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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare human attitudes toward nature in works by two green poets, Sohrab Sepehri (1928-1980) and Robert Frost (1874-1964). The emergence of new approaches in the humanities, such as ecocriticism, to examine the relationship between literature and the environment in the text results from human life’s extensive growth in numerous dimensions and the resulting negative impact on the environment. In Frost’s poetry, the human being is presented with various options when confronted by nature. He has the option of viewing nature as a source of catastrophe and succumbing to it, or he can choose to fight nature, conquer it, or submit to it. Additionally, the individual can protect and respect the environment. The human is capable of coexisting with and benefiting from nature. On the other hand, Sepehri is a poet who learns about nature and discovers new forms of existence. Sepehri adores nature and regards it as superior to his anthropocentric world. These two poets share a philosophy of attitude toward nature and its elements. Both poets’ works are influenced by nature. One adores nature and is constantly reminded of it as if he sees it everywhere, and both poets are inspired by nature, but in very different ways. Sepehri and Frost have both established successful careers in poetry, but in contrast to Sohrab Sepehri’s romantic bent, Frost writes more simple poems that defy romantic convention. Sepehri and Frost’s poetry begins with joy and ends with knowledge. While Robert Frost lived in the modern era, he possessed a traditional worldview that set him apart from other poets. For example, unlike Sepehri, Frost is satisfied to stay in the terrestrial sphere and observe ordinary events; he is hesitant to travel beyond its borders. This comparative study examines the two poets’ divergent attitudes toward nature, emphasizing their distinctions.

INTRODUCTION

When the relationship between humans and nature is examined historically, significant shifts in this relationship and human attitudes toward complete human dominance over nature and unrestricted use of natural resources are apparent. Humanity’s indulgence in nature has resulted in a slew of environmental disasters. Global warming and ozone depletion are two examples of damage that can result in long-term ecological changes and expose humans to a multitude of dangers. Changing this approach will require more than technological advancements and the expansion of human knowledge; it will also require a re-examination of other forms of knowledge, particularly culture.

Ecocriticism was introduced in 1970, and its study grew out of some thinkers’ environmental concerns. As a form of literary criticism, ecocriticism responds to the appeal by establishing the “fundamental premise that human culture is inextricably linked to the physical environment, both influencing and being influenced by it” (Glotfelty, 1996). Ecocriticism’s central concern is the relationship between nature and civilization. Ecological theory and criticism are applied differently to literary works than other forms of literary criticism. It effectively demonstrates and promotes environmental protection while raising awareness and emphasizing the equality of natural and social realms. Due to the multidisciplinary approach of “nature,” an examination of literature and the environment is required.

Cheryl Glotfelty, the United States of America’s first Professor of Literature and the Environment, defines ecocriticism, an interdisciplinary concept, as “studying the relationship between literature and the physical environment” (Ibid).

Ecocriticism seeks to illuminate how nature is reflected in literature through close reading and rereading texts from an environmental perspective to establish a balanced outlook between humans and culture. By examining the connections between nature and culture, this novel approach asserts that literature does not float above the material world in some aesthetic ether but is a component of an enormously complex global system in which energy, matter, and ideas interact (Ibid, xix).

Ecocriticism is a subfield of literary criticism or theory made up of two components: “eco” and “criticism.” Ecol-
ology is the study or exploration of the relationships between various forms of earthly beings and objects. Several theorists refer to ecocriticism as green studies, or environmental criticism is a critical writing genre that focuses on the relationship between literature, environment, and nature. Ecocentrism, in terms of ecology and ecological issues, regards nature as the center of the universe and views nature and the environment as a central and fundamental aspect of the world. “Humans were an integral part of this nature and had no desire to dominate or control,” Michael Payne explains. Nature existed in its entirety, evolving through a cycle in which everything was connected and interdependent” (153).

According to Buell, ecocentrism is concerned with all organisms’ internal interconnectedness, most notably the environment. In other words, there are no autonomous entities because all beings and organisms are inextricably linked to and dependent on their environment. Additionally, there are no distinctions or dividing lines between the living and inanimate worlds. According to Buell (2005), “ecocentrism maintains that the world is an organically dynamic division between the living and the nonliving, the animate and the inanimate.” Thus, ecocentrism refers to the structure or state of environmental interdependence and the intrinsic connectedness of organisms, creatures, and things to one another and their environment. Conversely, ecocentrism refers to the inextricable interdependence of all organisms and creatures in their environment instead of a purely external connection between organisms and creatures.

There are numerous entities globally, and they all exist within an ecosystem, a web or organization in which all entities coexist, and each entity influences and is influenced by others. According to this view, nobody and nothing, including humans, have superiority over other ecological entities but has a relationship with other ecological entities. “Insofar as human beings are bio historical creatures that construct themselves through interaction with their surroundings,” According to Lawrence Buell in writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture, and Environment in the United States and Beyond (2001), human is not a distinct creature or entity that exists apart from the ecosystem’s web, nor is it an autonomous member with no connection to the ecosystem. According to Buell (2005: 100), “The community is defined to include soil, water, plants, and animals: a biotic community in which humankind is one of the millions of accretions and species that have a biotic right to exist.”

In Pastoral (1999), Terry Gifford proposed that “our inner human nature can be understood in terms of external nature” (156). Furthermore, Buell believes that human identity is inextricably linked to the environment, a belief he refers to as ecocentrism. “ecocentric thought resembles a scattergram rather than a unified front where all of its strains define human identity in terms of its relationship to the physical environment or other nonhuman life forms, rather than as a self-contained entity” (ibid: 101). Each object is so entwined with others in this way that its identity is entwined with that of other items. According to Nichols, human culture never isolates humans from wild nature. This is the central truth of all ecology. “Nothing I do can reintroduce me to nature. I have nowhere to go. From the moment I die, I am a natural being (originally).” Rather than anthropocentrically describing the nonhuman world in human terms, there are compelling new reasons to describe the entire world eccentrically (2011: xv).

Nichols asserts that humans are a part of both natural and non-natural environments. Moreover, Nichols believes that all beings and things, not just humans, are interconnected. “This is the core reality of all ecology,” he argues (ibid xv). His statements apply to all entities, affirming the relationship and connection between all beings and inseparable things. “I believe that I am inextricably linked to every living creature and material object that surrounds me,” Nichols believes (ibid: xv-xvi). As a result, human and nonhuman beings are intrinsically tied to one another and the environment, and neither can exist independently.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Given that ecocriticism is a relatively new approach to literary criticism, there has been relatively little research in comparison to other fields of world literature, and the majority of the literature review consists of a list of references. Separate studies on this ecocritical method have been conducted on Robert Frost and Sohrab Sepehri, but no comparative research on these two green poets has been conducted.


Leila Baradaran Jamil and Sara Khoshkam, in William Blake’s Songs of Innocence and Songs of Experience: Interelection/Coexistence of Human/Nonhuman in Nature (2017), investigated and analyzed the link between human and nonhuman in William Blake’s selected poems using the theoretical foundations of ecocriticism. One of the most glaring flaws in this field of research is the lack of a transparent methodology. It appears that applying comparative literature techniques and paying attention to cultural representations may overcome this issue.

There has been no comparative research on these two poets. As a result of this research gap in this field, comparative literature as a cultural study can aid in ecocriticism and bring together environmentally conscious poets.

Methodology and Aims

Ecocentrism proposes that all organisms, including humans, are products and components of a web or system that integrates and connects them all. Ecocentrism maintains that all animals are related and connected in this way. Plus, comparative literature, in general, aims to compare literary works
Using a culture-based approach, independent of geographic connection. Essentially, comparative literature is a means for highlighting the similarities and contrasts of cultural representations in order to conduct disparate discourses. Nature is one of these aspects. Comparative literature, in this sense, looks at the parallels and differences that reveal the dual-link between human and nature in literary works’ cultural expressions. The views of Sohrab Sepehri and Robert Frost on nature are compared through comparative literature in this study. Each discourse reflected the author’s different insight into nature and humanity’s interaction with it. This study intends to investigate the interaction between humans and nature in these works by examining a variety of natural components utilized in the poetry of these two poets. The findings might reveal the two writers’ respective worldviews and the parallels and contrasts between their discourses, as poets are concerned about the environment via culture. This research aims to evaluate two different perspectives of two great poets from two different pieces of literature, based on comparative literature and ecocriticism goals, each of which aims to portray natural aspects of poetry in its unique way. Meanwhile, they must pay and express their cultural bearers.

DISCUSSION

In both authors’ poems, the elements and natural beings create a world that encompasses a vast realm of nonhuman life. Naturally, a comparative analysis of all the nonhuman natural elements and themes between the two poets is a monumental task, and an attempt is made to compare the four natural elements between these two poets. Thus, the green poet or the poet of nature’s taste and sensibility becomes the narrator of the poets of nature. According to various perspectives, the poet of nature truly seeks his sensual awareness in nature through his literary sensitivity.

Birds

Sohrab Sepehri’s life is reflected in his poetry, travels, and encounters with nature. The poems “Eight Books” by Sohrab Sepehri include Death of Color, Life of Dreams, Downpour of Sunshine, East of Sorrow, The Sound of Water’s Footsteps, The Passenger, The Green Space, and Us Nil, Us a Look. His fascination with nature grew stronger as his proclivity for Buddhism grew. Sepehri was an expert at resolving philosophical and emotional dilemmas through nature. Inspired by Indian and Persian mysticism, he composed poems and believed in the spirit of nature. His poetry reflects his fascination with nature, and he envisioned the natural world artistically. His poetry is infused with a solid naturalistic sensibility. This means it has nothing to do with the positives and negatives of the current situation; instead, it is about beauty (Masoumi, 1997, p. 220). According to Ghazizadeh, Sepehri attains God’s light through his journey through nature. Sepehri, a living and autonomous nature with an existential unity, is God’s embodiment of human hopes and secret ambitions (Mullah Ebrahimi, Rashidi, and Sansebli, 2012: 217).

In his sixth book titled “Passenger,” Sohrab Sepehri writes:

- And love, only love
- He took me to the breadth of sorrow,
- It made me the possibility of becoming a bird.
- And a drink of sorrow?
- The pure sound gives an elixir to this drink

(Sepehri, 1389: 293)

Sepehri can transform into a bird with the aid of a bird and his unique description of love and the joy of belonging to nature. “Mystical love elevates man to the ascension stage, allowing him to transform into a bird,” Jalali explains. As a result, the bird is a symbol of greatness and ascension in traditional Persian literature, which Sepehri appropriated (Jalali, 154, 1383). The bird, Mitra Jalali explains, is a “symbol of perfection” in the belief systems of several ethnic groups. In Indian mythology, the bird is the embodiment of the soul in paradise.

Birds are the progenitors of gods; according to indigenous Australians, a black bird frequently represents the evil spirit, whereas a white bird represents the holy spirit. In China and Japan, the red bird is a symbol of piety and generosity. In ancient Greek and Hebrew culture, the bird that eats grapes symbolizes eternal life (Ibid). This poem depicts both the bird’s superiority over man and man’s desire to attain angelic status. In Sohrab’s poetry, the bird serves as the mediator of divine love, inviting man to be as light-minded as birds and introducing bird life in nature as a biological model for human life.

Robert Frost is a poet in the William Wordsworth and Ralph Waldo Emerson traditions, but unlike Frost, Sepehri writes in a free-flowing style devoid of rhyme and weight. On the other hand, Frost’s poetry has substance and rhythms. Robert Frost was a conformist. As a nature farmer, Frost followed tradition and infused his poetry with romanticism, transcendence, and symbolism. He refused to “run wild in search of new ways to be new” (Lathem, 2002, p.59), preferring instead “the old-fashioned way to be new” (Frost, 1995, p.75).

His relationship with nature is a result of his preoccupation with chaos. Nature is frequently a source of fear or a source of contention for him or both. He is fascinated by what nature can do for and to us, and he feels compelled to conduct an exhaustive examination of it (Fagan, 2007: 393). “While Frost’s career encompasses the modern era and it is illogical to refer to him as anything other than a modern poet,” said Huang Zongying, a Peking University professor of English and American literature, “it is also difficult to place him in the mainstream of modern poetry” (Huang, 2000, p.42).

Robert Frost depicts a part of a mountainous environment in his poem “Hill Wife”:

- Hill Wife
- Loneliness
- Her Word
- One Ought Not To Have To Care
- So Much As You And I
- Care When The Birds Come Round The House
According to Fagan, “Birds that fill their breasts.” is a sign of their connection and interest in one another. Birds do not garner the same level of attention as nests, demonstrating their isolation (Fagan, 2007: 153). A house in the woods serves as the foundation for poetry, and the song of birds serves as a reminder of his loneliness. The bird serves as a metaphor for the poet’s intense emotions. Birdsong serves as a call to reconnect humans with nature. As a result of the bird metaphor, this poem stands apart from other poetry regarding human connection and fascination.

Frost was a firm supporter of traditional forms of poetry that emphasized meter and rhyme. He once remarked that writing without a meter was akin to playing tennis without a net. As a result, he prefers traditional poetry forms such as sonnets, rhyming couplets, and blank verse to the twentieth-century’s free verse. Frost’s attitude toward poetic forms can be deduced from his apologist, “the sound of sense.” He stated that “I, alone among English writers, had set out to create music out of what I will refer to as the sound of sense. The best source for the abstract sound of sense is the voice behind a closed door. It is our language’s abstract vitality.” To be a poet, one must master the art of breaking sense sounds with all their irregularity of accent across the regular beat of the meter (Thompson, 1964, p.79).

The Sky
Sepehri asserts that poetry is born out of the personal, spiritual, or mystical experience - experience comes first, followed by poems. He believed experience breeds expressiveness, and expressiveness, in turn, breeds spontaneity. According to Frost, poetry begins consciously and ends involuntarily. According to Sepehri, the “presence that disturbs me with low or high thoughts” resides in the light of setting suns, the rolling ocean, the living air, the blue sky, and man’s thinking. Sepehri regarded nature as a living entity. Nature is depicted in most of his poems as both a healer and a teacher or moral guardian. He is a devout follower of nature, a devout devotee of nature, or a high priest of nature.

In his first book titled “Death of Color,” Sohrab Sepehri writes:

Role
On a dark night
That sound did not mix with sound
And no one saw anyone up close,
One climbed the cliffs
And the bloody nails
On a rock does not play a role

And then no one else saw him
The rain washed away the blood color that boiled from
the tension wound
And it dried up on the rocks
The storm has destroyed the maps
Which remained from the sole of his foot.
If you show any open question
There will be no sound.

That night
No one came
Until the news of the color of the flower that was about
to blossom.
Mountain: Heavy, wandering, cold-blooded.
The wind was blowing, but it was silent.
The cloud is full but calm.
Leak the moment that the nails of the familiar hand secret
Went to start working on the rock,
Thunder roared,
Lightning lit a stone
Which was engraved on it in a short moment
The body of the role that must remain immortal
(Sepehri, 1389: 50)

“The cloud symbolizes oppression,” explains Jalali. A tyrant’s atmosphere, blind to the beginnings of the struggle, but in vain if he seeks to break the warriors’ steel rock; for the poet believes that this stone “does not wear out or fade” (Jalali, 1383: 101). The poem is set against the backdrop of a dark autumn night. The poet sought to draw the reader’s attention to natural elements such as night, bloody rock, wind, rain, and thunder, all frequently used in horror stories and poetry.

“Role’s poetry is beautiful and profound; it tells the story of a man who bears the burden of responsibility alone and destroys himself with his words and actions, but the lamp that cannot be extinguished by fire and his role are permanent on the rock, and his stone is always standing on it” (Thervatian, 1389: 59). The interaction between man and nature in this poetry demonstrates that man is occasionally superior to nature, and nature is, in turn, occasionally superior to man.

The poem “Looking at the Bird in Winter” by Robert Frost is included in the “New Hampshire” section:

Looking For A Sunset Bird In Winter
The West Was Getting Out Of Gold,
The Breath Of Air Had Died Of Cold,
When Shoeing Home Across The White,
I Thought I Saw A Bird Alight.
In Summer When I Passed The Place
I Had To Stop And Lift My Face;  
A Bird With An Angelic Gift
Was Singing In It Sweet And Swift.
No Bird Was Singing In It Now.
A Single Leaf Was On A Bough,
And That Was All There Was To See
In Going Twice Around The Tree.
From My Advantage On A Hill
I Judged That Such A Crystal Chill
Was Only Adding Frost To Snow
As Gilt To Gold That Wouldn’t Show.
A Brush Had Left A Crooked Stroke
Of What Was Either Cloud Or Smoke
From North To South Across The Blue;
A Piercing Little Star Was Through
(Frost, 1967: 232)

The poet casts a glance at a tree in the cold dusk, recalling a previous sighting of a bird in the same location. Rather than seeing the bird during the summer, hearing it sing has inspired him to believe he will see it this winter. “The pattern is similar to a brushstroke, and the cloud of smoke that extends from one side of the blue sky to the other represents a lonely star this winter with a flickering star inside,” Fagan explains (2007, 204). Additionally, the star conveys optimism. A permanent connection to nature is one of the characteristics of this poetry, which establishes it as a fundamental human interaction independent of the chapter.

The Rain

A man stands in front of a cloud in Sohrab’s poetry, and a man sees a cloud in Frost’s poem, both of which look to nature for solutions to human problems.

The fifth book is titled “The Footsteps of Water.”
Umbrellas should be closed,
You have to go under the rain
Thought, memory, must be carried away in the rain.
With all the people of the city, you have to go in the rain
The friend must be seen in the rain.
Love must be sought in the rain.
You have to sleep with a woman in the rain.
You have to play in the rain
Under the rain, you have to write something, talk, plant a lotus
(Sepehri, 1389: 280)

“In Sohrab’s poetry, rain is a metaphor for purification, washing, freshness, and a fresh look” (Sharifian, 2007: 1). In this poetry, man’s relationship with nature results in nature’s superiority. Sohrab Sepehri’s most distinguishing poetic quality is his emphasis on the visual. Although numerous poets before Sepehri used images in their works, none saw images as a primary or exclusive poetic production or presentation mode.

Robert Frost states in his poem “Wind and Rain” from the section “A Tree of Control”:

The Wind And The Rain
That Far-Off: Day The Leaves In Flight
We’re Letting In The Colder Light.
A Season-Ending Wind There Blew

Frost’s poetry was distinct from that of the modernists in several ways: its adherence to traditional formalism (as opposed to the formal dislocations and direct challenges to conventional forms found in much modernist writing); theordinariness and rustic simplicity of its subject matter; its resolutely narrative quality; and its absence of what modernists such as Eliot, Stevens, or Crane considered essential (Beach, 2003: 15). The poem is divided into two sections: the primary setting is a forest in the fall, and the second set is a desert in July. The connection between human and natural life cycles serves as a reminder of nature’s inspiration: life is fleeting, and nature outperforms man in this regard.
“The poem’s final stanza returns to the subject of the first section, which is an attempt to reclaim youth following a traumatic experience,” Fagan explains. The narrator used to enjoy the rain, but now that he has been through so much, the rain serves only as a symbol of his sorrows. As a result of this, he cries (Fagan, 2007: 361). Nature inspires human beings to express human emotions at times and at times purifies them.

**The Trees**

Frost’s poem “Tree At My Window” alludes to the interaction and proximity of man and environment. Nature’s mirror can reflect the human mind. In this scene, the poet’s mind and the tree are inextricably linked. The tree represents a hazy mind emerging from the earth, swayed by the wind (as opposed to the internal air):

*Tree at my window, window tree,*  
*My sash is lowered when night comes on,*  
*But let there never be curtain drawn*  
*Between you and me*  
*Vague dream-head lifted out of the ground,*  
*And thing next most diffuse to cloud,*  
*Not all your light tongues talking aloud*  
*Could be profound.*  
*But, tree, I have seen you taken and tossed,*  
*And if you have seen me when I slept,*  
*You have seen me when I was taken and swept*  
*And all but lost*  
*That day she put our heads together,*  
*Fate had her imagination about her,*  
*Your head so much concerned with outer,*  
*Mine with inner: weather*  
*(Frost, 1967:318)*

Man reflects nature, and nature reflects the man. Frost is not a romantic poet; however, this poem possesses a romantic quality in that the relationship between human and natural states is quite apparent (Cuddon, 1993: 815).

Frost is primarily concerned with the landscape and people of New England as a regional poet. His poems, for example, “Pasture,” “Stopping by the Snowy Evening,” “Birches,” and “After Apple-Picking,” paint readers a picture of idyllic villages removed from the bustle of cities, with an unpolluted land free of modern industry. In contrast to the advanced modern and industrialized city life, these captivating scenes contain peace, beauty, tranquility, and human emotions. At the same time, the poet muses on eternal human problems that persist regardless of social conditions. As a result, Frost instills his themes and thoughts in the minds of his readers through the use of a thread or a logical inference. Frost is the most deceptive poet in our literature’s history (Parini, 2004, p.266).

Alternatively, in Frost’s poetry, we occasionally encounter a human being engaged in a conflict with nature; It is occasionally the polar opposite of nature, and occasionally, despite being beaten, it has a heroic effect.

His most recent poem, which appears in his final collection of published works, is about the conflict between man and nature:

*A winter Eden in an alder swamp*  
*Where conies now come out to sun and romp,*  
*As near a paradise as it can be*  
*And not melt snow or start a dormant tree.*

*It lift existence on a plane of snow*  
*One level higher than the earth below,*  
*One level nearer heaven overhead*  
*And last year’s berries shining scarlet red.*

*It lifts a gaunt luxuriating beast*  
*Where he can stretch and hold his highest feast*  
*On some wild apple tree’s young tender bark,*  
<What well may prove the years’ high girdle mark.>*

*Pairing in all known paradises ends:*  
*Here loveless birds now flock as winter friends,*  
*Content with bud inspecting. They presume*  
*To say which buds are leaf and which are bloom.*

*A feather hammer gives a double knock.*  
*This Eden day is done at two o’clock.*  
*An hour of winter day might seem too short*  
*To make it worth life’s while to wake and sport*  
*(Frost, 1967:322)*

The central themes of the poem are alienation and solitude. The narrator embarks on a “solo” journey through the woods. For a brief moment, he intends to enclose the forest in his mental order and requirements: “I display the maple to myself and then throw the maple on the ground.” The crisis and turmoil are metaphorically depicted as a forest and snow, which has bleached everything, regardless of man or his desires: “I create a line of quivering footprints on colored snow.” At any given time, the only order in the existing world is generated by the presence of a human in front of a dark vision. Man confronts nature in order to establish his existence and fights it. Likewise, his withdrawal is not a sign of surrender but rather a method of resurrecting and resurrecting the lost force.

Given the infinite dimensions of this cycle, man’s relationship with nature is a kind of struggle with no clear winner or loser. Cutting down a maple tree is a natural part of this cycle, and “tree overhanging” is not against nature. Here is a metaphor for man and nature coexisting harmoniously: a single human crushes a single tree. Man is engaged in a vital conflict with nature, not as an adversary but as a friend. Changes in man’s harmonious relationship with nature are part of a process in which neither side, man or nature, is deficient.

Sohrab Sepehri’s stance on this subject is as follows: Nature’s (tree) superiority over man:

*The day*  
*Knowledge lived by the water*  
*Man in the gentle laziness of a pasture*  
*He was happy with azure philosophies*  
*He thought on the bird side*  
*He was beating with the pulse of the tree*  
*The anemone was defeated*  
*The concept of the big bang*  
*At the bottom of his words, he was trembling*  
*Man*
In the text of the elements

You are sleeping

He woke up near the dawn of fear

(Sepehri, 1389: 244)

It is impossible to assume that nature is the source of evil or that nature contains both power and evil. It is a mathematical technique that combines algebra and a sequence of continuous events. While the world is hazy and complicated, this does not mean it is inherently evil. However, even a cursory examination of Sepehri’s poems reveals nature and the human relationship with it. Sepehri’s characters gain prominence and thrive amid natural phenomena.

The mountain, in comparison to man, soars to the heavens. The valleys twisted in front of his squinting eyes. On roads, unusual maneuvers are necessary. Whether he is alone or amid a dense forest, the trees beckon him to an enigmatic presence. Streams cross the silver waters. They are surrounded by fields with wildflowers blooming in the corners.

His fascination enriches Sepehri’s poetry with natural scenes and his portrayal of vibrant images of nature. Even in his first book, The Death of Color (1951), which does not devote as much time to nature as his later works, he comprises numerous examples of using nature effectively. According to Hosseini (2000), Sepehri is a romantic poet, and one of romanticism’s defining characteristics is the glorification of nature (p. 10). According to Ashouri et al. (1992), the poet’s interest in nature was influenced by Far Eastern mysticisms (p. 26). In several of his poems, Sepehri does not refer to nature. From 1961 onwards, he develops an “amorous” relationship with nature, coinciding with the publication of Torrent of Sun (Meghdadi, 1999, p. 122). "Penetration into natural phenomena" is a central theme in this book (Dastghheyh, 2006, p. 130). Then, as his fascination with nature grows, so do his Buddhist leanings, and humans gradually fade from his poetry (Meghdadi, 1999, p. 131). His depictions of nature are not purely descriptive; he is “looking for a secret” that he cannot find in civilized urban life. As a result, he seeks solace in the natural world (Torabi, 2010, p. 236)

CONCLUSION

Poetry has long played a significant role in literature as a traditional and effective means of expressing one’s sentiments. With the arrival of the twentieth century, poetic invention and advancement reached a new level. Numerous avant-garde movements chastised previous poetic traditions and attempted to invent new forms of poetry to convey the day’s mood. It has become fashionable to abandon tradition.

When a man interacts with nature, he learns several lessons. He first grasps the concept of change and its constancy. Days, seasons, and years are cyclical, evocative of the constant transformation of phenomena. Another is that man becomes aware of his limitations in the face of this reality; he recognizes his capability limitations and distinguishes between two permissible and forbidden areas. This vital information is required for his survival. However, man has an alluring proclivity for crossing impossible boundaries. He wishes to enter the realm of previously unknown secrets. Confronting something ambiguous and the novel is sufficient reason to venture beyond established boundaries. However, submission to the impossible is the conclusion of the story.

Frost discusses man’s relationship with the environment on his destined planet, as well as his personal and social interactions, as we concluded the analysis. Additionally, the poet strikes a balance between two extremes. Contrary to popular belief, he never advises abandoning the modern world in favor of nature. He is rarely transformed into an enthusiastic admirer of nature. Nature, he believes, is neither a spiritual balm nor a motherly figure. This nature does not expect Frosts’ “the man” to perform miracles. He does not expect that it will reveal extraterrestrial truth. He believes that this nature is a mixture of ease and suffering, good and evil. It comes into contact with some rocks, and the seeds germinate deep within the soft soil. It is occasionally harmed by nature and is occasionally on the verge of extinction. While he is aware of his flaws in this unequal conflict, he never views himself as a helpless creature, and man’s relationship with nature, like his relationship with his fellow humans, is both one and apart.

On the other hand, Sepehri taught us how to be sympathetic towards nature and draw comfort from it during times of distress. Frost demonstrated how to work tirelessly while also seeking temporary relief by venturing into the woods and interacting with the forest’s rural people. Sepehri is a poet of contemplation and thought, whereas Frost is a poet of action, work, obligation, and duty. Frost is a pessimist, a realist, and an anti-romantic. Sepehri is a mystic, a transcendentalist, and a romantic. Unlike Sepehri, Frost is content to remain within the earthly realm, observing mundane phenomena; he is unwilling to venture beyond the bounds of this earth. Frost is neither a mystic nor a shaman. He is not a romantic when it comes to nature. Natural objects are not focal points for mystical medicine or springboards for fantasy in his poems, but rather objects with which man acts in his daily work of gaining a livelihood. According to Frost, man and nature are distinct entities that can coexist but not fuse into a single being. Frost retreats to rural areas to savor nature’s bounty and then returns to nature to respond to the call of duty.

In Robert Frost’s world, man has a complex attitude toward and interaction with nature. As with Sepehri, Frost is mainly devoid of romantic or extraterrestrial beliefs. He is intimately connected to the soil, the water, and the sun. It is entirely natural in its touch and sensations. He adores nature but is unconvinced of the existence of a transcendent force. It is associated with nature, but unlike Frost, who avoids romanticism, Sepehri’s poems are replete with such themes. They both scrutinize everything around them, searching for nature: the bird, the water, the tree, and the sky. To both poets, man is significant in the same way that simplicity is, and any simple scene can inspire reflection on both existence and its mystery.

In contrast to Wordsworth, Frost confines himself to the terrestrial realm, to everyday events; he is unwilling to venture beyond the boundaries of the earth. Frost is not a
wizard. When it comes to nature, he is not a romantic. In his poems, natural objects are not treated as centers of mystical treatment or as springboards for fantasy but as objects man interacts with within his daily labor to earn a living. Frost’s worldview views man and nature as two distinct entities that can coexist but never merge. Frost travels to rural areas to immerse himself in nature’s splendors while also withdrawing to attend to social, familial, and professional obligations.
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