

## Journal of Tikapur Multiple Campus

Vol.6; June 2023

ISSN: 2382-5227

Published by Research Management Cell (RMC)

Tikapur Multiple Campus

### Non-Human World in Ernest Hemmingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*

**Kedar Bhattarai**

Department of English, Tikapur Multiple Campus

Far Western University, Nepal

Email: kbhattarai034@gmail.com

#### Abstract

This study explores human attitude towards non-human world in Ernest Hemmingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. The narrative in Hemmingway's masterpiece *The Old Man and the Sea* integrates human and non-human world. However, in this paper, I assume that Hemmingway displays contradictory attitude towards non-human world. The study uses post humanism as a theoretical lens. It employs the critical insights forwarded by Deleuze and Guattari, Val Plumwood, and Donna Haraway as the theoretical parameters to analyze the selected text. The study involves the exploration of the nature of the relations between the entities human and animal. Besides, the study seeks relationality, the interspecies connection, along with the recognition of embodiment, instinct and finitude as the shared ontological grounds in the selected narrative. The study suggests that Hemmingway offers both anthropocentric and biotic attitude towards non-human world.

**Keywords:** non-human, biotic, anthropocentric, harmony, relationality

#### Introduction

Eco-criticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment (Glotfelty et al, xvii) with an attempt to seek the attitude and values expressed in literary works related to human and nonhuman interconnectedness. "Ecology," observe Steward T.A. et al "wants to know how organisms interact with each other"(4). The range of ecology encompasses "strictly biological to concern with strictly physical phenomena"(6). Ecological concerns are not the concerns about environmental problems only. Instead, it is an integrated approach to respond to the entire ecosystem. Arne Naess' notion of ecosphere or biosphere includes, "individuals, species, populations, and habitats, as well as human and nonhuman cultures"(4) and

---

Copyright 2023 ©Author(s) This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons



Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

the intimate relationship for the well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on earth . Humans and nonhumans share the same Earth and planet as members of the ecological community. However, anthropocentric attitude does not treat nonhuman on equal par. This research is prompted by some of the questions the researcher has raised in the field of Human- Animal Study. Is literature a proper avenue to discuss the concerns of human-animal relations? How is the entity animal conceptualized and produced in literature? How does one access the entity animal? How the relations between human and animal maintained in Hemmingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*?

Animals are ubiquitous- in their natural habitats, in farms, factories, zoos, labs and in literature. Literature and literary analysis are human phenomena that mostly orbit around human affairs. Literary animal analysis examines the ways animals are projected in literary works. Kenneth Shapiro maintains that “the critical stance of Human Animal Studies(HAS) scholars explicates and evaluates the objects of its study, Human Animal Relation(HAR), in ethical terms—particularly on the value of valuing animals for themselves” (799). According to Shapiro, Human –Animal Relation is the object of study of HAS. Shapiro’s emphasis is to evaluate and analyze this relation in ethical terms that values animals for what they are rather than what human think and construct of them.

The question whether literature can be a proper avenue to discuss the concerns of human-animal relations is a significant question to deal with. Although literary animals are the product of creative imaginings and are similar to other cultural constructs, they are not all fictitious. Deleuze and Guattari maintain that literature is an assemblage of multiplicities and strata, of intensities and constructions and selection (4). Deleuzian “assemblage” is the assemblage of the social and the material elements. In addition, Deleuze and Guattari believe that the book forms “the rhizome with the real world” (11) and have “an aparallel evolution” (11) in which each invokes the other and tells the stories of relations. In Deleuzian term, a piece of literary work “deterritorializes and reterritorializes” (11) the world at a time. The literary constructions and the world, in this sense, make up each other. Thus, literary constructions of humans and animals, the relation between them and the analysis are believed to uncover the real world issues pertaining to human- animal relations. In Deleuzian line, a literary study on animals is the act of ‘reterritorializing’ animals through words. It can vocalize the issues of animals and serve to establish animals as the actors of the world. Thus, literature not only provides a location and subject to discuss the real world problems of human and animal but also helps sensitize the central issues of animals. Moreover, the inspection of the relations between human and animals in literary works corresponds to the inquiry of the problems of the real world animals. Therefore, pursuing scholarship on Literary Animal Study is also an integral part of literary study and criticism.

The literary works that lend space to animals are the study object of literary animal studies. However, Paul Waldau claims that animals in literature “often remain in the margins of artistic endeavors”(128). Waldau takes animals as the marginal entity in creative spaces like literature and art. Waldau’s question is about human centrality in creative domain. Similar to Waldau, Kate Soper raises concerns about the ‘intellectual endeavors’ of representing nature and its entities. Soper claims that discourses on nature and human relation to non- human world are always “historically mediated, and indeed ‘constructed’, through specific conceptions of human identity and difference” (4). Soper’s ‘historically mediated or constructed’ relationship’ assumes the interplay of multiple interests of human in representing them in literature. Animals in literature are human constructs akin to their construction in advertisements, films, cartoons, toys and paintings. Since animals cannot speak and tell their experience, it is human who carry the task of representation or raising voice for them. Waldau’s question of marginality of animals in artistic creation and Soper’s worry over the possibilities of betrayal or prejudice in representation are related. Thus, both Waldau and Soper invite the entity human under scrutiny in terms of its relation with animal. In this sense, literary animal study is a human affair yet ‘the affairs’ are not outside the critical scrutiny. Therefore, literary animal study also calls for a critical inspection of the issues of marginality and representation along with the critiquing of human affairs in literature.

Authors, through their works, offer contradictory as well as perplexing viewpoints towards nature. In many cases, authors swing both ways and offer anthropocentric as well as bio centric outlook in their works. Paul W. Taylor claims that human attitude towards non-human world depends on “the way we look at the whole system of nature and our role in it”(99). Taylor forwards four basic cores of bio centric outlook: the belief that “humans are members of the Earth’s Community of Life”(99); that there is a “system of interdependency between all living things” for existence; that “each organism is unique individual pursuing its own good in its own way” and that “humans are not inherently superior to other living things”(100). Bio centric outlook of Taylor not only accepts the interdependency between human and nonhuman world but also denies the supremacy of human beings over non humans. In contrast with bio centric viewpoints of Taylor, Nicholas Agar argues that bio centric argument is an impossible ethic to apply since it denies the fact that “there ever are any morally significant interests or needs to be taken into account” (165). Agar uses the term *end-interdependence* to counter bio centric system of interdependence between living things which he believes is “ethically less demanding”(166). Agar’s argument establishes human supremacy over other creatures and promotes more practical and utilitarian perspective towards nonhuman world. Agar opines that “the other side of end-interdependence is *conflict*. Here, the ends of objects tend to exclude one another;

the achievement of A ends rules out the achievement of B ends” (166). Agar takes conflict between the elements of nature as a natural outcome of end interdependence where one survives at the cost of other’s exclusion. Thus, there always exist two possible relations between human and non-human world: of harmony or of conflict. In case of ambivalence, both go along the same line creating confusion on attitudes of the author towards nature. In this paper, I assume that Earnest Hemmingway presents contradicting attitudes towards nonhuman world.

### **Theoretical Grounding**

The scholars of literary animal studies come across range of theories in analyzing human-animal relations. And it is even more difficult to pin down a particular approach out of the vast ranges. Regarding the question of accessing animals in literary studies, Kary Weil, in “A Report on the Animal Turn” identifies three distinct trends or moments in literary and critical theory- the linguistic turn, affective turn and ethical turn (4). Weil maintains that the theoretical lens, forwarded by modern and post-modern philosophers, that focuses on representation of animals through language fails to get into the question of animals as animals (9). Employing language to excavate the stories of disparities and inequalities in human-animal relations projected through the narrative of the texts has its own limitations. However, it is equally challenging to see animals outside words. Under such dilemma, the animal question needs to be brought into the realm of the socio-material realities which is assumed to be contributing in accessing the ontology of the relations between the entities human and animal. In such situation, I ground my thinking in the works of the new materialists’ branch of post human philosophy for the analysis of the selected texts.

Post humanism pays attention to a “more-and-other-than-human world” (Taylor 2). Susanne Gannon writes that more-than-human requires the researchers to search beyond taken-for-granted rational, cognitive contexts to attend to surprising configurations of bodies, things, affect, matter which collide to form new assemblages and possibilities (128). As the posthumanist researchers adopt various descriptions for their approaches – including ‘relational materialism’, ‘feminist materialism’, ‘new empiricism’ (Gannan 133), the researcher will use the socio-material approach/‘relational-materialism’ which is grounded in the critical insights forwarded by Deleuze and Guattari (notion of becoming, assemblage and affect), Karen Barad (material entanglement/diffractive methodology), Rosi Braidotti (The Post Human Knowledge), Val Plumwood (blind spot of centrism) Roberto Esposito (body the impersonal) and Donna Harraway (situated knowledge). The theoretical parameters selected to analyze the selected texts articulates the notion of relational materialism for the analysis.

Relational materialism (also called material –semiotic entanglement) is a post humanist approach which believes that discourse and matter are mutually implicated in the unfolding of the meaning. Karen Barad, the post-human philosopher, asserts that matter and meaning cannot be dissociated, not by chemical processing, or centrifuge, or nuclear blast. Mattering is simultaneously a matter of substance and significance (3). It is a non-hierarchical approach to study relations between human and non-human others (MacLure 658). In this regard Cary Wolfe urges to remove meaning from the ontologically closed domain of consciousness, reason, reflection, and so on (Introduction xxv). Similar to Wolfe, Rosi Braidotti in *The Post Human Knowledge* asserts that human needs to be assessed as materially embedded and embodied, differential, affective and relational (6). She defies abstract universalism of humans as hegemonic, imperial and enlightenment driven mode (6) and takes embeddedness and embodiment as the reality of all living beings. Another materialist Roberto Esposito, in *Persons and Things*, maintains that human body is the “ follow channel and the operator” (4) of relations and it is the subject to instinct and passions where the animal within inhabits (7) and the “individual and collective experience are united” (11). Esposito notion of impersonal denies the traditional categories of human and animal. Donna J. Haraway, an American Professor of biology and animal studies, concedes that “We are, constitutively, companion species. We make each other up, in the flesh” (3). Like other feminist and post humanist theorists, Haraway also holds the view that “subjects, objects, kinds, races, species, genres, and genders are the products of their relating” (7). According to Haraway, the invention of tropes like subject, object, gender, and species are the categorical terms that have served to establish the divergence between human and non-human animals. The researcher will use the insights of these post human philosophers for the analysis of the selected texts.

### **Critics on Hemmingway’s *The Old Man and the Sea***

Both the entities human and animal are the socio-material facts of nature. And they are in relation to each other as the actors of the larger ecological system. However, the ways these biological facts configure in the world of literature and western metaphysical traditions is the fundamental question in this study. The study, in this section, examines the empirical foundations of the relations between the entities the human and the animal in the text scrutinized.

Ernest Miller Hemmingway, an American novelist and short story writer, in his novella *The Old Man and the Sea* (1939) presents a story of an old fisherman Santiago who lives in the coast of Havana. The story also integrates non- human world- nature, sea, fish, turtles, wind, African coast, lions, and weeds- in its narrative string. Hemmingway as writer is not traditionally associated with environmentalism (Jones 51). However, in *The Old Man and the Sea*, he not only seems to present his

nature awareness but also tells the stories of humans and their relationship with non-human animals. There have been voluminous readings on this work of Hemmingway ever since it was published.

Leo Gurko seeks affirmative note in Hemmingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. Gurko notices that Hemmingway's protagonist Santiago holds "heroic impulse" (379). In an optimistic tone Gurko writes, "world is a continuous skein of possibility and affirmation" (379). Gurko regards Santiago as a heroic figure as he overcomes the obstacles with his limits and makes ultimate efforts to achieve triumph over marlin, the fish. However, Gurko sounds conventional in his attitude towards nature as he treats nature as an opponent against which Santiago proves his heroism. In brief, his analysis of the text reinforces the notion of human centrality and species hierarches.

Clinton S. Burhans contradicts Gurko in his reading of Hemmingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. Burhans maintains that "solidarity and interdependence" (450) rather than individualism and heroism, that Gurko claims, pervade in the novel. Burhans maintains that isolated individualism and pride drives man beyond his true place in the world (453). He employs the trial of Santiago to establish the point that human beings are the part of the universe and have a specified role and space in it and its basis, believes Burhan, is his tragic vision of life (455). Although Burhan holds different views than that of Gurko, he is not far from being anthropocentric as well. Like Gurko, Burhan's emphasis is Santiago and his adventures not the marlin, the non-human entity.

In his essay titled "Man or Fish?: An Eco-critical Reading of *The Old Man and the Sea*", Allen C. Jones makes an evaluation of Hemmingway's engagement with nature. Jones' emphasis lies on the way nature is represented in the text and the ways literature and literary discussions define the entity human (52). Jones concludes that novella's final image of nature leaves the audience think about the position of human in nature. Although Jones is justified in his eco-critical scrutiny of Hemmingway's classical novella *The Old Man and the Sea*, his eco-critical analysis is less concerned with the issues of aquatic lives in the sea. In addition to this, Jones makes no further effort to establish the dynamic role animal, here marlin, plays in the story.

The reception of Hemmingway's *The Old Man and the Sea* has been diverse. It can be inferred through these readings that the novella seems to bear anthropocentric and abiotic attitude towards non-human animals. On the one hand, it seems to deal with the human singularity, superiority, dominance. On the other hand, it also talks of the existential limitations and integrity between creatures within the story line. Hemmingway's to and fro approach towards non-human animal is intriguing for the researcher also. Through his classic hero Santiago, who seems to swing both ways in terms of his attitude towards non-human world, Hemmingway as a writer invites the

assessment of his attitude towards non-human animals. Thus, the researcher in this narrative observes and analyses Hemingway's attitude towards non-human animals and searches for the relational possibilities between human and non-human animals.

### **The Non-Human in *The Old man and the Sea*: Analysis**

In *The Old Man and the Sea*, Hemmingway shows his eco-awareness bringing together the interaction between human and the non-human world. However, he presents conflicting attitude towards non-human world. Hemmingway's protagonist Santiago is a fisherman who spends most of his time away from home fishing in the sea. The sea in the novella forms the backdrop of action as well as serves as a home for Santiago. It is "cheerful and undefeated" (1) like the eyes of Santiago that have "the same colour as the sea" (Ibid) but it is "cruel" for the delicate birds because they have "harder lives" (8) against the sea. However, sea is also the source of living for Santiago as he makes his living fishing. Santiago and his friends talk about the sea, its current, depth and the weather when they are resting. Santiago dreams of "places . . . and of the lions on the beach" (8). He is "very fond of flying fish as they were his principal friends on the ocean" (10) but feels sorry for the delicate birds for their hard struggle against sea tides. Hemmingway's reflections on nature, sea, fish, turtles, wind, African coast, lions, and weeds establish that he has vivid sort of nature awareness along with deep reverence for it.

Hemmingway shows deep reverence for biotic life and abiotic nature through his protagonist Santiago. The biocentric notion of deep ecology forwarded by Arne Naess maintains:

So-called simple, lower, or primitive species of plants and animals contribute essentially to richness and diversity of life. They have value in themselves and are not merely steps toward the so-called higher or rational life-forms. (5)

Naess holds the view that all things in the biosphere have an equal right to live and blossom and "richness and diversity" of life. In this regard, Santiago understands his role in this earth and the value of other non-human world also. He assures himself, "You were born to be a fisherman as the fish was born to be a fish" (39); which testifies his respect for his profession and respect for the non-human world. Santiago and the other fishermen respect the calm and placid nature of the sea and believe that "It was considered a virtue not to talk unnecessarily at sea" (14). Talking is a human affair and nature is known for its serenity not for artificial noise human beings produce. Hemmingway has good regards for this virtue of nature. Besides, Santiago appreciates the elegance and nobility of the marlin, the fish Santiago succeeds to hook. He asserts, "Never have I seen a greater, or more beautiful, or a calmer or more noble thing than you, brother" (35). Santiago is convinced that the dignity and behavior of marlin is

even greater, “There is no one worthy of eating him from the manner of his behavior and his great dignity” (28). Santiago is aware that he is a fisherman and his job is to kill the fish but his love and respect for the marlin is constant. He declares, “You loved him when he was alive and you loved him after. If you love him, it is not a sin to kill him” (39). He spends three successive nights alone with the marlin and has the feeling of empathy for it, “I wish I could feed the fish” (22). In addition to the respect for the sea and the fish, Santiago has the sense of love for the birds that fly in the sky above the sea in search of food. He urges “Stay at [his] house if [they] like, bird,” and regrets that he is “sorry [he] cannot hoist the sail and take [them] in with the small breeze that is rising” (20). Santiago’s concern for his necessity as a fisherman and his duty as a member of the ecosphere is reflected in his love and empathy for the fish and the birds that fly. And he shows his deep respect for the sea by not speaking unnecessarily in the sea.

However, Hemmingway presents the “divided consciousness” (Sanders 184) of his protagonist Santiago whose psyche dwells between human and non-human world. Santiago spends his days and nights in the open sea against the confines of human affairs, however, he is never away from human world and its affairs. He misses the boy, Manolin, who accompanies him for first forty days of his fishing. In his eighty fifth day, he succeeds to hook a huge marlin with whom he spends three successive nights on the sea. Despite being situated within nature, Santiago feels lonely in the sea and very often misses the presence of the boy, “I wish I had the boy. To help me and to see this” (Ibid). He misses many things of human world, “I wonder how the baseball came out in the grand leagues today, he thought. It would be wonderful to do this with a radio” (Ibid). Santiago’s recounting of his relations with the boy and his concern for radio and outcome of basketball matches shows his state of mind which is occupied with the affairs of the worldly life where relations and activities like baseball and market value of the marlin complement the raw nature . Santiago can never be away from the intervention of human world “against the overarching background of nature” (Sanders 183) which prevents him from the appreciation of the grandeur of nature itself. In this sense, Hemmingway merges both human and non-human world into his narrative where human affairs dominate the psyche of his central character Santiago.

Besides, Hemmingway, in *The Old Man and The Sea*, takes ambivalent attitude towards sea since he treats it both as male and female. Santiago’s friend “spoke of her as *el mar* which is masculine. They spoke of her as a contestant or a place or even an enemy” (10). However, Santiago holds patriarchal belief and “thought of the sea as *la mar* which is what people call her in Spanish when they love her” (Ibid). Eco-feminists argue that equating nature with female is a masculine attitude towards nature which allows the male to exploit both women and nature. Janis Birkeland notes,



“Ecofeminism is a value system, a social movement, and a practice . . . that explores the links between androcentrism and environmental destruction” (18). Hemmingway’s protagonist, Santiago, holds androcentric belief where women and nature are meant to serve men with great favors. Hemingway also seeks the nexus between women and the sea:

But the old man always thought of her as feminine and as something that gave or withheld great favours, and if she did wild or wicked things it was because she could not help them. The moon affects her as it does a woman, he thought (10).

The “wild and wicked things” of the sea is analogously treated with the irrational flaws of the women with a view that the flaws and irrationality of the sea and woman are common features caused by the effects of moon. It is the fact that full moon produces tides on the sea but the impact of moon on women is no more than a prejudiced belief towards women. As Hemmingway puts, the sea is both masculine and feminine. However, when it is regarded as a competitor in the field, it gets positive attributes of masculinity where as it is associated with negativity or feminine attributes whenever she gets wild and wicked in her behaviors. Furthermore, Santiago relates the behavior of the hooked marlin with masculine traits, “He took the bait like a male and he pulls like a male and his fight has no panic in it” (17) which reflects his androcentric attitude towards the particular way of doing things. In his association of the marlin’s activities with masculinity, Hemmingway takes for granted that the certain ways of doing things with masculine traits which is gender biased in reality.

The possible relationship between human and non-human world can either be of harmony or of conflict. In *The Old Man and The Sea*, Hemmingway explores both the possibilities. His protagonist Santiago lives by the coast and depends on sea for survival yet has harmonious as well as conflicting relationship with the elements of nature. Scott Russell Sanders believes, “How we inhabit the planet is intimately connected to how we imagine the land and its creatures” (194). Santiago assumes harmonious relationship with the sea that “gave or withheld favor”(10) and he is “happy to see so much plankton because it meant fish”(12) and finds affinity with the delicate birds that seek shelter in his boat. But his attitude towards the marlin he catches is not of harmony but of conflict. He assumes the role of the exploiter of non- human world and affirms his superiority, He concedes, “Now we are joined together and have been since noon. And no one to help either one of us” (18). Bandana Shiva blames science and technology as the root cause of the subjugation of nature. She opines, “[science and technology] removed all ethical and cognitive constraints against its violation and exploitation (Introduction xiv). Nature as a source of raw material for human progress has licensed human beings for its exploitation to the fullest potential. Shiva accuses

renaissance notion of development and progress for the uncontrolled exploitation of nature. Santiago connects himself with the fish not out of empathy or reverence but with a motive to kill it and sell it in the market. Besides, Santiago holds the view that “man is not made for defeat,” and affirms that “[a] man can be destroyed but not defeated”(38). The notion of defeat presents him in conflict with the fish, the marlin, he hooks in his bait. He struggles to overpower and kill the marlin and feels joy on his victory of killing. However, he regrets the killing afterward, “I am sorry that I killed the fish though” (38). Santiago has mixed feeling about human supremacy over nature, “But I was more intelligent than he was. Perhaps not . . . Perhaps I was only better armed” (38). Through such line, Hemmingway offers contradictory views towards animals. He presents Santiago as a character who swings both ways in terms of his attitude towards non-human world, “they are not as intelligent as we who kill them” (23). There is reverence for nature at the same time there is a sense that human beings are always in conflict with nature and are undefeatable also. Besides, Santiago does not hesitate to establish that human beings are not only more intelligent but also better armed than other creatures of the world. Yet, he accepts the greatness and nobility of the fish, “they are more noble and more able” (23) than the human beings. He invites the fish to accept his challenge, “Come on and kill me. I do not care who kills who” (35). It makes very difficult to infer a clear view of Hemmingway towards non-human world. His opinions on human and non-human relations are filled with contradictory ideas that display both harmony and hostility towards non-human world.

In addition, Hemmingway holds both biotic and utilitarian perspective towards non-human world which intensifies the ecological ambivalence to a complex level. His protagonist Santiago in *The Old Man and The Sea* claims, “He is my brother. But I must kill him and keep strong to do it” (22). He is filled with the sense of interconnectedness which makes him address the fish as his “brother” but his need to kill it and sell it in the market for his living makes him declare that he must kill it. Holmes Rolston claims that humans “bring all the value into the world” (25) and treat nonhuman world as “our sources”(Ibid). Moreover, the post human philosopher Val Plumwood argues that a centric and self- enclosed form of reason/rationalization fails to integrate larger body and ecological support base which only promotes the human distance from the nature as the Other(4). Plumwood opines that such logic denies the dependencies of beings on each other and strengthens the divergence in human animal-relations as well. Plumwood takes ‘reason centred culture of west’ as a ‘hazard to survival’ since it promotes domination and commodification of other and encourages unethical practices towards non-human lives (5). Reason (rationalization) for Plumwood is a culprit in human-animal relations since it brings othering of the entity animal.

As a solution to current ecological crisis of reason, Plumwood suggests “(re)situating humans in ecological terms and non-humans in ethical terms” (8-9). Plumwood’s resituating of human assumes the existing divergence between species of nature. In addition, his call for bringing non-human within the sphere of ethics also presumes that human activities towards non-human lives are unjustified. Plumwood, in a way, presents the ecological crisis and a way out through his analysis of the crisis of reason. My take in this is that Hemmingway also presents a crisis of reason in human –animal relations. For Santiago, the fish is his resource of living yet he keeps addressing it as his brother. Furthermore, his utilitarian perspective of killing the fish takes another sense when he accepts, “You did not kill the fish only to keep alive and to sell for food, he thought. You killed him for pride and because you are a fisherman” (39). Santiago contradicts with the notion that human beings exploit nature to serve their needs only. Instead, he associates the act of killing with the pride of a fisherman. As a fisherman by profession, he must kill the fish to satisfy his ego and show his fellow fisherman that he is still capable of performance despite being old. Nature in this sense becomes a battle field for the contestants of human world who exploit it to satisfy their ego. Besides, human beings treat nature as a source of pleasure also. Santiago “loved to see the turtles eat [bubbles] and he loved to walk on [turtles] on the beach after a storm and hear them pop when he stepped on them with the horny soles of his feet”(13). Stepping on turtles cannot be a matter of joy in normal sense because it hurts the innocent turtles physically. However, Santiago finds pleasure in their painful popping when he steps on them with his horny soles. This shows his indifferent attitude towards the pain of the fellow creatures. At the same time it makes him a complex character both careful and inconsiderate towards the suffering of the other creatures. Hemmingway presents Santiago as a moral being who has the feelings and respect for the nature. But at the same time, he shows Santiago as a rational being who understands the necessity of killing the fish for a fisherman.

### **Conclusion**

Underscoring the logic of dichotomy and rationalization leads to divergence between human and non-human world as it establishes two sides or versus which resists the possibility of cohesion among species. Human beings need to acquire a habit that shows reverence towards other life forms in theory and practice. The convergence between human and non-human animal is possible in conceptual sense when the entity human adopts multiplicity. The call is not to treat ‘human versus animal’ but to show faith and reverence in human and animal both, including their differences and resemblances. In this sense, Earnest Hemmingway in his masterpiece *The Old Man and The Sea* brings the human and non-human world together. However, Hemmingway takes both utilitarian and ethical stand to deal with the non-human world. His protagonist

Santiago shows ambivalent attitude towards non-human world. He considers himself better armed and more intelligent than the fish yet he accepts the fact that humans are not nobler and greater than other creatures of the earth. Hemmingway presents Santiago with the sense of environmental ethics which makes him respect the nature and other beings as brothers. At the same time he shows his hero Santiago as a rational being who knows what he has to do as a fisherman. In conclusion, Hemmingway swings both ways presenting him as the writer who values nature and has deep reverence for it. At the same time, Hemmingway also seems to be presenting himself as an anthropocist who firmly values human supremacy and regards human as an undefeatable entity of nature. In conclusion, the novella, *The Old Man and The Sea*, bears contradictory testimonies of human attitude towards non-human world in it.

### Works Cited

- Agar, Nicholas. *Life's Intrinsic Value*. Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press, 2007.
- Braidotti, Rosi. *Posthuman Knowledge*. Polity Press, 2019.
- Clinton S. Burhans, Jr. "The Old Man and the Sea: Hemingway's Tragic Vision of Man." *American Literature*, vol. 31, no. 4, 2020, pp. 446–55, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2922437>.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi, The University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Esposito, Roberto. *Persons and Things: From the Body's Point of View*. Polity Press, 2015.
- Gannon, Susanne. "Local Girl Befriends Vicious Bear': Unleashing Educational Aspiration through a Pedagogy of Material-Semiotic Entanglement." *Posthuman Research Practices in Education*, edited by Carol A. Taylor And Christina Hughes, Palgrave MacMillan, 2016, pp. 128–148.
- Gruen, Lori. "Dismantling Oppression: An Analysis of the Connection Between Women and Animals." *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*, edited by Greta Gaard, Temple University Press, 1993.
- Gurko, Leo. "The Heroic Impulse in The Old Man and the Sea." *The English Journal*, vol. 44, no. 7, 1955, pp. 377–82, <http://www.jstor.org>.
- Haraway, Donna J. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Prickly Paradigm Press, 2005.

- Hemingway, Earnest. *The Old Man and the Sea*. Bush Pig Production, 2005.
- Jones, Allen C. "Man or Fish?: An Ecocritical Reading of The Old Man and the Sea." *Teaching Hemingway and the Natural World*, edited by Kevin Maier, The Kent State University Press, 2018.
- MacLure, Maggie. "Researching without Representation? Language and Materiality in Post-Qualitative Methodology." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 26, no. 6, 2013, pp. 658–67, doi:10.1080/09518398.2013.788755.
- Naess, Arne. "The Deep Ecology Movement." *Problems Of International Justice*, no. 1979, 2019, pp. 144–48.
- Plumwood, Val. *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*. Routledge, 2002.
- Rolston, Holmes. "Value in Nature and the Nature of Value." *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*, vol. 36, 1994, pp. 13–30, doi:10.1017/s1358246100006421.
- Sanders, Scott Russell. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Edited by Cheryl Glotfelty et al, The University of Georgia Press, 1996.
- Shapiro, Kenneth. "Human-Animal Studies: Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, Troubling the Future." *Society and Animals*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2020, doi:10.1163/15685306-BJA10029.
- Shiva, Vandana. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India*. Zed Books, 1988.
- Soper, Kate. *What Is Nature: Culture, Politics and the Non-Human*. Wiley, 1995.
- Steward, T. A. et al. *Ecological Understanding: The Nature of Theory and the Theory of Nature*. Elsevier Inc, 2007.
- Taylor, Paul W. *Respect for Nature*. Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Waldau, Paul. *Animal Studies: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Weil, Kari. "A Report on the Animal Turn." *Differences*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2010, pp. 1–23, doi:10.1215/10407391-2010-001.
- Wolfe, Cary, editor. *Zoontologies: The Question of the Animal*. University of Minnesota Press, 2003.