ALEXANDER KLING

Action, Framework, and the Poetics of "Co-Making": A Testing Device for Ecological Narratives

The Law of Ecology and the Precept of Ecological Texts

The following considerations are dedicated to the question of how ecological fabrics, i.e., structures (in)formed by ecological principles, can be narrated. My starting point is the first law of ecology formulated by Barry Commoner in *The Closing Circle* (1971), and the first precept of ecologically oriented texts Lawrence Buell describes in *The Environmental Imagination* (1995).[1] Commoner and Buell both name four aspects to mark their understanding of ecology and ecologically oriented texts respectively. All these aspects deserve a closer look, but I will focus my considerations in each case on the first point.

Commoner's first law of ecology reads as follows: "Everything Is Connected to Everything Else" (33). Based on this, an ecological fabric is primarily distinguished by complexity: Ecological fabrics are assemblies of "different living organisms, and between populations, species, and individual organisms and their physico-chemical surroundings," which all together constitute an "elaborate network of interconnections in the ecosphere" (33). Furthermore, Commoner sees ecological fabrics as controlled by a cybernetic system that operates through the processes of a stable instability, for example in the relationship of predators and prey. However, an anomalous imbalance in this relationship can cause the "collapse" (35) of the whole ecological fabric; usually this is triggered through "external effect[s]," since for the self-regulation-processes of the ecological fabric it is more difficult to keep these unfamiliar factors—in particular the influence of man—"in balance" (36). Finally, it is important that the examination of the entanglements of ecological fabrics can take place on different levels of complexity. For instance, the relationship of predator and prey depends on a series of other factors of interrelations which Commoner illustrates with the metaphor of the net:

> Most ecosystems are so complex that the cycles are not simple circular paths, but are crisscrossed with branches to form a network or a fabric of interconnections.

---

[1] To be precise, Buell speaks of an "environmentally oriented work" (7). For the distinction between the prefixes "eco-" and "enviro-;" cf. Bühler 34-35.

> Like a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads—which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." (38)

For Commoner the complex interrelations between heterogeneous entities are a mark of stability. By contrast, "[e]nvironmental pollution" is mainly due to the fact that the ecological fabric "has been artificially simplified and made more vulnerable to stress and to final collapse" (38).

Buell's first precept of ecologically or rather "environmentally oriented work[s]" in turn reads as follows: "*The nonhuman environment is present not merely as a framing device but as a presence that begins to suggest that human history is implicated in natural history*" (7). Central to Buell's argument is a rewriting of American history, a reassessment of events, texts, and ideas that are less concerned with human relations but rather with the relations of people and their environment. The environment thus takes on the role of a historical actor—it shapes the course of history and is at the same time shaped by historical processes. Therefore, the environment is not just the decorative backdrop, "the framing device," of "human history" (7). However, the question arises whether and, if so, how texts conceptualize the role of the environment as an active agent.

In this context Buell differentiates between two poles—the representation of environmental issues is "at least faintly present in most texts but salient in few" (7). Buell's distinction points towards the fact that in most fictional and nonfictional texts nonhuman entities are neither the main focus of representation nor active forces of historical processes. Rather textual representation is aligned with the creation of a setting for the drama of man. Buell explains the outlined distinction with recourse to his first precept as well as to some examples. On the one hand, Charles Dickens' *Martin Chuzzlewit* "barely qualifies [as an environmentally oriented work], since the American West is little more than a backdrop for Martin's picaresque misadventures" (7). On the other hand, "E. M. Forster's *Passage to India* clearly would, for it reflects at every level a version of the theory of determinism by climate posited by discredited police commissioner MacBryde: Forster seems seriously to consider that difference in latitude shapes emotions, behavior, art" (7).

With Commoner's first law and Buell's first precept, two consequences for an ecological narrative become visible. First, ecological narratives have to demonstrate the complex relationships between heterogeneous entities. Second, this leads to the abandonment of the distinction between foreground and background, as well as between action and framework, which are fundamentally organized by the difference between (active) human and (passive) nonhuman beings. In order to continue these considerations, I will proceed

from the concepts of ecopoetics und zoopoetics and one of their central features—the "co-making" of humans and nonhumans. Afterwards I will try to develop a kind of testing device for ecological narratives, namely on the ground of a conjunction of actor-network-theory and narratology. Finally, I will explain this testing device on the basis of two novels from the genre of *Heimatliteratur*.

Ecopoetics, Zoopoetics and "Co-Making"

Reflection on the forms of ecological narratives seems important to me not least because the founding texts for the concepts of ecopoetics and zoopoetics frequently refer to a different literary genre: lyrical poetry.[2] To track the link of eco- and zoopoetics with lyrical poetry for a moment, I draw on one example—the German nature poet Wilhelm Lehmann (1882-1967). Lehmann is a co-founder of the *Naturmagische Schule* and his poems and essays have been influential for the post-war generation of German (nature) poets like Günter Eich and Peter Huchel. Although in the second half of the twentieth century Lehmann's poems and essays have been gradually superseded by a more politically oriented poetry in the tradition of Bertolt Brecht, it is nonetheless fair to say that an ecocritical rediscovery of his texts has taken place recently.[3] I will only focus on two aspects of Lehmann's theory of nature poetry. First, Lehmann understands poems as ecological fabrics. Here, too, everything (i.e., every word) is connected to everything else, and the creation of an "equilibrium" is the "highest achievement of poetry which does not allow a judgment like: in any poem this or that single line delights the reader, because all singularity loses itself into the whole like the leaf into the tree"[4] (301). Second, Lehmann repeatedly emphasizes the moment of the world, for example in the shape of the cuckoo, articulating itself in

---

[2] This applies at least to the research contributions of Scigaj, Gilcrest, and Moe, which are briefly considered in my following argumentation.

[3] For example, since 2005 the Wallstein Verlag has published a *Wilhelm-Lehmann-Yearbook* under the title "Sichtbare Zeit."

[4] "Solches Gleichgewicht, wobei weder das eine noch das andere sich vordrängt, ist die höchste Leistung der Dichtung, die dann ein Urteil wie: an irgendeinem Gedicht freue diese oder jene Zeile, gar nicht erlaubt, weil alle Einzelheit sich in das Ganze wie das Blatt in den Baum verliert." If not indicated otherwise, all translations from the German are my own.

poetry—"Poetry is everywhere onomatopoeia …"[5] (304). What Lehmann is expressing here is poetry's rejection of the "generalizing tendency" of language which leads—due to its terms in the collective singular ("man," "tree," "animal")—to a restriction of "the abundance of beings and things"[6] (347). Poetic language is thus directed towards the concrete and the unique; it works in language against language, and in this way it fulfills, according to Lehmann's poetical concept, the function of ecological compensation: "The sewage of civilization, politics, technology, commerce are increasingly contaminating meaning and language. A successful poem is the best disinfectant against such pollution"[7] (354).

These brief reflections should suffice as a hint at the fact that each literary genre has its own ecological dimension which needs to be examined by investigating representatives, as well as the poetology, of a genre. In the context of this article, I will focus my considerations on the ecological dimension of narrative texts.

However, with regard to Lehmann's poetry theory, it should be added that it is quite remarkable that he understands poetic language—together with its attention to the relationship of the individual and the whole, its sense for the concrete and the unique, and its compensatory function against the contamination of civilization—as a form of dwelling in the world. Thus, Lehmann's texts are located in a close proximity to Martin Heidegger's reflections on poetry and dwelling which he found, for instance, in the poems of Friedrich Hölderlin. Beyond that, Heidegger's reflections on this topic are a central, albeit critical reference point for the theories of ecopoetics (Bühler 142-46). I will now examine theories of ecopoetics in more detail and link them with theories of zoopoetics in order to present an explanation concerning the genre of "ecological narrative" and to discuss how such narratives can be investigated with the means literary studies provide.

Primarily, it is important to consider that the terms ecopoetics and zoopoetics are both to be understood in a double sense. On the one hand, the

---

[5] "So leicht allerdings wie der Kuckuck, der uns selbst seinen Namen souffliert, macht es uns der übrige Welthausrat nicht, aber Dichtung ist überall Onomatopöie und lockt selbst dem Schweigen Stimme ab."

[6] "Der Sprache wohnt als solcher eine verallgemeinernde Tendenz inne: in weitester Abstraktheit kann sie, mit Vernachlässigung der Einzelheit, sehr ausgebildet, die Fülle der Wesen und Dinge in 'Mensch', 'Baum', 'Tier' abkürzen."

[7] "Solches Gleichgewicht, wobei weder das eine noch das andere sich vordrängt, ist die höchste Leistung der Dichtung, die dann ein Urteil wie: an irgendeinem Gedicht freue diese oder jene Zeile, gar nicht erlaubt, weil alle Einzelheit sich in das Ganze wie das Blatt in den Baum verliert."

terms are applied to literary, essayistic and theoretical texts dealing with the topics of ecology and animals. On the other hand, ecopoetics and zoopoetics are different, but closely related methodological concepts that serve to focus upon ecological and animal issues in literary, essayistic, and theoretical texts. It is common that these ecopoetical and zoopoetical studies tend to challenge "traditional" research contributions, which are often characterized by anthropocentric orientations as well as a systematic neglect of ecological and animal issues. For the combination of both understandings of each term one could say that ecopoetically and zoopoetically oriented studies aim to establish a canon of texts which are primarily concerned with the topics of ecology and animals. However, this raises the question for the criteria of these texts.[8]

In the founding studies of ecocriticism, a number of observations concerning these criteria can be found. First, scholars have often mentioned that ecopoetical literature establishes a contiguity between human poetry and the "poetry of nature" (Rigby 79; Kopisch 51-52). A typical rhetorical device for this contiguity is onomatopoeia also highlighted by Wilhelm Lehmann. Second, scholars of ecocriticism underline that ecopoetical literature is characterized by a specific "situatedness" that reflects the relationship between experience and expression, world and word (cf. Scigaj 38; Rigby 80; Gilcrest 3). Furthermore, for Leonard M. Scigaj the ecopoetical reflection on that situatedness is a means of representation in which "nature is not dominated, reduced to immanence, or reduced to a reliably benign aesthetic backdrop for anthropocentric concerns" (80). Third, related to the ecopoetical purpose of not separating human and nonhuman beings via the oppositions of subject and object, action and framework, foreground and background, one can see a close relationship of ecology and poetics respectively *poiesis* in a double sense. On the one hand, for David W. Gilcrest, "ecology, inasmuch as it is a concept that appears in many types of texts, is an artistic creation, the result of a poetics (*poieein*: to do or make)" (12). Ecology as a textual concept, therefore, is made by rhetorical and poetical strategies—and the result of this "making" is the "ecologized text" (12). On the other hand, Kate Rigby emphasizes—against an understanding of this rhetorical and textual "making" in an anthropocentric sense—that "[m]aking is by no means an exclusively human practice. Many other species make things, some of which display not only high levels of craftsmanship but also an aesthetic sensibility" (79).

---

8   For the following considerations, cf. also the introduction of this volume.

Just like ecopoetics combines ecology and poetics, zoopoetics hinges on
the notion of a linkage between animals and poetics in a double sense. "Zoo-
poetics," Kári Driscoll writes, "always involves the question of zoopoiesis,
of the creation *of* the animal as much as the creation *by means* of the animal"
(223). Again, the process of making is decisive. On the one hand, animals
are products of human's imaginative and technical prowess, on the other
hand, animals have their own powers to make and create—therefore animals
likewise are patients and agents of poetics and *poiesis*. Aaron Moe also em-
phasizes the double-sidedness of animals and poetics/*poiesis*. Furthermore,
he explicitly highlights the fact that humans and animals are interrelated
in a process of "co-making" (2). According to Moe, the task of zoopoetical
scholarship is to locate the animated animals in the allegedly dead letters of
poetry in order to reconstruct the process of co-making, into which the poets
have insight—unlike the literary scholars who still refuse to acknowledge the
power of making that animals possess and exclude them from poetics/*poiesis*.

Following the outlined research contributions, I would suggest that the
concept of "co-making" is of central importance for a theory of ecopoetics
und zoopoetics. And it is precisely the idea of a common activity of human
and nonhuman beings where one can find the key for a kind of literature that
follows Commoner's first law of ecology and Buell's first precept of ecologi-
cally oriented works. "Co-making" means that all entities are interrelated
and that therefore it is not possible to distinguish between "human history"
on the one hand and its nonhuman, so-called "framing device," on the other
hand. Hence, ecopoetics and zoopoetics are fundamentally grounded in the
belief that heterogeneous entities are co-makers.

To sum up the previous observations, it should be underlined that ani-
mals are of central relevance for the (literary) study of ecology, because in
their case the processes of co-making become particularly evident. Therefore,
animals are a privileged object of ecologically oriented research; they repre-
sent—together with their proximity to human beings, their unquestionable
ability to suffer, and the fact that they are often conceived as both living
beings and semiotic figures an epistemological, ethical and aesthetical chal-
lenge for literary theory located in the field of ecocriticism. Furthermore, it
is notable that the examination of the co-making processes involving het-
erogeneous entities can take place on three different levels: first, the level of
text production—here one has to take into account the poet's experience in
the process of the creation of an artwork, Moe speaks of the animation by
the "energy of animal poiesis" (10); second, the level of the text itself—here,
one has to ask whether and how the text puts on scene the processes of

co-making; and third, the level of text reception—here one has to consider whether and how the energy of co-making stored in the text leads the recipient to an enhanced attention towards the ecological processes in his or her non-textual environment. At this point, I cannot investigate all these deliberations more closely. Instead, I will focus on the figuration and examination of the processes of co-making in narrative texts.

Ecological Narratives

In the previous section, I have initially highlighted poetry as a privileged medium of ecopoetics and zoopoetics. I have done this due to the observation that the literary scholars aforementioned (Scigaj, Gilcrest, and Moe, in particular) develop their theoretical designs frequently based on lyrical poetry. Nevertheless, texts written in prose are equally important for ecopoetical and zoopoetical issues—one just needs to think of the genre of nature writing, to which a vast number of research contributions is available (cf., e.g., Finch/Elder). However, nature writing must also be distinguished from another genre written in prose and dealing with ecological issues, namely: ecological narrative. S. K. Robisch describes the distinction between nature writing and ecological narrative as follows:

> Nature writing is most often based on observation and rumination, offering the reader a view of a place and/or species that include both research and personal response. The work demands the reader's participation—to go and see, to experience, to negotiate the writer's perception with the reader's own. Ecological narrative, on the other hand, is less apparently driven by activist or scientific concerns, even by particularly ecological ones. The reader finds and emphasizes the influence of the nonhuman world on all aspects of the text. (178)

Following Robisch's juxtaposition, nature writing and ecological narrative can be distinguished based on the assumption that nature writing is marked by an essayistic, biographical trait, and the clear display of a scientific orientation. By contrast, ecological narrative can be characterized by the fact that it makes the "nonhuman world" the central topic of the text, and this happens particularly in a way that gives the nonhuman entities "the significance they deserve[] as physical facts acting upon plot and character, rather than treating them as mere setting or backdrop" (Robisch 184). Following this explanation, it is decisive for this genre to render the nonhuman entities in a way that shows their power to make—and Robisch expressly highlights the animals as constitutive nonhuman figures of ecological narratives (188-89).

Thus, ecological narratives are characterized—once again strictly in the sense of Commoner's first law of ecology and Buell's first precept of ecologically oriented works—by the interrelatedness of all entities, may they be human or nonhuman. That means that ecological narratives conceptualize all these heterogeneous entities without any qualitative hierarchy; instead, all entities are situated on the same level.

In reference to Bruno Latour and *actor-network-theory*, human and nonhuman entities can be described as actors. It is no surprise in this context that Latour approaches the dichotomies of action and framework, foreground and background as well. He writes: "Tradition refused them [the nonhuman entities] this label [as social actors], in order to reserve it for subjects whose course of action took place in a world—a framework, an environment—of things" (*Politics of Nature* 76). Like the scholars of ecopoetics and zoopoetics, Latour challenges the distinction between human beings as active forces on the one hand, and nonhuman beings as a framework or environment of human actions on the other hand. Beyond that, the aim of Latour's political ecology is also very similar to the theories of ecopoetics and zoopoetics—he wants to replace the traditional division, the "great divide," by a new division, in which "social actors" are associated "with other social actors," whether they are human or not (77).

For the purpose of this chapter, there is no need to discuss in detail Latour's strategies of composing and legitimatizing his symmetrical ontology. Rather it is crucial for me that Latour—while he emphasizes the actor status of human and nonhuman beings and thus subverts the outlined traditional distinctions—draws on a terminology borrowed from literary studies, especially from narratology (cf. also Latour, *Reassembling the Social* 43-62). This eventually leads to my final and crucial considerations. With recourse to Commoner and Buell I have already tried to show that ecology is nearly synonymous with complexity and that an ecological text (insofar as it deserves this name) is characterized by representing this complexity in content and form. In case of narrative texts—for other genres it would be necessary to develop other approaches—this would be realized by shaping the nonhuman beings neither as backdrop and decoration of the human history nor by using them for generating a special kind of atmosphere or characterizing the human characters in an indirect way.[9] Instead, it is a key point of ecological narratives that human and nonhuman beings are both driving forces of the

---

9   Roland Barthes labeled these narrative units, which do not contribute to the action of the narrative, "indices" (246).

plot—hence, humans and nonhumans likewise have to figure as co-makers or co-actors. However, the question remains how scholars can grasp and analyze the degree of narrated ecological complexity.

Testing Device and *Heimatliteratur*

In the ending paragraphs I would like to propose a kind of testing device for the evaluation of the complexity of narrated ecological fabrics. The distinctions between action and framework, foreground and background correspond with the narratology's distinction between "story" and "diegesis," pivotal for the structure of narrative texts. Gérard Genette outlines this distinction in *Palimpsests*:

> The story told by a narrative … is a concatenation, or sometimes more primitively a succession, of events and/or actions; the diegesis, in the meaning suggested by the inventor of the term (Etienne Souriau, if I am not mistaken), which is the meaning I shall be using here, is the world wherein the story occurs. (295)

The distinction between story and diegesis is valuable with regard to a classification of narrative units—for example one might ask whether a narrative unit contributes to the action or rather to the construction of the fictional world. Genette, though, is primarily interested in the differentiation of story and diegesis in relation to his theory of intertextuality in *Palimpsests*. However, under a willful neglect of Genette's research intention, it is this differentiation I want to highlight as a useful concept for the examination of ecological narratives. In the context of his theory of intertextuality, Genette describes among other topics the literary procedure of "diegetic transposition," by which he means the transfer of an action from a *hypotext* into a *hypertext*—and in this process, the transferred action remains nearly constant in both texts, while the diegesis, by contrast, changes fundamentally. Genette explains this procedure as follows:

> Whether it be fictional or historical, the action of a narrative … is aptly said to 'unfold' usually within a more or less specific spatiotemporal framework: in archaic or legendary Greece, at King Fernando's Court, or in Russia of Napoleonic times. This historical-geographical setting is *inter alia* what I call the diegesis, and it is obvious enough, I hope, that an action can be transposed from one period to another, or from one location to another, or both. Such a diegetic transposition—let us call it, for brevity's sake (not beauty's) *transdiegetization*—can of course not occur without at least some changes in the action itself. (296)

Following Genette, the decisive aspect of "diegetic transposition" is the removal of an action from its original environment and its repositioning in a new environment. It is precisely this procedure I would like to render as a testing device for the ecological dimension of narrative texts. Genette himself states that the modifications of action (which result from the shift from one diegesis to another) can turn out in varying degrees; this implies that some actions are more closely related to their environment than others. Consequently, the more action and environment are interrelated, the more modifications are necessary and therefore the more difficult it gets to separate between action and framework, foreground and background, story and diegesis. Thus, the level of difficulty that occurs in separating action and environment is decisive for the ecological degree of the narrative. Or to put it in other words, those texts in which the nonhuman entities (which initially generate the environment) stick inseparably to the story (which is allegedly based on human actions) show the ecological impact of the narrative in its uppermost clarity—here, the nonhuman beings are in fact not just decoration but rather driving forces of the story and therefore connected with the human characters in a constellation of co-making and co-acting.

To close my argumentation, I demonstrate the testing device by reference to two novels of the genre of *Heimatliteratur*, Ludwig Anzengrubers *Der Sternsteinhof* (1885) and Peter Roseggers *Jakob der Letzte* (1887) (for a more detailed analysis of these two novels, cf. Michler 198-244 and 270-88). Anzengruber initiates his novel as follows:

> A pouring rain had rushed down. Swirling and foaming the otherwise so calm stream runs between the two hills; at the height on one side there stood a large and proud farmstead, at the foot of the other, along the banks of the stream, there lay a range of little huts.[10] (5)

The novel starts with a description of nature—the stream functions as an actor, which leads the narrative perspective towards the human dwellings. Thereby, the implied social difference between the inhabitants of the mentioned buildings introduces the pivotal aspect of the novel. The protagonist of the text is the poor but beautiful Helene who, since her childhood, has been animated just by one desire—to become the peasant woman of the rich

---

[10] "Ein Gußregen war herniedergerauscht. Wallend und gischend schoß das sonst so ruhige Wässerlein zwischen den zwei Hügeln dahin; auf der Höhe des einen stand ein großes, stolzes Gehöft, am Fuße des andern, längs den Ufern des Baches, lag eine Reihe von kleinen Hütten."

Sternsteinhof. For this aim she ruthlessly overcomes all social resistance. Therefore, the text narrates the plot of social climbing, which is grounded in the Darwinian "struggle for existence" (cf. Michler 229). However, the nonhuman entities like the stream in the starting passage of the novel move out of the narrative focus, they remain on the status of mere background props. Thus, in the sense of Genette's diegetic transposition, it would be possible to shift the plot of social climbing from the peasant world to a different kind of diegesis, for example a medieval aristocratic society or one of modern capitalists. Thereby, it would be necessary to adjust the nonhuman entities to these other worlds, but this could happen without a substantial impact on the plot structure.

Rosegger's novel *Jakob der Letzte* is likewise situated in a rural environment. The protagonist of the text is Jakob Steinreuter, who is bound into a traditional structure of his family genealogy and the peasant work. By this means, the novel constitutes a stable and static connection between the human and his environment. The central topic of the text, however, is how, over more than twenty years of plot duration, this allegedly invariable condition changes step for step, resulting in a fundamental transformation of the peasant world. The transformation is caused by the fact that Jakob's neighbours sell their farmsteads to an industrialist who stops cultivating the land and instead lets it grow wild in order to use it as hunting ground. Only Jakob refuses the purchase offers, because he wants to maintain his traditional way of life.

Up to this point, the plot structure is characterized by an ideology of anti-modernism, but beneath this conservatism, one can additionally observe another aspect of the narrative, i.e., the unfolding of complex relations between human and nonhuman entities. At one point of the text, Jakob warns his neighbour against selling his farmstead:

> Neighbour, think about it. If you move a fresh larch tree out of your high forest into the valley, together with its root, and give it the best soil and the richest dung as well as wet and sun as you wish—the larch tree nevertheless perishes. A mountain tree cannot be moved, especially when it is fully grown—neither can a mountain man.[11] (66-67)

---

[11] "Nachbar, bedenk's. Wenn du von deinem Hochwald einen frischen Lärchbaum versetzest hinaus ins Tal, mitsamt der Wurzel versetzest, und ihm dort die beste Erden [sic] gibst und fettesten Dung, und Naß und Sonne wie du willst—der Lärchbaum geht zugrunde. Ein Gebirgsbaum laßt sich nicht versetzen, wenn er ausgewachsen ist, schon gar nicht. Ein Gebirgsmensch auch nicht."

Jakob analogizes his neighbour to a tree, which is interwoven with other heterogeneous entities. Furthermore, in Jakob's depiction the peasants are inseparably "entangled with their ground, with all the herbs and trees that stand on it, even with the beetle on the blade of grass and with the bird on the treetop, not to mention the cattle in the pasture"[12] (68). Jakob's argument demonstrates that the removal of the peasants from their environment must lead to their ruin—and exactly this ruin is the topic of the further plot. Thus, the novel itself implements the proposed testing device of ecological narrative: The peasants are transposed from their traditional world, their diegeses, and thereby fall into misery. At the same time, the peasant's farmsteads are no longer cultivated and become places of wilderness. From the trees to the blade of grass, from the cattle to the beetles, from the soil to the human peasants—here indeed everything is connected to everything else. And so, at the end of the novel Jakob perishes as well, although he maintains the conservative ethic affirmed by the text—the individual is powerless against the transformations that take place in the complex fabrics of his environment (cf. Kling).

The examples of Anzengruber and Rosegger illustrate that, on the one hand, nonhuman entities in narrative texts can simply be passive backgrounds for a story of the human. But on the other hand, there are texts in which the nonhuman entities fundamentally organize the entire logic of the narrative. In the first case, the narrative might even revolve around an ecological topic, nevertheless, solely in the second case—in which action and framework can barely be separated—one is faced with an ecological technique of narrative.

Works Cited

Anzengruber, Ludwig. *Der Sternsteinhof. Eine Dorfgeschichte*. 5th ed. Leipzig: Breit-kopf und Härtel, 1905. Print.

Barthes, Roland. "An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative." *New Literary History*. 6.2. (1975): 237-72. JSTOR. Web. 26. Apr. 2017.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination. Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1995. Print.

---

[12] "Du wirst sehen, wie der Mensch verwachsen ist mit seiner Erde, mit allen Kräutern und Bäumen, die darauf stehen, selbst mit dem Käfer auf dem Grashalm und mit dem Vogel auf dem Wipfel, geschweige mit dem Vieh auf der Weide."

Bühler, Benjamin. *Ecocriticism. Grundlagen–Theorien–Interpretationen*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2016. Print.

Commoner, Barry. *The Closing Circle–Nature, Man, and Technology*. New York: Knopf, 1971. Print.

Driscoll, Kári. "The Sticky Temptation of Poetry." *Journal of Literary Theory* 9.2 (2015): 212-29. Print.

Finch, Robert, and John Elder, eds. *The Norton Book of Nature Writing*. New York: Norton, 1990. Print.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newmann and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1997. Print.

Gilcrest, David W. *Greening the Lyre. Environmental Poetics and Ethics*. Reno: U of Nevada P, 2002. Print.

Heidegger, Martin. "'…dichterisch wohnet der Mensch…'" *Akzente. Zeitschrift für Dichtung* 1 (1954): 57-71. Print.

Kling, Alexander. "Ökologische Komplexität in Wissenschaft, Heimatliteratur und Science Fiction (1850-1900)." *Narrative des Anthropozäns in Kultur und Medien*. Ed. Gabriele Dürbeck and Jonas Nesselhauf. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2018 (forthcoming). Print.

Kopisch, Wendy Anne. *Naturlyrik im Zeichen der ökologischen Krise. Begrifflichkeiten–Rezeption–Kontexte*. Kassel: Kassel UP, 2012. Print.

Latour, Bruno. *Politics of Nature. How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2004. Print.

Latour, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Lehmann, Wilhelm. *Gesammelte Werke in acht Bänden*. Ed. Wolfgang Menzel. Vol. 6. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2006. Print.

Michler, Werner. *Darwinismus und Literatur. Naturwissenschaftliche und literarische Intelligenz in Österreich 1859-1914*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1999. Print.

Moe, Aaron. "Toward Zoopoetics. Rethinking Whitman's Original Energy." *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 31.1 (2013): 1-17. Print.

Rigby, Kate. "Ecopoetics." *Keywords for Environmental Studies*. Ed. Joni Adamson et al. New York: New York UP, 2016. 79-81. Print.

Robisch, S.K. "Ecological Narrative and Nature Writing." *A Companion to American Fiction 1865-1914*. Ed. Robert Paul Lamb and G.R. Thompson. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005. 177-200. Print.

Rosegger, Peter. *Jakob der Letzte. Eine Waldbauerngeschichte aus unseren Tagen*. Volksausgabe. Vienna: A. Hartlebens Verlag, 1895. Print.

Scigaj, Leonard M. *Sustainable Poetry. Four American Ecopoets*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1999. Print.