking about the biblical fall, but the view that we've brought so much environmental devastation to the planet, and I'm talking about the climate crisis of course, but other things, point source pollution. We've added so much pollution. We saw with Gilgamesh, the beginning of

deforestation,
or not the beginning of it, but
it being chronicled in the west, and
certainly now,
deforestation is everywhere. And
so we've screwed up the planet so much.
Is it in a state of irretrievable decay?
Is there nothing that can
be done?
Shouldn't we think about it anymore,
because
all is lost, to quote Milton's Eve
from
from Milton's Paradise Lost. So it is an
interesting question,
one that I think is some important to
take up, is
if this view is as common,
if it is very common today.
So let's go to Aemilia Lanier.
Note, the same exact year, (let me get out of
there so you can see), it's 1611.
The same exact year it's published,
same exact year it's written, not
published as
John Donne's second anniversary.
You may have heard of Lanier, before and
unfortunately her.
Her big claim to fame has traditionally
been
that she may have been Shakespeare's
dark lady.
If you've read Shakespeare maybe
you've encountered Shakespeare in high
school. You know
that he has sonnets, and some
of those sonnets
are written for a beautiful young man,
which Shakespeare is very much
preoccupied with, and

some are written to an older woman,
generally referred to as the dark lady,
and people have suggested that that may
have been Aemilia Lanier. Why
I think that's unfortunate, is because
Aemilia Lanier,
is just this remarkable writer and
person and thinker in her own right, and
to
just see her as that, as an
object, an object of Shakespeare's
affection, wow that does her a real
disservice.

And her writings reveal
a very different person than
Shakespeare's sonnets, and
and in Shakespeare's sonnet and
she's this sort of mean,
cruel, seductress,
couldn't be further from the truth.
Lanyard is really a proto-feminist, and I
think

some of the things that she's doing are
just well ahead of her time,
and she's an important thinker in other
regards. which is what we'll be looking
at here

with Christian stewardship. She was the
mistress to Henry Carey, who is Queen
Elizabeth's cousin.

So to put her life in a little
perspective,
she didn't have
any real any real role in
that. That was sort of all negotiated by
her family,
and she was like an official mistress.
It's hard to put those in
contemporary terms, but it was
a known thing that

a man would have a mistress, it had to be a certain kind of woman on all, and Aemilia Lanier fit the bill.

And it's all very disturbing chapter in the history of patriarchy, and how it functioned, and it is profoundly misogynistic. But she's also, in spite of being sort of trapped in a system, that limited her options, she's also a remarkable person because she's arguably the first professional woman writer in England, and maybe in Europe. And how that happens is via something called patronage. So, in the renaissance especially, and I'm talking about the early renaissance, I'm talking about like with Michelangelo for example, how did Michelangelo earn a living as an artist? How did he get to do things like, we saw Michelangelo's David, that remarkable statue, or the designing the dome for Saint Peter's Basilica in Rome. Well you did that because you had a wealthy patron, and patron is someone who pays an artist to do works. Michelangelo is very fortunate because he's such a great artist, that the Catholic Church itself was his patron, and different people in the catholic church were his

patron.

Wasn't always that, most artists didn't have it

so good. So you may have a job for a patron for example, of doing a portrait of their family that would hang above the fireplace, and that kind of thing was very

very common. And I

guess you get your work where you can get it,

so people were willing to do that, but know that artists didn't work the way they do today. So an artist today, well let's say

a writer, a writer will write a book, if the book becomes successful, lots and lots of people will buy it, and that's how that person would earn their living.

There are, it's hard to be a writer nowadays and make your living off of writing,

but that's the goal, and that's how it works.

Books weren't disseminated nearly as much here. The printing press has been

around in England, but it's really just kind of really gearing up in a big way during this period.

So patronage is still alive and well. The patronage system however,

is always been thoroughly patriarchal, and what I mean by that is it's male patrons. They're the ones in control of the money,

and it's male artists that they decide to give their money to and commission. So it's a guy-guy

system for sure. However something happens here with Aemilia Lanier. Lanier is a female artist, so she's already bucking the system. Some, it's unlikely I think, that you would have found male patrons that would be willing to supply her with money to do her work, unfortunately. So she does something fascinating. She goes to a wealthy woman, and has her become her patron. And you're going to say, this woman's name is Margaret Clifford. We'll see her directly, and that little move there of this system that is usually a male artist and a male patron shifts now, for the first time, arguably in England anyhow, to a female artist and a female patron. And that's why she's so important, because Aemilia Lanyard then, is arguably the first professional woman writer, in the same way that Michelangelo was a professional painter, because they are paid for what they do for their career. So really important milestone in that sense. Cookeham was written for Margaret Clifford, and Clifford, so what it's about, and if you haven't read it already, it's about a community of women. I'll talk about that in a moment, but just to give you the basic

idea here.

There's an estate, and the estate is called Cookeham. So what's that word?

What does it describe? Describes an estate,

and this would have been landed gentry at the time, had had large estates, so big house in the middle

of very large grounds.

There are a group of women there, so Margaret Clifford is there. It's, her brother is actually the one who doesn't own the house, he's actually sort of rented it from the crown,

but there is Margaret Clifford, and she has

friends with her there, and people like Aemilia Lanyer. So it's a big house, you can have friends stay with you,

and there is a group of women there. That group, we tend to call

a homosocial group. So, important word. So the word there is not homosexual,

because what's not what's being suggested here, is not that these women necessarily are having sexual, romantic, relationship but rather

we know definitely that they were homo social group, that they had deep lasting relationships with each other,

but they're sort of homosocial, so that means

one sex together, but in the way that a deep social bond would be. Now men have always done this.

So if you look at the Iliad

Homer, if you look at well, look at even

the Epic of Gilgamesh.
It's a bunch of guys, and the
guys are all together and
they're friends. The relationships
they have
are all same sex. So same-sex groups
and forming deep relationships like that
have always been
around. But principally in literature and
the portrayal of them has always been
in a patriarchal culture, has always been
a male-male kind of thing.
Here, we see a female group together.
and think about that. Here, we
have the first professional woman writer
in England,
and what does she choose to write about?
She immediately
turns the table on this tradition of
having male groups, and
this is entirely about a group of women.
If you read the text, or when you read it,
if you haven't already,
look for. or think about, if
there are male
characters there, or look for them as
you're reading, and if you haven't, I'm
going to be a spoiler and tell you,
there are no male characters in this
work, and we will see this
in future literature coming up.
Feminist writers like Louisa May Alcott,
is going to be a group of
all women, and it's clearly a homosocial
group.
But here we have it as a group of just,
a group of women, but in 1611. And we're
going to see this
as we go through with other writers, even
in the century another,

woman writer won't be a spoiler on that, who really focuses on that group, and wants to make it very clear that the strongest bonds that she has, the people that she loves the most, are women.

So we'll get to that. So I just gave you like a little incentive to want to keep reading on.

The Description of Cookeham is what we would call a country house poem, and I'll explain what that is in a minute, but I'll tell you that we're also going to get to today, a guy named Ben Johnson, who wrote an important country house poem. And depending on how you want to look at it, the Description of Cookeham, or To Penshurst, are the first country house poems. One was probably written first, that would be Cookeham, and one was published first for sure, and that was To Penshurst, but either way, the tradition begins right here in the beginning of the 17th century, and we will be looking at a Pawn Appleton house by Andrew Marvel. And Marvel's poem is probably the last real country house poem, and that's not that far away. That's right at the middle of the 17th century. So what's a country house poem about? Well I call it a so-called country house poem because the idea here is that it's about a country estate,

and they focus on the, presumably the house here. The problem with that description, and scholars gave it a while back, before we got very, before we started thinking about things ecocritically, is that, and you'll see it was both Cookeham and Penshurt, and again these are the poems that inaugurate the tradition, there is virtually no description of the house. The tiny bit, just like one line in in these poems, really among many, many, lines of poetry that's written. So what is described then? Well it's all about the estate. So imagine a large country house, and in this case, not only would it have been a large house, but a large estate, in many cases, hundreds of acres, because they're out in the country, hence country house, rather than urban or city house. But what these alters want to do is talk about the landscape around there. They want to describe it in lush detail. So more point of view, from an environmental point of view, well this is interesting. The fact that they're talking about, not only the country or the landscape and features of it and trees and animals and all that, but they're also very much focusing in on the relationship of the human dwelling there, and I mean dwelling not only in the sense of the

the physical building, a house
is a dwelling,
but the way human beings dwell there,
and
Johnson will be very explicit.
He wants to make clear, he wants to talk
about that dwelling in the last line.
So, we can, we should
look at this carefully,
to talk about what the relationship is
between the human beings dwelling there
and the place itself. So a better
description
of this just to go back, would not be to
call it a country
house poem. A better description is
country estate poem, because that's
really what's being talked about, the
estate.
Or, you could say the countryside
poem. That would be a little confusing,
and the estate
is connected to the house. So I think
a better
term, even though it's not one that
doesn't common usage yet,
I think it'll become more and more
common as time goes on.
It's not really generally country
house, but country estate poems.
Cookeham, in again the date beginning of
17th century is part of the explosion of
interest in,
and pastoral. What's happening of course.
is London is growing, and I mentioned
before last lecture that we have a
population from growing from like 15
(birds just flying by here, you may have
heard them)
between hundred and seventeen hundred

populations increasing tenfold.
So lots happening in London, lots
happening and we're gonna get to Ben
Johnson, we're gonna see it,
as far as how London is experiencing
your growth of
urban expansion, and to the countryside
it's being completely changed.
People are also not happy with
city life
in different ways. Some people like it a
lot, but there's
growth of crime and growth of
other problems. Disease,
the plague still sweeps through England.
So
at this time, people are
really
writing a lot of pastoral, because
they kind of pine for the countryside,
because of the
increasingly urban life that they're
living. This doesn't mean people are
writing pastoral everywhere. People on
the rural parts of England
aren't really as much, but again as we
saw pastorals, this urban
form that likes to imagine a perfect
countryside when there
are environmental problems. These poems
are interesting from our point of view,
because we saw with pastoral before,
and I gave you an example, and I'll
remind you of it at the time,
and that was Sydney's
1579 poem, The Shepherd's
Calendar.
And I mentioned that, this is
very important pastoral,
and now putting that into the context, we

have here,
that is written just 30 years before
this,
and it was a very, very allegorical work.
Sydney, I'm sorry, Sydney, Spencer,
Spencer, also of course writes *The Fairy
Queen*, and *The Fairy Queen*
is incredibly allegorical work.
But now we're shifting to literal work
here, literal pastoral. So when we're
talking about the countryside, we're not
talking about it in a metaphorical way
as some veiled way of talking about
politics, but we're talking about the
actual countryside, and that's an
important
transition too that's happening here
with Lanier,
and with Johnson too. So Cookeham
also consciously echoes Virgil's first
eclogue, as an
an aside, I'll note here, it tells you
something about
Aemilia Lanier. Lanier is an educated
woman.
Increasingly, well it's still quite a
rarity in England at the time, but
becoming more
common that wealthy parents
would have
secured tutors to do things
like teach their daughters, in this
case,
Latin. So it's pretty clear Aemilia Lanier
has read
Virgil's first eclogue
in the original Latin.
So again, you start educating women,
you give them the ability to read these
texts and all,

then look out for what's coming, because they're going to intervene in the male tradition, and here's an example of it. So Virgil's first eclogue remember, Melabois is being kicked out of his farm. That establishes, what's often referred to as the exile motif in the west, becomes incredibly important. Writer after writer after writer, is going to have people exiled from different places for different reasons, and often consciously aware of Virgil, and doing it, and you can see echoes of Virgil in their writing. But here again, this is an all-male thing, who's being exiled? Men are being exiled. Why are they being exiled? Well, like we saw with Virgil's first eclogue, soldiers are coming home and they own property, and their property is being transferred, and it's a male thing. But here you get a woman writing, she decides to take over that tradition and the group that's being exiled are women. It's in fact that homo social group, that all female group. Even though Margaret Clifford's husband is the person who had rented the place, there's no mention of him being exiled. He's an absentee landlord, and he's not a landlord, he's an absentee renter in the sense he's never even around. So it's all about the exile of women, and again, so interesting with someone like Aemilia Lanier. So it's not only that she seeks out the ability to

become a professional writer
as a woman, we're going to see
Catherine Philips do that in
mid-century,
and become a professional writer in a
different way.

But in this case in particular,
with Lanier, she just
jumps right in, and taking this
male
tradition by the reigns and steering it
into
a female tradition.

It is new in that women are the
disenfranchised group here.
They are the ones who are being exiled,
and again as I mentioned, the state is
being leased from the crown
by Clifford's brother. I'm not sure
scholars know why, maybe they do, I'm not
sure if they do, but why Clifford wanted
to
leave the estate, to no longer rent
the estate,
but he's made that decision. And it
underscores something here, because
Margaret Clifford,
who was being talked about in
the poem,
Clifford, this wasn't her
decision. So
again, Aemilia Lanier is drawing attention
to something here,
and this is the fact that
throughout history,
men have been the ones calling the shots,
making decisions with respect to
something like this,
and Lanier is clearly focusing in on
this event

of Clifford being disenfranchised and all, to draw attention to well, how much that sucks, and how unfair that is, and how the person who really cared about this place, Margret Clifford and her entourage, how important they were to the place. And that's

Lanier

making a critique of male controlled property here, and why it's a problem, because

we're going to talk about the relationship those women had to the place, why it was so important, why they cared so much about it, and if you think about it for a moment, the guy who could have stopped all this and kept that relationship intact and all, just as sort of oblivious and

acting in a very unfortunate way, in a very worrisome way with respect to the environment.

So Lanier uses this exile motif to dramatize a sense of loss.

We saw Melibous feeling a sense of loss, and also to do what Melibous, was happening with Melibous, of course Virgil's the one doing it, to talk about the moment when the landscape moves forward.

So this is a line, 154, "placing its pleasures in your heart, Cookeham withdrawals." So what's happening here?

Well remember we talked about Virgil exploring the idea of environmental consciousness,

where Melibous suddenly has become really conscious of his environment, but at the moment of his leaving it, his withdrawal.

So the same thing is happening here.

This homo social group, and they very much

love the place where they lived, but now that they're being exiled from it, it's really coming into sharp relief.

So did they know it was there before? Sure, and remember I gave you the example of Santa Barbara, the 1969 oil spill,

sure people knew they had a beach there before. They may have walked on the beach every day,

but suddenly it seemed very different after the oil spill when they saw that they were losing their beach.

These women are losing their Cookeham.

They're

losing their home that has both nurtured them,

and they have nurtured as well. So this is

the same basic thing happening, but a little different here.

But also to underscore that using

two words that we've had, Cookeham is anthropomorphic, as described in human terms.

We've had that with

Chaucer and medieval writers, and it's also anthropocentric, and we need to be clear about the fact that it's anthropocentric, even though it's it's very much concerned about the environment. So "hills vales

and woods, as if one bend it knee." So the landscape is literally acting like a person, and it's, you wouldn't even say it's an animal here, bending its knee, because bending its knee is the idea of someone bows down before, whether an idol, a religious figure, or even a person.

"They had appeared your honor to salute."

So this is anthropomorphic.

They're acting like a human being, the futures of the environment, but also they're bowing down to a human being, so it's clearly in that tradition of being anthropocentric, what Lynne White Jr found so disturbing.

But Aemilia Lanier has a shift happening here.

Anthropocentrism, as opposed to ecocentrism, though it need not be and just to be clear, because this poem is going to spend a lot of time talking about the features of the environment and in a very

thoughtful way. So it's not eco-centric, it would be unfair to call it that.

It will, it's on the in the western tradition, we're seeing the movement toward ecocentrism

here, and I think it's fair to say that it's emerging and beginning here, although we're not there yet. Also one thing worth noting that I didn't

about the exile motif, if you remember

way back when we had Virgil,
I said to note that it's
not the case that the landscape is
being changed in a modern sense. So it's
not like there's environmental
devastation,
and as a consequence, a person develops
an environmental consciousness.
That's exactly what happened in the 1969
Santa Barbara oil spill.
Something happened to the environment.
But here,
Lanier is bringing it, and again the same
way we're moving toward ecocentrism,
she's moving toward that, because it's
not the case
that it's randomly being
changed, the environment. So
this was with Virgil's first
eclogue,
Caesar Augustus made a decision,
and that was it.
But here, something is
happening,
potentially happening to the environment
itself.
I'm going to talk about that, and that's
because Lanier,
and Clifford and their circle of
women
are no longer going to be there to
protect it. So
presumably after
Melibous left, someone took care of that
farm, and it was just the same way that
it was before
when Melibous was there, but
here we're going to see that something
different is
happening, in these women and the way

that

Aemilia Lanier portrays it, are very, very, concerned that the place will be taken care of.

And it's actually Cookeham, the estate is actually described as dying without human tending. So the notion here, is that this group of people occupying the place, and again it's an all-female group, because even though Clifford's brother might have been involved with running the place, he wasn't, and he's not here at all doing it. So in this case, and this is what's so important, and let me just jump to the next slide, which is

right here, is a form of Christian Stewardship. So what's going on there? Well remember the fear, in this sort of relationship that we saw unfolding in Genesis, is that human beings would think of the earth as inconsequential, and certainly is inferior to a metaphysical realm. So nature, phusis was seen as second raid, and we saw this very early in the term, regarding that divide between the physical and metaphysical. Here however, the physical matter is a great deal.

This whole poem was a celebration of the physical, but more to the point, from our environmental point of view, it's a celebration of what we would call nature, of trees, and hills and dales and all, the beautiful aspects

of it.

But there is a relationship being made clear here, that human beings have to that place it's not one of score and it's not seeing it as an inferior realm potentially sinful and all no, rather the relationship, and that's what this poem is sort of about, and celebrates is how that group, in this case a group of women, took care of that place, nurtured the place, made sure that it was okay.

They are protectors of place.

Hopefully that phrase just resonated with you, and remember the idea of a genus loki.

I think it's quite fair to say first, because

Aemilia Lanier, remember this is a wide read, widely read educated writer, that she knows about the protectors of place and she actually cast this homosocial group of women as the genus loki of Cookeham.

What did they do there? They just don't sit around all day and like shepherds, leaning on their shepherd's hook and singing songs. They're actively engaged in taking care of the place.

Then that raises the question, this is the question resonating throughout this work.

What happens when they leave?

Who's going to take care of the place? So is this all just metaphorical?

No, I don't think so, and we actually know

this in terms
of Ben Johnson, we're going to get to
directly,
but we know it because of the
relationship he had with his wife
and the relationship that his wife had
with
Penshurst. What I mean by that is well,
most of these country estates were owned
by
people, by men who also had homes
in the city, city home, and they would
go back and forth.
Sometimes they would spend a good bit of
time out in the country. So whenever
a major disease, especially like the
plagues swept through
London, they would hightail it
out of there and go out into the country
where they would basically shelter in
place,
in a in a sort of safer area until it
was okay to go back into the city.
They spent an awful lot of time,
generally speaking, in the city.
So what happened to the country estate?
Well,
it was very often the case that women
who were there, in the case of Johnson,
his wife, and in this case,
I'm sorry you will say the owner
Sydney of Penshurst, his wife
stayed there in the country, but here we
have this whole
group of women who are there. They are
there 24/
7, all year long, and they're
taking care of the place.
We know from the letters that the owner
of the Penshurt estate,

Sydney had with his wife, going back and forth, that she was the one involved in the day-to-day management of the estate. In other words, first off, the estate often included farms that were being leased to farm owners and all, somebody had to manage those leases and the relationship with those people and those people needed money when there were droughts and all; someone had to deal with that. Someone had to deal with the direct maintenance of the estate itself, not only the staff of the home, but the staff, the groundskeepers and all, and that was a big job, because these are big estates and who is that falling to? Well we know in the case of Penshurt, it fell to the woman managing it there. The guy who owned it, he was largely absent most of the time, and Lanier wants to draw attention to that, where the person, the guy in control of it, Clifford's brother, he's absent all the time. Who's actually taking care of this place and the day-to-day? It's the women there. So it seems like it's just metaphorical, but the fact is, that when that group gets pulled away, Lanier is right to raise the question, who's going to take care of it? They lovingly cared about this place, and now we don't know.

But again from the point of view, a bigger point of view of Christian Stewardship, this is a notion of Christianity, where the human role is to take care of the planet.

So in other words, in Genesis, human beings get dominion over the planet. Okay but what does that mean? Well, there's a lot to suggest, and Lynne White Jr wanted to underscore, especially coming out of the metaphysical tradition, that they just didn't care much about the planet at all, and the main thing we wanted to do is act well while on it, so we could get off it, and be with god forever.

Lanyer is interpreting the passages, and she's not doing it explicitly here, but it's pretty obvious of Genesis and the whole tradition differently.

In other words, yes human beings are given dominion of the planet, god creates everything, and he hands the keys to us.

But according to Lanyer, that's when it begins, because now human beings have to take care of god's creation.

I mean, god created this wonderful, beautiful, striking planet with all its wonderful nature. Who are we to destroy what god created? We should take care of it because god valued it and he gave it to us. What an incredible,

big responsibility. That's huge, and it needs to be taken care of, that the word for taking care of here is stewardship, that human beings would be the stewards, that they would take care of it. And in that reading of the bible, that's divine mandate. That's responsibility given to you by god. The interesting thing is, for over well over 2,000 years, that separates the writing of Genesis and this work, Christian stewardship doesn't really occur as a major force in thinking. So only right around now around 400 years, and arguably you can kind of go back to its epicenter, with Aemilia Lanier and suggesting that that is the role the Christians, that that defines the role the Christians have with the planet, that we are here to take care of it, and and maybe when the time comes to see if we're worthy to get into heaven, maybe god's going to be thinking about that. That he gave us the creation to take care of and what did we do with it? That's a remarkable shift in Christian thinking, and it's a remarkable shift in a very environmental direction, and this will not end with Aemilia Lanier by a long shot. This will continue. We're going to see, as we get people who are in the Christian tradition,

like Thoreau and Wordsworth,
these folks,
firmly are in this tradition, and
that's a couple hundred years later,
and it doesn't end with them.
It's alive and well today, and arguably
I would say the two most, without a
doubt,
influential Christian environmentalists,
or at least well-known today,
are Al Gore and Pope Francis.
They both are thoroughly in
the Christian stewardship
tradition. Pope Francis wrote an
amazing appeal
for Catholics to take the planet
seriously, and deal seriously with
climate change and the climate crisis. He
is thoroughly in that tradition.
So this is not just a nice little poem
here,
this is the beginning of something big,
and
something that we all should welcome
right, because coming out of this
Judeo-Christian tradition,
billions of people on the planet now
subscribe to that,
and in the sense of Catholicism,
which have around a billion
people alone on the planet who are
Catholic, it is it is absolutely
wonderful
that the person leading that
religion
is taking Christian stewardship
seriously, and even pushing it
forward. Because if not, if we
had a Christianity that's ascribed to
that older fundamentalist view, and

that's still alive and well, particularly in the United States, we would be concerned about that in terms of the climate crisis, because that group may not particularly care about doing anything to intervene and to try to slow down the crisis, but Pope Francis clearly is, and Al Gore incidentally is coming out of a Baptist tradition, which often is with like the Southern Baptist Conference in the United States, subscribe to a fundamentalist reading of the Bible, but he is not. He, like the Pope, they believe in evolution. They believe in things like that, but they're also very concerned about caring for the planet. So really important character, Aemilia Lanier. Ao Ben Johnson, oh let me just look back to that. This is published in 1616. So you could see where Aemilia Lanier would be seen as the first writer of (sorry get myself out of there) the first writer of a country estate poem, but then Johnson gets the credit for having published the first one, because Lanier just didn't get published until much later. I'm curious if you found Johnson difficult to read. I'm basically doing a check-in every now and again with writers to see. We're going to be getting to more and more modern writers and all, but really

Johnson,
can be difficult because his language,
like a lot of poetry, isn't quite
straightforward.

To put him in into context historically,
Shakespeare, you may know where he fits
in around 400 years ago or
so, there were two people in his career
that
sort of bookended his career. They were
very influential. One is
Christopher Marlowe who came before
Shakespeare, and was sort of the most
renowned playwright at the time.
When Shakespeare comes on the scene,
he's really competing with Marlowe. He
wants to be as good as Marlowe,
or as successful I guess, but there is
someone coming
after him too, and that's Ben Johnson. And
Ben Johnson also does theatrical
writing, and he becomes a real,
we don't have to get into it. They
sort of debate things out. They have
very different positions, for example,
like on
the importance of classical learning and
classical tradition that we're doing.
But Johnson does write plays, but he's
also
known for writing something called court
masques, which are theatrical entertainment
like a play, but designed just for the
court. And
in that sense, Shakespeare's
writing, you're familiar with
the Globe Theater maybe, where his
plays are being performed,
and you may know that people could
just stand there and for a very,

very small amount of money, watch a play and all.

Johnson is writing for the king, and

very high situated, highly situated people like that. So different kind of writing, but just to let where he fits in.

Penshurst is definitely in the pastoral mode. So

it is, in terms of genre, a country house poem, as was Cooke Ham, although as we noted, it's better to characterize that as a country a state poem. But like Cooke Ham, it's clearly in the

pastoral mode. And what's so interesting, and it underscores how much pastoral and the environment means in this writing, is that the house is largely absent from Penshurst too.

The focus shifts from house to surrounding in

in both poems. That's why they are readily

called "country estate poems."

So, what's interesting is Penshurst is highly critical

of houses that were being built in the day.

They were called prodigy houses.

We know them more commonly as like trophy house. You may

know them even more commonly by the more recent term, which is mcmansion.

So what are these? Well right now, we at this period of time, 400 years ago, we have an explosion

of an emerging middle class. These are people

who did not necessarily get their money

by
the way that most people had
traditionally done, people with money.
So people with money traditionally
landed gentry. People have had money for
generation and generation,
old money that's passed on, principally
in land and all. So like
huge country estate which has,
some of these can be very, very, large,
thousands and thousands of acres,
many little farms, and at this point in
time especially,
those little farmers would all be
paying rent to the landowner, and
landowners would have lots of money
because of that. And they don't really
have to work much because they've
inherited all this wealth. But
there's an emerging group of people
coming on the scene that are making
their money and things like trade and
all, can
trade from other parts of the world, and
also
emerging manufacturing. We're not at the
so-called industrial revolution
yet, but we are at the point where we
have proto-industrial practices,
Textiles are incredibly huge in England,
even at this period.
So you have this new group coming on the
scene, merchants and the like who are
making lots of money, and they want to
signal the fact that
basically, they've arrived. And
you can buy
lots of little things like jewelry and
wear lots of fancy clothes,
but the way then seemingly, the

way now, to signal that you've arrived is to have a really big house, ostentatiously big house that shows off that you've arrived, and that's what mcmansion is, that notion. So Johnson is critical of these, and from the very beginning he talks about it. So he's talking about Penshurt here, but notice that the house of Penshurt isn't described it is sort of negatively described, because we're talking about these prodigy houses, these mcmansions, and what they're like. "So thou art not Penshurt," you're not like one of these mansions, because what are they? They're built to envy a show. They're built to be showy and ostentatious and they're built because you want people to envy the money that you have. When you drive by and look at your mcmansion, they go wow I wish I had that kind of money, or you don't have to drive by anymore, you can watch the videos of a Kardashian house. So what are they like? They're of touch or marble. Touch is like another type of marble. So these houses, one of the first things you want to do to show you have a lot of money is use really expensive material. What could be better, like imported marble, bring marble in from by ship from Italy. Wow you must have a lot of money to do

that.

And they're big. They have a whole row of polish pillars. So out in front they look like a classical building, like a Greek building with these pillars all out front.

Or a roof of gold, and yes people were actually putting gold on their roof. So using gold leaf like on tiles with trims, so that especially when the sun hits it, these houses would be glistening with gold. I mean if you can't show that you're wealthy in any other way, I think there's nothing beats wrapping your house in gold as much as possible, "or has the lantern whereof tails are told."

That lantern is kind of just. you'd have to know the period, and I'll explain.

Even today mcmansions often have like turrets, that round thing going up like a little tower.

Well that was a conspicuous feature of these prodigy houses, mcmansions of the day, and often ending in an all glass thing at the top surrounding. And what would happen is there'd be like a lamp in there at night that would burn, so that from miles away you could see the house here.

So you may have noticed today that some prodigy houses they have lighting out in the landscape at nighttime. The interesting thing the

lighting doesn't always
draw attention, you would think to
beautiful trees and the features and all,
but the lights are
turned on the house itself, to shine on
the house, so you can see the house,
so that it is not only
ostentatious and obviously during the
day, but we're trying to make it
ostentatious at night,
and this same thing is happening
here, except not with
spotlights cast on it, but in fact with a
lantern that was made to show it all
night long.
And what's it all about, so that
tales are told about it,
so just like new house gets
built in a
in a community and everyone is talking
about, did you see that house, how big it
is,
You have the marble. There's gold. It's
got one of those big turrets.
That's the idea. You want everybody
talking about the fact that you have
lots and lots of money.
The problem is at the time, especially
prodigy houses, could not be sustained by
their
surrounding resources. So, if you were
like a landed gentry person,
and the person who owns this
Robert Sydney, so Ben Johnson writes the
poem
of an estate owned by Robert Sydney. You
couldn't do that, so Sydney had money and
all, but
to incorporate all this incredibly
wealthy things, and people

did it, you would you would literally harm the environment. So let me explain that, give you an example. So right about this time, right at this time, lumber for example, is incredibly expensive. Why that happens is we saw that Londoners were burning coal and all. that's because they deforested, as I mentioned, the area around London. What that meant was, the cost of lumber, or the cost of wood, from 1550 to 1620, it's right the time this is written, it increased faster than any commodity in western history, pretty much, and what that meant was, if you owned like a wooded area or an estate anywhere near London, you were in possession of a lot of money, because it's not just people wanting it to burn that wood, but they wanted it for other things like furniture and houses and all, and a really large number for things like making mass for ships, which are incredibly important, as England is really moving out into the oceans now. So what people would do, is they'd buy a country estate, and the first thing they would do is to mine the resources, so to speak of the place by doing things like clear-cutting the forests and all, stands of woods that you had, because you can make a lot of money. You could take that money

and put it right into the house, and that's what people were doing. So you could see an enormous interest in the house, but caring less about the surrounding environment. Ben Johnson wants to draw attention to the fact that this house, which we never see described, for good reason, which I'll say directly, has an explosion of life around it, "a joy'st in better marks... of air of water or wood," because it's surrounded by this explosion of life. So yes, the house compared to these ostentatious trophy houses, isn't going to compare. It doesn't have marble and gold and all that, but what it has is a remarkable surrounding estate, and that estate has never been touched, and Johnson wants to be clear about the fact that there are still, old gross forests there and all. So this is the kind of new architecture coming online. This is actually a home. This is a royal residence in Hampton court. You can see it's designed to be huge and massive. Note the landscape here that is carefully cultivated and this would be another example where trees are actually being shaped, and we're going to see topiaries and all involved here too. This is what is fashionable at the time. And you remember I mentioned when we had

Chaucer, that England was sort of the backwater of Europe, and it really kind of paled by comparison to to like Paris, or especially art wise in the Renaissance with Italy. So England, still feeling that sort of anxiety when they wanted something really great, like architecture, they still went to the continent, and they still went for like Italian inspired architecture like this. And this is again, another view of Hampton court and the estate, and notice the the sort of way it's carefully crafted. This is the actual house at Penshurst. 400 years later, it's still it's still there. It's like 20 miles south of London. You can go visit it, and I think this this photo sums up what Johnson is trying to to portray in words. Also let me just see if I can slightly move down here, sorry. The house is sort of almost lost in the environment, the real emphasis here is on the beautiful environs. Note the old growth trees along here, we didn't see anything like that in Hampton court because everything had been cut down, and that was a conspicuous feature of these sort of things, that everything was cut down. This is a wonderful, one of the reasons I selected this photo, a wonderful pastoral scene, because hey there are your sheep, and they're grazing. This is

it, but just look at that picture.
It's meant to be,
at least for a big country house of
state, a house in harmony with nature.
That's the idea.
Again, exactly the opposite of
what's happening
in the trophy houses.
So this is the beginning of something
that we're going to see
emerge kind of fully formed with
really modern environmental thinking
with Henry David Thoreau, which won't
come for another
250 odd years, almost 250 years
later,
but keep in mind though, that
Thoreau actually takes it to its logical
conclusion,
and a little building, that's like a tiny
house today,
about the size of a garden shed really,
that's not
Penshurst. It is still a large building and
it's still in the state,
it is only comparatively smaller than
the large country houses and
the estate may be natural, but the house
is not
so natural. And in that sense, as I
note here, one is an ideal,
in that Johnson would like
to see
a state house, a smaller and more
emphasis on the estates,
but Thoreau says well, what if we took
that to its logical conclusion,
and I just want to just show you that,
because I don't want you
to think that this is sort of the end

game on how to
live most environmentally
soundly with respect to an environment.
Thoreau
is moving more in that direction. So,
sorry my
Prezi is a little off here today, see if
I can move this down.
So,
this is of course, that view we had of
Penshurst,
but this is actually it from the
front, and it's looking
more like Hampton court there.
It's more
cultivated and all, so this is, the
other viewers looking behind.
This is Thoreau's cabin. So looking at that
building and that home, and that home
two completely different things. That's
actually a reconstruction of his home.
This is the site where it really was. You
can see it's in
the middle of a it, was a kind of a
freshly.
a new growth forrest. We'll talk
all about that when we get to Thoreau,
and this is the inside of it with
Thoreau's bed, his fireplace where he is
cooking, his desk for writing, and his
famous three chairs, and we'll get into
all that.
So yeah,
it's an important work, To Penshurst,
but
it's just in a transitional way.
Remember we had, very beginning of the
term, the
introductory lecture, I had
Nickelback song,

Rockstar, and the line in it is, "I want a bathroom so big I can play baseball in it."

So, it's already in Penshurt, and we're going to see more of this as we continue. As we hover here in the early modern period, there's a critique of excessive consumption, and this is really emerging capitalism happening at the time here.

So this sort of new group of people, merchant class and all, aggregating tons of money, that's going to be more and more common, and as it is happening, there are going to be people like Ben Johnson to draw attention to it and its problems, and they're going to, and this is notable for us in the case of Johnson, do it on environmental grounds.

That all this consumption has huge environmental consequences that, yes you can have the fanciest house around and all, and you can bring in imported materials, and that'll be great, but what are the environmental consequences of it? We can ask that question in a big global way now, and the other class I teach, The Climate Crisis: what it is what each of us can do about it, we do just that. But here Johnson is laying it out nice and neat for you, because it's all contained in this one estate. There's the house at Penshurt, and the estate looks great

because nobody is involved with excessive consumption. Again, you have to give them a little bit of latitude there because it's still a pretty big house, and still a pretty nice way of living, but compared to these other trophy houses, these McMansions of their day, it's not very big and opulent at all, and that and as was typical at the time, literally to get some of the money that you would need to build those houses, you would have to overtax the resources of the place, and Johnson wants to make clear that the Penshurst estate is not only not overtaxed, but let's look at it very sort of sustainable. But again I just want to make clear, in the same way we saw the comparison of the two houses, the underlying idea here is that it's a more sustainable way of living. It in an absolute sense, it's still problematic, so let's not forget that, but the notion here is that excessive consumption is a problem. Yeah, we know that Thoreau read Penshurst and other country estate poems. So, it's not just that this work shows up, and no one thinks about it. People spend a lot of time thinking about this particular poem and its environmental significance. To Penshurst, here's just like we saw with Aemilia Lanier and Cookeham, it explores

modern environmental consciousness.
But here is something
different is happening.
So with the emerging environmental
consciousness that we first saw
with Melabois, the character in Virgil's
first eclogue,
he of course is changing place, the
place isn't really changing.
Johnson wants to draw attention to the
fact that the place
is changing. That there's a lot happening
at this point in time in England,
and especially right around London in
its larger suburbs, which is what this is,
a lot is happening. These
estates are being bought, they're being
clear-cut and this is causing a real
problem.
You could look at any suburban expansion,
whether the
first major one in the mid 18th
century, mid 19th century, which is
the Thoreau's era, to the big one which is mid
19th century, mid 20th century, after the
second world war. The suburbs
are going to be a site of
a great deal of environmental change and
arguably degradation.
Johnson is drawing attention to that
here. We know we don't want,
you don't necessarily think about
suburban expansion outside of,
after the second world war in the US,
but here's a round of it happening 400
years ago.
So he looks to
here in Penshurt, both to endangered and
pristine environments.
Penhurst would have us look

to
endangered and pristine environments at
the same time. So
in its opening, Johnson immediately
directs us to the endangered landscape.
So we saw with pastoral, what's
happening
is that often, it's written
about the city,
it's written about the countryside and
all, but really what is being addressed
are the problems of the city
in a massed way by talking about
something else entirely.
Johnson is not doing that. Johnson is
doing something similar, we saw Ed
Bertinski doing with those large-scale
photographs that he has,
and he's looking right at the site of
environmental devastation. So
right at the first line, he's looking at
those estates, those McMansions, those
and he's finding them as being
problematic, and
that's newish on the scene, that we find
pastoral looking right at
environmental devastation rather than
running away from it and imagining,
running away from
urban devastation problems and imagining
a beautiful countryside.
This is the way Johnson imagines it.
And I think it's important sort of
epistemologically as the way he gets
knowledge of it.
He wants us to think something like
this is
arguably the greatest residence in
the
architectural resonance in the United

States, which is in Fallingwater
Pennsylvania by Frank Lloyd Wright.
Wright clearly wanted that house to fit
into its environs. He built it over top
of the stream,
and it's made to fit in, and uses natural
material there and all.
Is that the way the Penshurst estate
looks?
Not really, but it's
important to understand conceptually
that's the way
Johnson imagines it. And that's important
because
people like Johnson were asking the
question: how could human beings live
in the most natural way, and the most
accord with nature, in the most
sustainable way?
And that is a really fascinating issue
to be happening
400 years ago. People before were not
raising that question.
Johnson wants to raise it. Johnson will
be influential directly on people like
Thoreau, who will influence Muir, who'll
influence
people like Frank Lloyd Wright, who will
actually then,
just like Thoreau, but in an entirely
different kind of way,
imagine what a resonance, what a dwelling
would be, that was
in accord with nature, to be most natural,
and that's
it. It also gestures to the natural
material, go back and just show that,
the same stone that is
literally
here in that stream bed we're locally

quarried to give the stone
here and all. You look at that
stone, but it's meant to make you look at
the rest of the stone.

Here's a more obvious example I took
hiking in England,
where you have this stone wall
here, it's almost indistinguishable from
the natural outcropping of stone.

The goal in this, if you're going to have
a dwelling that's in accord with nature,
is to have it as much as possible
like this,

where the two are almost
indistinguishable. If you looked quickly
you might not realize,
one is a human creation the other is
entirely natural.

So hence the house itself
is making a gesture. So in the
case of falling water,
it's meant to draw attention to the
countryside, that's
the purpose of it, and
Johnson sees that as an
important role
in play. So it's not just that it is
sustainable and accord with the
environment,

it wants you to turn away from human
inhabitation and look to the
surroundings and focus on that,
and that's what that poem does. That's
what Aemilia Lanier's description of
Cookeham does,
and you can see why it's moving toward
biocentrism, because it is not a
celebration of human inhabitation and
human dwelling
at all, but a celebration of something

outside of it.

Again, important milestone poems for this reason,

and Penshurst makes a similar gesture,

at least the way Johnson imagines them.

We always have to kind of bracket it off, because

Thoreau is going to be doing something different was his dwelling, his house at Walden pond, and certainly Frank Lloyd Wright is going to be doing something different with

house and Fallingwater, but

it's making a gesture to the pristine environment, and it wants us to look there.

That's what Thoreau wants you to do;

that's what Frank Lloyd Wright wants

you to do. He want you to look at

nature, and think about the relationship that human dwelling

has to nature. Dwelling, not just again. in the sense of a building, but

dwelling the house, which we've been looking at with these different houses,

but the act of dwelling there, the act of inhabitation there, what is that like and

is it sustainable?

So we have one last character. You may have heard of him,

William Shakespeare. Did you find

Shakespeare difficult to read?

Curious. He's again 400 years

in the past. People, you probably

have encountered him, may have

encountered him in high school.

Shakespeare gets a lot of play still 400 years later.

Just curious about that. So

As You Like It takes place in a forest, and this was actually a real forest in Worcester England, and if you were to ask people in England, can you tell me what you think would be a really natural place in England, and they may not have given pastoral landscapes like maybe in the lake district or something, but the answer they may have given you would have been a place like the Forest of Arden, because it's in part, an old gross forest. So, to Shakespeare's audience, in setting it there in the Forest of Arden, he's really setting it, we'll get to this word, but what he would think, many people would have thought of a sort of wilderness at the time. This is a picture of it. Sorry for the grainy picture, I couldn't get very many, I couldn't find a good picture of the Forest of Arden today, and this is another picture of it. Sorry for being in the scene there. This also underscores that it's not just all forest, but it also kind of a pastoral landscape too. You may note, this looks a lot like the scene I showed you of Penshurt. So it is in part a pastoral place too, and not entirely without human habitation, but in England, national parks and all can be that way, and we'll see this later when we get to Wordsworth.

So
what Shakespeare wants to do is to
reveal that our perception of the
environment are not only
influenced by works of art like pastoral,
but these perceptions
differ. What I mean by that is, if you
would,
if your encounter with
landscapes was just mediated by pastoral,
so in other words, you live in a city, and
you just have read about pastoral,
when you actually go out and see these
places, you might have
seen them just the way these
artists, these pastoral artists
had portrayed them. But there are other
ways of perceiving the landscape
too, and what Shakespeare wants to do is
draw attention to that.
And what makes Shakespeare so important,
his intervention in this particular
play,
is that he wants to draw attention to a
basic fact,
and that is, there is no one
landscape or one nature.
You could have a range of different
people all looking at the same exact
thing,
but they're all going to see different
things, and that's exactly what we have
happening in this play here.
It is
pastoral, but Shakespeare is,
as you may guess, because of his
fame, there's a reason for
it. He's a sophisticated writer.
Early on, he wrote *The Two Gentlemen of
Verona*, often called *The Two Gents of*

Verona, which is an early pastoral, which like we saw, I alluded to with Spencer and all, very sort of allegorical, but very much in the pastoral tradition. I mean past Shakespeare, has read all these other pastoral writers, he wants to show that he can do it too.

He does it, he's like them, but the pastoral, they're going to get in *As You Like It* is more complicated, because we are going to see different members, different city dwellers, and people who are actually from the country, and that's new, that we actually have characters from the country talking about the Forest of Arden, so let's look at those different views of pastoral.

So first, we have this one from Duke Senior, and let me scroll, move this down a little, oh

that's not what I wanted to do, that's more like what I wanted.

I'm not going to read all this through, because

you have the option of hitting the pause button and reading it,

but we have here with Duke Senior, and he's a member of the court.

He sees this place in a very pastoral way,

and why does he do that? Well, because he's read a lot of pastoral literature.

The only thing he doesn't do quite pastorally here,

he has to reconcile in his mind. So pastoral is coming out

of this Greco-Roman tradition,
geography-wise Greece and Rome are both
obviously on the Mediterranean.

You have a very pastoral kind of climate
there, and not unlike what we have here
in Santa Barbara.

They're all the same
basic climate,
where you don't have really cold weather,
it's almost
never happens, you would have snow in
Santa Barbara.

Once when I've lived here, and on the
number of years, I'd be sure,
I saw snow up on the mountains, but that
that was rare,
and not here downtown. So the cold winter
is just something that you don't quite
have here in the way you would have and
throughout the rest of
Europe, because the
they were truly Mediterranean
climates. The duke has to
reconcile his pastoral belief, about what
the countryside is like was the fact
that it's cold,
and he says well, the cold here
is different, but

I actually like the cold, and I'm
paraphrasing what he's saying here.
Because when I freeze and
shiver, it makes me realize how
wonderful the warmth is and all, and
the cold sort of educates me
on how to see the
the rest of the world. So that's
clever I think but again
other than that Shakespeare coming up
with the workaround to deal with the
fact that he's not in the Mediterranean

climate here.

This guy sees the world through pastoral eyes. He, and that's remarkable right, because he's faced with the reality of what this forest is like, but he's not seeing it as a reality he's seeing it through the eyes of artists who have been doing pastoral for a long time.

This is the Duke again, "under the greenwood tree." So if you go back and look at the

introduction, the first lines of Virgil's first eclogue, it talks about the greenwood tree, and Shakespeare wants to be very clear, this guy has been reading a lot of pastoral literature, and he's actually writing about it. So remember

the sort of pre-formal pastoral that I gave you, that wonderful poem by Sappho from the 7th century before the Christian era: "come hither come hither," "come hither come hither come hither."

Shakespeare is making sure, this guy, he's read Virgil's first eclogue, he's read probably Sappho, and he's thoroughly into that, and as a consequence, the environment that he sees before him

is that he that's his preconceived notion, and that's what he carried into the forest.

Again, I won't read this all for you. You can pause and read it, and hopefully you will.

Jacquez, another character, and he's

interesting because he represents an emerging group at the time who are concerned about wilderness and especially about animals, and even animal rights.

So this is a period in time where vegetarianism is actually beginning to take off among certain groups. Now don't get me wrong, it's not the nationwide trend sweeping England. Everyone's not becoming a vegetarian, but the vegetarians are on the scene. They are writing and all.

That he wants to argue here, Jacques here, is that the people who are in this forest are mere usurpers.

They are not the actual residents of this place. Who are the residents of this place?

The animals who live there, and he is very concerned, and the scene in particular about them being killed and all. So how unjust it is that this very natural scene, which is inhabited by a range of wonderful beings are now being hunted and killed by these usurpers, who don't belong there.

So the Duke sees the Forest of Arden through pastoral eyes. It conforms to his view of literary representation of pastoral, except for the cold, and he can work that out.

Now Jacques here, this is you can see him, you can see in him the beginning of a modern environmentalist ethic, where people would say, "yeah the best thing we can do with wilderness is

to leave it alone,
to block it off, and not to go there, and
if we do visit it, like
in a national park, we should be
very careful about how we visit it and
how we interact with animals and all.”
This is modern. It's even more modern
than someone like Teddy Roosevelt. who
would be
playing instrumental role in setting up
the national parks in the US, because
Roosevelt saw them it's a place where
you could go hunting and all,
sort of like a game reserve. Other
people like John Muir and all, weren't of
that mind. They thought it should be left
alone. We certainly shouldn't be there,
and they're killing animals and all.
Where does that view begin? Well you can
kind of trace it back and see that
Shakespeare doesn't create it here,
Shakespeare is taking
views that are out in the world, and he
pays attention to what's going on in the
world,
and he wants to talk about the different
ways people can view the environment. He
knows people are thinking about it this
way.
So he puts one of those people into the
actual
forest there.
Another one is Touchstone, “but now I am
an Arden the more full I am. When I was
at home, I was in a better place, but
travelers must be content.” So he's saying
he'd liked it at home
more than the Forest of Arden, but we'll
hear a little more from him.
And again, I won't read this here, but

he says, he actually is
debating back and forth, so in respect
that, this is a private place.
I like the fact that it's
private, that it's
respected the solitary. I like it very
well. So I'm quiet here alone, but the
fact that it's private, I don't like it. I
like being back in the city where there
are lots of people and things are more
exciting,
and he goes back and forth.
The fact that it's
sort of spartan life he likes it, but
it
fits my humor well. This
is here, but
there that there's not more plenty of
it, goes against my stomach." Well if
you're in London, you could
go into any pub and get food everywhere
at all; this is not like that.
So Touchstone, his view is, in in a way
I would argue, a more considered view,
in that
he is going back and forth,
saying the good and bad of it and all. So
it's not like he's idolizing it like the
Duke,
or it's not like he's seeing in a
certain kind of a consistent way,
as does Touchstone as well, but he's sort
of going back and forth on it here.
And again the third person looking at
the same exact forest, seeing it in
different ways.
Orlando introduces yet another view, a
forest view here,
and he thinks in "this uncouth
forest

cheer thyself a little and
uncouth forest yield anything
savage, it'll either be food for it or
bring it for food to thee.”
So he thinks of the forest as a scary
place,
a savage place, and that's not a pastoral
view. A pastor also the
countryside is nice and welcoming, but
what that is very consistent
with the way people, especially in the
countryside, would have seen
like a Forest of Arden. This would have
been a place where there were wild
animals, and until
just a few centuries before England had
a real wolf problem. So you would be
killed by these wild animals. In fact, one
of England's great achievements
of the time
was to eradicate the wolf and to
hunt it into extinction, and
made it seemingly a safer place to be.
But if you actually went, and people were
in the 17th century, going to places
like Italy and crossing over really
wilderness areas like the alps and all.
People saw them as immensely frightening
and dangerous,
and forests in general were seen as
dangerous, not because of wild animals
and getting lost and
problems like that, but because that's
where bad people hung out too.
So the story of Robin Hood,
Robin Hood of course, is a good criminal.
But real criminals would go like to
force, because you were outside the reach
of law, and you can do whatever you want.
And in fact, if you're a wealthy person,

if you're really any person,
if you were traveling through like a
deep forest, you would want to go with an
armed guard, because
that's where criminals would, if
they were going to
hijack you or attack you, steal from you
or do whatever,
that's where they would do it, because
that's
where it was, the place where
their law didn't reach.
So most people, the idea is and Orlando
is representative of that,
not that it's a wonderful
pastoral place or a wonderful wilderness,
but instead, it's a really
frightening and dangerous place, and
the other scene you have here, and I
won't read it, this is where he
encounters the Duke and his court,
and he actually is startled
speaking, so gently in other words
gently meaning you talk like a gentleman.
"Pardon me I pray I thought that
everybody here was a savage." When I
encountered a bunch of guys here in the
forest
I just assumed you were a bunch of
criminals and you were
uneducated and all, but gosh darn you're
a gentleman and all,
what a surprise is that. And
he says, I
put my sword away I'm surprised. I
thought this was
not a nice place at all. Think about that
though,
as a view of the environment. That's
a striking one. To think in the

environment
and wilderness as a dangerous place. So
to
Orlando's point of view, going to a place
like Yosemite,
which today we see is like
the height of
wilderness and beautiful nature
and all
splendor, To Orlando, that would be like
the biggest, scariest place you could
possibly imagine.
But he's not just a caricature in this
poem, that's probably the way,
that is the way that the overwhelming
number of people in Europe
would have seen wilderness as a scary
place at the time.
The fact that it's shifted into our
day is fascinating,
and we will be looking at that shift
and where it occurs.
So Corinne is a is a fascinating
character to show up. So we're about
number five now as far as characters, and
there are more that we don't even get to.
Shakespeare really wants to explore all
these subject positions,
but all the pastoral literature we've
had here is an
actual shepherd. This guy is an actual
rural farm worker, and
I won't read his speech here. I
hope you do.
He talks about the fact that he doesn't
have a very nice life. He doesn't own the
land that he's on,
and when he meets these people from
the court who need help,
and they say will you help us? He said

how can I help you? I am
so poor. I don't own this land, I
can't really do anything,
and as is the plate with rural
farm workers like me,
my master, the person who actually
owns this property, is
that land gentry person,
is of a churlish disposition. He's not
nice at all.

So he's not known for hospitality.
So this is what shepherds
really are like. They are not people
happy, singing poems and having a good
time and having a life characterized by
odium.

As people like Raymond Williams have
argued, the
rural farm workers and all,
sort of had the same fate as what we
think of as the proletariat,
and that would be like urban
factory workers and all.

But the gulf between people who had
money and people were actually working
was

huge, even in rural places like this.

So to Raymond Williams writing
like in the 1970s as a cultural Marxist,
a cultural critic, but Shakespeare was
aware of that 400

years ago, that there was a vast
injustice, and the people who actually
lived out on the countryside did not
live this wonderful pastoral existence
at all,

and to prove that too, he's going to put
one of those people

Korin, who's into my way, I think one
of the most sympathetic people

in the text. So Shakespeare wants us to make us aware that we all see the environment differently, and these we would call them subject positions, go from overly idealizing it like the Duke, to seeing it in terms of the really harsh realities of life for the rural working class. And it is a great observation to make because, that's still today. When someone looks at the forest, a forest or natural resources, what do we see and why? And just to conclude this, go back to our beginning again, (oh sorry I want to just go back here then). To conclude this, you can (have glare on here for some reason, not know why that is) but anyhow, so this makes clear that these are done with sort of live streaming technology, and I'm not doing a lot of post-production with these videos, but it makes clear that the environment is not something that is the same for every person, that different people will view it in different ways given their subject positions. That is an important insight in Shakespeare's partner. He really wants to drive that home, but it's important for one, for us to leave with today to think about what that means.

So in other words, someone goes up and you see Alaska, parts of Alaska, it's incredibly still wilderness and incredibly beautiful. You may go up there and see that and think wow, this true wilderness, true nature. This is maybe one of the most precious places on earth.

Someone else will go up there and say, this is one of the most precious places on earth, because it's sitting on top of vast stores of oil that we could pump up and mine, and we could deforest that to get to the oil, and you could think who would ever do that, but look at the boreal forest in like the Alberta tar sands.

That is being cut down now, and the beautiful forest cut down to get what's underneath of it, which is the tar sands, which is this oil rich sand that can be extracted, oil can be extracted from. So different people look at the environment very differently, still happens today, 400 years after Shakespeare drew attention to it, and it can have profound environmental consequences.

So we're going to stay in the renaissance a little longer at the next lecture, but I hope you see that it really is also a truly early modern period where modern things are emerging, both regarding insights regarding the

environment,
regarding the way that we interact with
it, whether we're stewards of it, or
whatever.

So an interesting period. I hope you're
enjoying it. So
I'll see you next time.