



# ECOCENE

CAPPADOCIA JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL HUMANITIES



Volume 3/Issue 2/December 2022

General Articles



## Ecology and Epiphany in Short Fiction by Zadie Smith and Joyce Carol Oates

**Barbara Barrow**

*Lund University, Sweden*

barbara.barrow@englund.lu.se

ORCID: 0000-0002-0001-1143

Barrow, Barbara. 2022. "Ecology and Epiphany in Short Fiction by Zadie Smith and Joyce Carol Oates." *Ecocene: Cappadocia Journal of Environmental Humanities* 3, no. 2 (December): 123–34. <https://doi.org/10.46863/ecocene.78>.

Research Article/ Received: 24.03.2022 /Accepted: 02.11.2022

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



# Ecology and Epiphany in Short Fiction by Zadie Smith and Joyce Carol Oates

by Barbara Barrow



## Abstract

This essay investigates ecological epiphany in short stories by Zadie Smith and Joyce Carol Oates, moments in which characters confront the link between their own consumption habits and planetary damage. These moments build on a longer literary history of epiphany in modern fiction, a history that foregrounds suddenness, physicality, and the mundane, but these short stories also adapt epiphany to address prominent concerns about anthropogenic climate change in the twenty-first century. Through close readings of Smith's "The Dialectic" (2019), Smith's "The Lazy River" (2017), and Oates's "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" (2019), I show how these stories' ecological epiphanies invite the reader to emotionally confront the urgency of the climate crisis and to take action. While important arguments by Amitav Ghosh and Rob Nixon argue that literature must make planetary crisis visible, Smith's and Oates's short stories suggest that some contemporary writers now face a different issue, not a need to heighten the visibility of the damage, but rather a need to psychologically confront its terrible obviousness.

Keywords: cli-fi, short fiction, denial, epiphany, climate change, species loss, emotion, ecofeminism



## About the Author

Barbara Barrow is Senior Lecturer / Associate Professor of English at Lund University. Her research interests include women, gender, and sexuality, the environmental humanities, queer ecology, and literature and science. She is the author of a monograph, *Science, Language, and Reform in Victorian Poetry: Political Dialects* (Routledge 2019) and of articles in *Nineteenth Century Contexts*, *Victoriographies*, *Feminist Pedagogy* (as co-author), and elsewhere. Her current book project, *Coastal Pleasures: Literature, Queer Longing, and the Shore*, investigates queer oceanic and ecological desire in Victorian and Modernist writing.

# Ecology and Epiphany in Short Fiction by Zadie Smith and Joyce Carol Oates

*Barbara Barrow*

Since the phrase “cli-fi” was coined around 2007, the genre has come to occupy a central role in public debates about literature, climate change, and how readers should take action.<sup>1</sup> Rodge Glass (2013) notes that these “finely constructed, intricate narratives help us broaden our understanding and explore imagined futures, encouraging us to think about the kind of world we want to live in.” Sarah Perkins-Kirkpatrick (2017) writes that cli-fi can motivate readers to engage with climate change through “compelling storylines, dramatic visuals, and characters.” In academic circles, cli-fi has become the focus of monographs that analyze titles ranging from the novels of Margaret Atwood and Octavia Butler to Bong Joon-ho’s film *Snowpiercer* (2013) and is often credited with raising environmental consciousness among readers.<sup>2</sup> As these examples suggest, “cli-fi” is generally taken to mean long-form narratives, mostly novels, as well as films and serial television shows.<sup>3</sup>

Yet short literary fiction, I will argue, also has something to offer readers seeking to confront and understand the dangers of a changing planet. Zadie Smith’s “The Dialectic,” the leading story in her collection *Grand Union* (2019), invites the reader to consider the horrors of poultry farming, a practice notorious for both its animal rights and environmental abuses. “The Lazy River” from the same collection tells the story of a group of vacationers who prefer an artificial river to a polluted ocean.<sup>4</sup> Joyce Carol Oates’s “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” (2019) takes readers through a crisis in the marriage of two Hudson Valley residents as storms, fires, and polluted air destroy the region.<sup>5</sup> Each story features a moment of reckoning, in which a character realizes their role in planetary harm, a role that is physically as well as emotionally felt.

I will term such moments “ecological epiphanies.” While the concept of epiphany is influential for novels as well, short stories offer up ecological epiphanies in more concentrated form, urging the reader to see the connection between their own behaviors and detrimental environmental effects. Ecological epiphanies in short fiction stress

interconnectedness, linking human consumption to broader networks of exploitation of both the human and nonhuman world. They build on a longer history of epiphany as a literary device in modern fiction, adding environmental consciousness to existing epiphanic traits of suddenness, the mundane or commonplace, and physical sensation. Ecological epiphanies in short fiction also foreground how contemporary characters—and, by extension, contemporary readers—come to grapple emotionally with the visibility and obviousness of environmental crisis, which is a vital stage in overcoming denial and taking action.

### Fiction, Epiphany, and Ecology

The contemporary short stories I examine share with modern fiction the use of epiphany as a literary and aesthetic device that communicates a surprising, startling moment of recognition. Most literary critics take this definition of epiphany from James Joyce's posthumous novel *Stephen Hero* (1944, 1963), the early draft of what became *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916). Discoursing on the philosophy of Aquinas, the character Stephen explains the moment of epiphany:

First we recognise that the object is *one* integral thing, then we recognise that it is an organised composite structure, a *thing* in fact: finally, when the relation of the parts is exquisite, when the parts are adjusted to the special point, we recognise that it is *that* thing which it is. Its soul, its whatness, leaps to us from the vestment of its appearance. The soul of the commonest object, the structure of which is so adjusted, seems to us radiant. The object achieves its epiphany. ([1944] 1963, 213)

While objects—in this case, a clock—can inspire this moment of “sudden spiritual manifestation,” an epiphany can be verbal or mental as well, occurring “in the vulgarity of speech or of gesture or in a memorable phase of the mind itself” (211). For Sharon Kim, such moments of epiphany effect the “manifestation of character” in fiction, or “subjectivity, the luminous trace of a singular being” (2012, 2).<sup>6</sup> The interplay between the common, or vulgar, and the elevated or luminous, is central to these definitions of epiphany.

Without addressing epiphany directly, Smith's nonfiction explicitly credits the mundane or common with inciting a strong emotional response to planetary crisis. In her essay “Elegy for a Country's Seasons” (2018), Smith contemplates what she terms the “minor losses” of climate change, in which hedgehogs can no longer be spotted in gardens, or bumblebees at picnics (15).<sup>7</sup> These losses “don't seem worth mentioning—not when compared to the visions of apocalypse conjured by climate scientists and movie directors” (15). Yet such sweeping, catastrophic visions fail to make people act, precisely

because “we had a profound, historical attraction to apocalypse. In the end, the only thing that could create the necessary traction in our minds was the intimate loss of the things we loved” (19). In other words, it is precisely the ordinariness of what will be lost that has the greatest power to sway people. In her stories “The Dialectic” and “The Lazy River,” such mundane moments become, accordingly, the catalyst for moments of environmental epiphany.

Physical, embodied experience also plays a role in character epiphany. According to Robert Langbaum, modern epiphany reveals a “sudden change in external conditions” that “causes a shift in sensuous perception that sensitizes the observer for epiphany” (1983, 341). While Langbaum is not explicitly concerned with planetary crisis, more recently, environmental psychologists have used the term epiphany to describe a changing relationship between humans and nature. Joanne Vining and Melinda S. Merrick conducted interviews with thirty-four participants in a study about environmental epiphany and found a common thread in the experience of “a sense of oneness with nature” that “may facilitate a positive change in environmental attitudes and behavior” (2012, 486). Participants described having moments of environmental epiphany while contemplating the sunlight on a nature trail, or the droplets of water that make up a waterfall, all moments that engage a strong sensory perception (489). These epiphanies are generally positive, stressing human-nonhuman connections and a sense of beauty.

Smith’s and Oates’s short stories complicate and extend these definitions of epiphany. Epiphanies in their stories are, like those above, sudden, physically sensed, and often inspired by the vulgar or the commonplace. Yet, unlike the modern fiction Kim analyzes, their moments of epiphany do not reflect the “luminous trace of a singular being,” but rather the combined traces of many individual beings who have participated, however unwittingly, in abuses of animal, human, and plant life. In other words, their epiphanies may take place in the mind of a single character, but they reflect collective human activities with damaging planetary effects.

Furthermore, the epiphanies their stories depict are different from the experiences Vining and Merrick analyze because they do not reflect positive experiences with nature, but rather a sense of horror and disgust at the damage one’s own body and patterns of consumption have done to the planet. However, these epiphanic moments do extend the possibility that characters—and, by extension, readers—might alter their behaviors. In “Elegy for a Country’s Seasons,” Smith writes that public responses to climate change tend to overlook the “emotional” side of witnessing large-scale changes in weather patterns and species existence (2018, 16), and yet these emotional responses are crucial

in effecting a shift from “the elegiac *what have we done?* to the practical *what can we do?*” (19). Epiphany in short fiction compresses this horror into a single, harrowing moment, initiating the first part of this transformation, and setting the stage for the next.

Ecological epiphanies also catalogue a shift in contemporary fiction’s reckoning with the silent, often invisible presence of environmentally toxic threats and hazards. Two influential works of literary ecocriticism present the problem of climate catastrophe as, at least in part, a crisis of visibility. The first, Rob Nixon’s *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor* (2011), describes “slow violence” as the gradual, accretive destruction of catastrophes like toxic drift and deforestation, a “normalized quiet” brooding beneath more sensational media depictions of catastrophe (6). Imaginative writing can challenge this normalized quiet by making these threats visible, making “the unapparent appear, making it accessible and tangible by humanizing drawn-out threats inaccessible to the immediate senses” (15).

The second, Amitav Ghosh’s *The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable* (2016), asks why literary fiction has not sufficiently engaged the subject of environmental catastrophe the same way nonfiction has. Ghosh attributes this problem to a key moment in the rise of the modern novel, when the details of everyday life moved into the foreground, and more improbable or fantastic phenomena such as extreme weather events came to be seen as the domain of fantasy, horror, or science fiction instead (15–24). He predicts that later generations will search today’s literature in vain for signs of the changed planet they inhabit, discover that most art and literature concealed these signs, and pronounce our time the “time of the Great Derangement” (11).

In both of these accounts, literary fiction has a responsibility to make planetary damage explicit and visible. Yet, in Smith’s and Oates’s stories, planetary damage is already explicit and visible: in the scum of human bodies left in the banks of an artificial river, in the toxic air that prompts residents of a small town to wear masks to protect themselves. The problem these stories pose is not the need to make disaster visible, but the need to understand how we reckon with disaster, or, to paraphrase Smith, how to feel disaster emotionally. These stories suggest that contemporary fiction faces a different issue, not one of the visibility of the damage, but rather of comprehending its terrible obviousness. These moments are akin to what Ghosh terms “recognition,” or “an already existing awareness that makes possible the passage from ignorance to knowledge” (4–5). Recognition is not discovery so much as “a renewed reckoning with a potentiality that lies within oneself” (5). For Smith and Oates, this moment of renewed awareness is both a confrontation with planetary crisis and an admittance of the role that characters’ own bodies and actions play in that crisis. They depict characters with

different psychological responses to climate change, combining these character-driven narratives with sudden, visceral moments of ecological epiphany to emotionally grapple with the crisis of a changing planet.

### Ecological Epiphany in Smith's and Oates's Short Fiction

Smith's "The Dialectic" takes place at Sopot, a seaside resort in Poland. A single mother of four sits on the beach eating a chicken wing with her teenage daughter and expresses her desire to "be on good terms with all animals" (2019, 1). Her daughter accuses her of hypocrisy, informing her that her desire to be on good terms "has nothing to do with the animal itself... It's about you, as usual" (3). Throughout this brief vignette, the narrator emphasizes the human characters' affinity with animals, stressing that both humans and animals share a sensory, embodied life. This affinity prepares the reader for an epiphanic moment that shows the connectedness of individual human consumption with a livestock industry that, in turn, is a major contributor to the climate crisis.

The story begins with the mother contemplating the "half-eaten chicken wing in her hand," its "visible shape of the bones," and the "tortured look of the thin, barbecued skin stretched across those bones," giving rise to her desire to form an affinity with animals (1). Moments later, her daughter "applied what looked like cooking oil to the skin of her tummy," suggesting a parallel between her own skin and that of the chicken's (4). This affinity then extends to the mother's twins in the ocean, "as unsteady on their feet as newborn calves" (2) and to the other tourists in the resort town, where "you did whatever everybody else did, without thinking, moving like a pack" (2). While the woman's desire to be on good terms with all animals seems to envision a bridge between the human and animal, the story indicates that the connection is already present in everyday activities like eating a meal or taking children to play.

The story closes with the mother experiencing this connection as a moment of epiphany:

. . . the woman discreetly placed her chicken wing in the sand before quickly, furtively, kicking more sand over it, as if it were a turd she wished buried. And the little chicks, hundreds and thousands of them, perhaps millions, pass down an assembly line, every day of the week, and chicken sexers turn them over, and sweep all the males into huge grinding vats where they are minced alive. (4)

On the one hand, this gruesome moment expresses the mother's flash of frustration with her husband, who has abandoned her to live in America, and the antagonistic behavior of her children. On the other hand, this encounter between the human and animal, and her own implication in animal cruelty, suddenly becomes grotesque to the

mother in this moment. Perversely, her attempt to bury that connection—to bury her own waste—only transports the story more vividly to the scene of mass slaughter. The shift to the slaughterhouse also connects this moment of individual consumption with a wider livestock industry that is a heavy driver of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>8</sup> This transition is made more urgent by the switch from past to present tense, and by the hint that the woman’s two sons, unsteady and knocked over in the water, are perhaps just as vulnerable as these “little chicks.” The woman’s sudden moment of recognition hinges on the mundane, and on her acknowledgment of the animal life that dies for her consumption and the consumption of the other vacationers at this resort.

Like “The Dialectic,” “The Lazy River” takes place in a resort setting, this time the southern Spanish town of Almería, at a hotel featuring a popular circular water ride. In this story, the Lazy River and its seducing, gentle currents act as a metaphor for passive consumption, while direct address and a first-person plural narrator implicate the reader in this passivity. “We’re submerged, all of us,” the narrator begins, “You, me, the children, our friends, their children, everybody else.... All life is in here, flowing. Flowing!” (2019, 25). Most guests flow in the current’s direction, some purchase plastic flotation devices to make “what is already almost effortless easier still” (25). Some “play dead...and in this manner discover that even a corpse goes round,” while others, attempting to swim against the current, are “swept away within the minute” (26). It is a river that rewards, even encourages, inaction.

Like “The Dialectic,” “The Lazy River” links human consumption with broader networks of exploitation. The narrator describes a coach ride past African laborers going to work in polytunnels where tomatoes are grown and meeting a Senegalese and a Gambian woman who crossed the ocean to come to Spain, women who could “swim the Lazy River backward and all the way around,” and who tell the guests about the difficulties of earning a living (33). The women “get to work,” the narrator reflects, “The men are in the polytunnels. The tomatoes are in the supermarket” (33). The narrator never quite finishes any of their reflections on these glimpses of exploited labor, thinking defensively, “For who are we to – and who are you to – and who are they to ask us – and whosoever casts the first –” (28). The narrator switches to first person for part of this passage (“And upon that punnet I saw a barcode...”), suggesting that a momentary splitting-off from the collective “we” mentality of the other hotel guests is necessary in order to fully acknowledge this exploitation.

This discomfort with visible injustice is also what frightens the hotel guests away from the sea:



But once you have entered the Lazy River, with all its pliability and ease, its sterilizing chlorine and swift yet manageable currents, it is very hard to accept the sea: its abundant salt, its marine life, those little islands of twisted plastic. Not to mention its overfished depths, ever-warming temperature, and infinite horizons, reminders of death. We pass it by. (31)

Garbage islands, overfishing, global warming: the ocean is the most pungent reminder of planetary crisis. This glimpse of the ocean differs sharply from the enthusiastic descriptions of the Lazy River's artificial ecosystem: "All life is in here, flowing. Flowing!" Life may have emerged from the depths of the ocean, but life cannot continue to survive there in its current state, and the guests avoid confronting this possibility.

In fact, the "life" of the river becomes more gratingly artificial, as if to challenge the comfort the guests take in its presence. As the story concludes, the guests sit on their balconies at night, scrolling through Donald Trump's tweets. Beneath them, "the Lazy River runs, a neon blue, a crazy blue, a Facebook blue," its hue shrilly reminiscent of corporate branding. In it "stands a fully clothed man armed with a long mop – he is being held in place by another man, who grips him by the waist, so that the first man may angle his mop and position himself against the strong yet somniferous current and clean whatever scum we have left of ourselves off the sides" (34). This moment recalls an earlier scene in which the Lazy River turns green, which "concentrates the mind in a very unpleasant way upon the fundamental artificiality of the Lazy River" (29). This recognition, in turn, prompts a sense of shame like the one "that came over Adam and Eve as they looked at themselves and realized for the first time that they were naked in the eyes of others" (29). Smith's Biblical revisionism neatly encapsulates our collective response to the crisis of planetary change. The sight of the chemical reaction is jarring not only as evidence of environmental damage, but also as a disturbing reminder of our own roles in creating that damage. It brings about a raw and visceral sense of physical shame, the shame of our own nakedness, in a moment of embodied, ecological epiphany. A tourist can walk away from the sight of the ravaged sea; one cannot so easily escape from one's own body.

Oates's "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" strikes a different tone, Smith's elliptical playfulness contrasting starkly with Oates's apocalyptic melodrama. Yet Oates, too, conjures up a powerful imagery of bodily ravage and shame and links this to characters' recognition of environmental damage. "Sinners" is told by a third person, present tense narrator, and focuses on Luce, a violinist and academic who lives in the polluted Hudson Valley with her husband Andrew, in a fictional town called Hazelton-on-Hudson. Their town has been ravaged by "floods, landslides, and firestorms," and

Luce has taken to wearing a face mask, a habit Andrew dismisses, in sexist fashion, as “catastrophizing” (2019). At the same time that these environmental disasters wreak havoc on their town, their longtime friends and neighbors suffer from a range of deadly health problems, some of which, like lung cancer, may be linked to the toxic environment: “diverticulitis, stomach cancer, pancreatic cancer, lung cancer (in someone who hasn’t smoked for thirty-seven years), leukemia, lymphoma, failing kidneys, failing hearts, inflamed joints, neurological ‘deficits,’ even strokes!” (2019). As a diversion from all these crises, Andrew and Luce throw a dinner party for their friends. The story’s climax takes place here, as Luce and her fellow musicians give an uneven but commanding performance of Franz Schubert’s string quartet “Death and the Maiden” while the guests look on, uneasily.

Whereas Smith’s “The Lazy River” presents a group “we” grappling with planetary decline, Oates gives us a married man and woman who approach this decline in opposite, clashing ways. As character foils, Luce and Andrew illustrate two different psychological responses to visible planetary crisis. Luce is alert to changes in the air, donning the face mask, scanning the horizon with binoculars, and working in her garden which, she observes, is “teeming with toxic microscopic life” since the onset of warmer temperatures (2019). She attends protests, volunteers to help with cleanup after a firestorm ravages their community, and experiences night terrors at the thought of toxic air entering the bedroom at night. While she admits to having a “predilection for melancholy” in her incessant worrying, she also sees the effects of anthropogenic climate change much more clearly than her husband and takes steps to mitigate the damage (2019).

Andrew, by contrast, refuses to emotionally reckon with the coming disaster, making jokes about their dying friends, and reciting sinister, discomfiting quotes from Jonathan Edward’s sermon. He buries himself in work as a diversionary tactic, spending his days indoors, while Luce works outdoors in the contaminated garden (2019). At night, while Luce frets, he sleeps the “quiet sleep of the oblivious.” Despite quietly donating thousands of dollars to environmental relief efforts, he refuses to engage with Luce’s catastrophizing. In an interview about the story, Oates remarks that Andrew’s response to planetary crisis is the more typical one:

Accusing others of “catastrophizing,” even as the world is disintegrating and one’s own health has become tenuous, is a form of denial in which most/many of us indulge daily. Obviously, we cannot “catastrophize” enough in proportion to the imminent global disaster, yet the human brain is so constituted that we cannot seem to imagine, still less take seriously, dangers that are not immediate. (Treisman 2019)

Andrew's perspective is that of the common denialist, seen through a distant, third-person perspective, and through the more frantic observations of Luce.

Instead of witnessing the environmental epiphany of a protagonist, then, we are at a remove, watching the antagonist finally acknowledge the visible and urgent reality of the climate crisis. Oates prepares for this moment by weaving strong moments of sensory perception throughout the story as a challenge to Andrew's refusal to see, hear, smell, and feel the damage. The story opens with Luce reflecting on her use of the face mask, necessary when the wind "'smelled funny,' 'smelled wrong'" (2019). Later in that same opening scene, Luce scans the sky with binoculars, engaging visually with the horizon, and hears a fleet of jets fly past with "earsplitting noise" (2019).

Luce's alertness to climate catastrophe manifests as moments of acute sensory perception that Andrew, at least initially, chooses not to feel. His refusal stems both from his denialism and from his habitual, condescending sexism, which leads him to dismiss Luce's worries as unnecessary, explain jokes to her, and engage, alongside his wife, in gendered divisions of household labor: he in his study, blocking out the natural world, she in the garden, tending it. This last image raises a long history of associations between women's bodies and nature, and a history of stereotypes that present women as uniquely connected to nature. These associations may inform Andrew's dismayed reaction to signs of aging in his wife's body: "she has seen that fleeting expression on Andrew's face, something like repugnance, at times when she is less than beautiful, sneezing, graceless, unkempt. When she looks *her age*" (2019). Andrew's dismissive gaze encompasses both the global planetary crisis and the more intimate—and natural—signs of vulnerability or change in his wife's body.

In line with this thought process, Andrew's epiphanic recognition stems as much from witnessing Luce's physicality as from experiencing his own. Luce's climactic performance of "Death and the Maiden" with her quartet sets the stage for robust sensory engagement. The musicians perform for their audience on Luce's and Andrew's deck, in the toxic air, against a "bloody sunset...like a cluster of burst capillaries," an image that merges planetary and human qualities (2019). Oates further blends the musicians' performance with symptoms of environmental disaster: during a key moment in the performance, a guest has a loud coughing fit; seconds after the final notes, a sudden storm moves in from the northeast. These moments of interconnected human and planetary suffering lead Luce to the understanding that her own body and its mortality has been put on display for the crowd and for her husband: "She has exposed herself, she thinks—her very soul outside her body, but perhaps it is her body as well, unclothed, naked. If

Andrew heard the music clearly, then Andrew knows. Everyone who heard must know” (2019).

This performance, with its raw physicality, inspires a moment of epiphanic recognition in Andrew. He leads the applause, with a “look of genuine surprise, relief, and delight,” and surprises Luce, early the next morning, by coming outside into the garden:

It is unusual for him to venture outdoors at this hour of the day. Usually he is at his desk by 8 A.M., in his spectacular study surrounded by three solid walls of books, staring at a computer screen that stares back at him. And the surprise is—Andrew is wearing a green gauze face mask of his own!

Must’ve purchased it in town without telling Luce. A joke, unless it’s something more than a joke. Luce stares at her husband uncertainly. Not knowing whether Andrew is mocking her or whether, smelling the befouled earth so close to their house, he is at last acknowledging that something is grievously wrong. (2019)

Given Andrew’s apparently genuine and appreciative response to the performance, it is plausible to read his donning of the mask as sincere, although the gender imbalance between him and Luce persists as she carefully adjusts his mask, careful “not to offend, though she means to protect him from looking foolish” (2019). Like Smith, Oates conjures the story of Paradise, in which Adam first sees the nakedness of Eve and then goes to join her in the “ravaged garden.” Here, their feet in the toxic soil, smelling the “miasma” of the previous night’s storm, they embrace (2019). Andrew’s new recognition of the coming crisis stems from his recognition of his wife’s exposed body during the music, the recognition that her body’s fate is also his own’s, and that their bodies are interwoven with the environment and what is happening to it. This recognition inspires Andrew’s environmental epiphany, compelling him to take a small emotional step towards acknowledging the obvious pollution and catastrophe that have devastated Hazelton-on-Hudson.

What are Smith and Oates suggesting when they show that it takes a visceral physical rawness, a moment of terrible, epiphanic reckoning, to compel their characters to accept the reality of planetary crisis? Does that mean that it’s too late—that the damage is already done by the time the recognition takes place? It might—but the delay of the characters need not be the delay of the readers. Through the “we” of “The Lazy River,” through the drama of Luce’s performance, readers can also experience that epiphany secondhand. Short literary fiction helps us grapple with the specter of our own bodies laid bare, vulnerable to hazards and pollution. For the characters of Oates’s story, these ravages are highly visible and perceptible; for the characters in Smith’s, they are

glimpsed in moments of uncanny proximity, when we see the “scum...of ourselves,” when we see the artificial water and feel the shame of Adam and Eve. Kim writes that epiphany is a “central trait of modern fiction,” presenting the “shining points around which characters and narratives accrue like constellations” (2012, 2–3). In the twenty-first century, a time of heightened public discourse about anthropogenic climate change, epiphany in short fiction invites the planet into these accruing constellations, asking readers to emotionally confront the raw terror, catastrophic but still mitigable, of planetary decline.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> On the origins of the term “cli-fi,” see Ullrich (2015).

<sup>2</sup> See Perkins-Kirkpatrick (2017), Trexler (2015), and Di Paolo (2018).

<sup>3</sup> For example, Ullrich (2015) discusses novels and films, while Adcock’s (2018) cli-fi reading list focuses on novels.

<sup>4</sup> “The Lazy River” was first published in *The New Yorker* in 2017,

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/12/18/the-lazy-river>.

<sup>5</sup> “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” first appeared in *The New Yorker* and later, in revised form, in her collection *The (Other) You* (2021). All Oates citations are to the 2019 online *The New Yorker* version, which is unpaginated.

<sup>6</sup> On epiphany and modernity, see also Beja (1971).

<sup>7</sup> “Elegy for a Country’s Seasons” was originally published in *The New York Review of Books* in 2014, <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2014/04/03/elegy-countrys-seasons/>.

<sup>8</sup> On the large and well-documented footprint of the livestock industry see, for example, Allen and Hof (2019).

### References

- Adcock, Shioban. 2018. “The New Vanguard of Climate Fiction Cli-Fi: An Introductory Reading List.” *Literary Hub*, July 5, 2018. <https://lithub.com/the-new-vanguard-of-climate-fiction/>.
- Allen, Andrew M., and Anouschka R. Hof. 2019. “Paying the Price for the Meat We Eat.” *Environmental Science and Policy* 97: 90–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.04.010>.
- Beja, Morris. 1971. *Epiphany in the Modern Novel*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Di Paolo, Marc. 2018. *Fire and Snow: Climate Fiction from the Inklings to Game of Thrones*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ghosh, Amitav. 2016. *The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Glass, Rodge. 2013. “Global Warning: The Rise of ‘Cli-fi.’” *The Guardian*, May 31, 2013. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/may/31/global-warning-rise-cli-fi>.

