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ABSTRACT

Aristotle’s tripartite paradigm of speaker-listener-subject informs much of Western rhetorical theory. The writer or speaker conveys the subject to the listener or the reader; therefore, it is an object--passive and voiceless. Mikhail Bakhtin, a philologist and philosopher of language, transforms Aristotle’s rhetorical triangle into a rhetorical circle. In place of “subject,” he substitutes the concept of “hero.” The hero is not an object of discussion; it is an active participant in that discussion. Its voice blends with the speaker’s and the listener’s voices in the dynamic concept of dialogism, an idea that goes beyond words and establishes the kind of relationships these voices create at the core of the hero’s meaning.

Subsumed in this subjective hero concept lies an intriguing aspect of Bakhtin’s paradigm: a hero is not necessarily a living entity; a hero can be ideas, objects, and locations. When viewed through the lens of traditional Western rhetorical theory, Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea appears as a monologue wherein Santiago seemingly speaks for the author about the subject of doom and man’s relationship to the world. However, when observed through the Bakhtinian lens of the rhetorical
circle and the concept of dialogism, the novella becomes a
dialogue between Santiago and the other hero, The Sea.

The significance of acknowledging a setting as a
"hero," a rhetorical force, opens up and broadens the
scope, depth, and dimension of a text by presenting a
multiplicity of ongoing interpretations. It expands the
field of participation for the reader who is also a viable
voice in the circle paradigm. It dimensionalizes
characters with whom it interacts, and it foregrounds the
importance of rhetorical style in creating text and
developing characters.

True to Bakhtin's idea of dialogism, this thesis is
certainly not the last word. It is but one voice joining
a continual conversation. In trying to make the words my
own, it is my goal to open up for discussion the
possibility that other voices in a novel may belong not
only to the traditional human hero; a place can be a
powerful rhetorical force that can dramatically shape the
dialogue and bring to light hidden aspects of the text.
When these voices are heard, provocative ideas whirl
around in a sphere of intriguing relations that fill the
text with a universe of possibilities.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Hemingway's Struggle: Friend or Foe to the Natural World?

The contradictory, seemingly simple, seemingly single-voiced language of Santiago and the narrator in Ernest Hemingway's novella *The Old Man and the Sea* can easily be interpreted as a monologue. In such a view, Santiago is only a mouthpiece for the author to speak about his "divided heart" in reference to the natural world. Many scholars who observe and comment on Hemingway's dual, contradictory stance regarding the natural world can certainly support this assertion. For example, Ann Putnam, who claims that Hemingway has a "heart always divided against itself," best defines his dichotomous nature as: the pastoral impulse to merge with nature conflicts with the tragic one to control or to destroy it--kill that which you love (99). She further claims that Hemingway ultimately views hunting as a treachery, not only acted against the hunted animal but also against the hunter (106). She also argues that he fixes in art what he could not hold on to in life (107). At this level, Santiago appears to represent Hemingway's guilt complex, for not only does the old man perform
treacherous acts, but he also acknowledges them as acts of betrayal.

Jane Meredith contributes to the idea of duality by revealing the complexity of the role of hunting in Hemingway’s life. According to Meredith, at an early age, it symbolizes a father-son bonding; however, this bond soon unravels into an act of desertion. His father begins to hunt alone and eventually commits suicide; therefore, the father-son bonding is an incomplete and fragile experience full of contradictions (189-90). This experience is a source of conflict for the adult writer. Echoing Putnam’s sentiments, Meredith claims that it is only through his art that he finds “refuge and release” from this unfinalized struggle (192).

Highlighting further Hemingway’s struggle, Charlene Murphy argues in “Hemingway’s Gentle Hunters: Contradiction or Duality?” that although his reverence for nature becomes more apparent in the aging writer, his sensitivity towards the natural world is evident in all his stories. His deep empathy and admiration toward the suffering of the hunted animal underlies his enthusiasm for the challenge of the hunt; this leads to writing from the animal’s point of view, at times (167); however, Murphy stipulates that the author conveys this sensitivity
more profoundly in his later works. Agreeing with the scholar, Rose Marie Burwell, Murphy also asserts that Hemingway loses the desire to kill animals by 1953 (171). This time frame corresponds approximately to the year (1952) when The Old Man and the Sea is published and, therefore, creates an interesting footnote to Murphy’s claim that the challenge of the hunt takes a back seat to his sensitivity towards nature in his later works (167).

As the title suggests, Fredrik Brogger addresses the author’s dual nature in his essay “Whose Nature? Differing Narrative Perspective in Hemingway’s ‘Big Two-Hearted River.’” These opposing perspectives speak in two different voices--the narrator’s and Nick Adam’s. Nick views nature as an object to be controlled; he defines it in terms of his needs. Through his skills and rituals of camping and fishing, he seeks to restore his mental integrity. On the other hand, the narrator’s relationship to nature refuses to add meaning to it. The voice is “detached, precise, observant, and forthright” (20). Unlike Nick’s view of the river, Santiago views the sea differently; she is la mar, an active participant with whom he interacts. This relationship alludes to Hemingway’s apparent desire to give nature a voice that speaks with intention.
Hemingway's "pastoral impulse" to connect with and reveal nature's perspective does not go unnoticed by other scholars. Terry Tempest Williams observes that the writer has a "deeply spiritual attachment to place" (11). Hemingway's own words reflect this attachment: "Can no branch of natural history be studied without increasing that faith, love, and hope which we also, everyone of us, need in our own journey through the wilderness of life" (11); however, regardless of this spiritual connection to nature, Williams confronts Hemingway's polarity: the joy of the huntsman versus the joy of the naturalist artist. The hunter wants to master nature; the naturalist wants to merge with it (10). His naturalist's heart knows that betrayal is "inherent" in the heart of the hunter (12). It is the fisherman in Santiago who wants to master the great marlin; yet, it is the naturalist in Santiago who states, in reference to killing the marlin, that it is a treachery everytime (Hemingway 50).

Also expounding Hemingway's reverence for the natural world, Nathan Scott understands the author as a spiritual writer whose world, as portrayed in his fictions, is "touched by glory" (19). He sees a Wordsworthian reverence for nature in Hemingway's works. In "Ernest Hemingway: A Critical Essay," Scott discusses the
principal ideas at the center of the writer's life: "a sense of the consolatory and redemptive glory of the earth" which creates "a certain pietas as forming one of man's principal obligations"; Hemingway's sense of the blackness or nothingness that lies behind the physical world and contradicts the sense of that glory; man's struggle against the chaos by steadfast disciplines of mind and spirit, and the dream of the possibility of transcendence through love (39-40). Incorporating Scott's view, Santiago's respect and love for the marlin, the sea, the moon, and the stars can easily be interpreted as a celebration of the "profound solidarity [...] that exists between man and the whole stretch of creation" (19). According to Scott, Hemingway's natural world "uttereth speech" and "sheweth knowledge" (19). Santiago appears to hear nature's speech and understand its knowledge.

Hemingway's Heroes of Code

Corresponding to Hemingway's respect for nature is the idea of codes of conduct for his heroes. In Ernest Hemingway: The Angler As Artist, Gregory Sojka draws precise parallels between Hemingway's real-life practice of fishing and his literary creation of heroes of code.
Fishing is an art performed with skill and grace, allowing the fish to do fair and noble battle. It has rules--an ordering process. If his hero follows these rules and rituals, "He can gain peace, honor, dignity, and even a moral victory" (4). There are four codes that derive from this ideology: one must possess grace under fire; hold tightly to principles in the face of adversity; perform to the best of one's ability, and show respect for one's opponent (4). Embracing these qualities, Sojka asserts that Santiago personifies such a hero, for he engages in "the aesthetics of the contest." Even if he loses, he still wins, for his victory is a moral one (141).

In regards to Hemingway's creation of heroes and their relationship to nature, Leo Gurko claims that the author carries on the tradition of the romantic writers such as Keats, Melville, and Conrad who all significantly shape the theme of "The mysterious, inscrutable, dramatic Nature onto which their heroes plunge themselves in search of their own self-realization" (68). According to Gurko, Santiago manifests such behavior. Extraordinary challenges surround him: he has not caught a fish in eighty-four days; he goes farther out to fish than the other fishermen; he catches and loses the great marlin (66-68). Hemingway's definition of hero encompasses the
fact that a hero must be challenged, and he meets that challenge with skill and fortitude. In doing so, he earns reaffirmation as a person of worth. Santiago gains reaffirmation by “stretching his own powers to their absolute limits regardless of the physical results” (68).

Reflecting Hemingway’s belief that the ideal is realized through literature and art, Santiago’s characterization is quite different from the real fisherman who inspires this tale. Hemingway’s essay “On the Blue Water,” which appears in Esquire in 1936, relates the following true story: an old man has been fishing alone in a skiff out of Cabanas and has hooked a huge marlin. Another fisherman rescues him two days later, sixty miles out. The front part of the marlin remains lashed to the side of the skiff. Most of it has been devoured by sharks. Unlike the stoic Santiago, the old man, half crazy from his loss, cries hysterically (Sojka 121). Sheridan Baker, using this true account, speculates that, unlike many of Hemingway’s autobiographical characters, Santiago is an objectified hero (128). Extending Baker’s idea of the “objectified” hero, the old fisherman is not a clone of Hemingway; he is based on a real old man who clearly is not a true hero of code, for
he exhibits no grace under fire. Hemingway transforms this real old mariner into the ideal Santiago.

A Different View of Santiago: Self-serving, Not Noble

Opposing Sojka’s, Gurko’s, and Baker’s viewpoints, Gerry Brenner, in his antithetical approach to interpreting Santiago, challenges this noble, hero of code depiction of the old fisherman. Brenner provides a psychological angle from which to view this text. He argues that there exist aesthetic defects in the novella that expose the author’s fixations and obsessions. Brenner suggests an undertone of filicide and fratricide. The subliminal anger heard in Santiago’s repetitive chant, “I wish Manolin was here,” embodies the filicide urge. The desire to kill the marlin who represents his brother symbolizes his obsession to commit fratricide. Santiago is a complex character. His “intended meanings and designs are at odds with repressed but discoverable wishes and anxieties” (178). Hemingway’s sentimentalization of Santiago--his excess of statements--exposes Hemingway’s underbelly of imbalances. He struggles to repress anxieties that conflict with his wishes to idealize himself. According to Brenner, Santiago’s brotherhood is
“a sham,” for his behavior reveals his self-serving, angry nature (184).

Ben Stoltzfus’s Lacanian reading of *The Old Man and Sea* supports Brenner’s idea of the hidden agenda. Stoltzfus focuses on three categories: what Hemingway consciously inserts into the text; what the reader brings to the text, and what the author unconsciously places in it. Stoltzfus unveils these aspects through Lacan’s theory which states that the unconscious is structured as a language. Words are signifiers that have denotative and connotative value. The Lacanian theory sees the Oedipus Complex in Santiago’s relationship with the sea: the marlin symbolizes, not the brother, but the father, and the sea represents the mother. He kills the father-figure to “regain harmony with the mother and her world” (195).

**The Old Man and the Sea:**
A Monologue Reflecting Hemingway’s Conflicted Nature?

Reflecting upon the above discussions, does *The Old Man and the Sea* only address such questions as: what is a human being’s role in nature—brother or adversary, friend or foe? Is this a tale of transgression and regret? Is it a study in crucifixion and doom? Or is it a theme speaking about redemption and reaffirmation of a human
being’s worth through the "aesthetic contest" of life?
Other questions surface regarding character development:
if Santiago loves the marlin and feels kinship towards it,
why does he kill it, especially when he realizes that it
is too large to fit inside his skiff? Is Santiago a fully
dimensionalized, noble protagonist who represents
Hemingway’s grace-under-fire heroes of code? Or is he a
static, stereotypical character locked within the
boundaries of a societal role and his and the author’s
conflicted, doomed psyche?

In answer to the above questions, David Crowe argues
that Santiago speaks Hemingway’s single-voiced word whose
subject is the study of doom (16). In his dissertation
regarding Hemingway’s dialogical imagination, Crowe, using
Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism, proposes that
Hemingway’s earlier stories: The Sun Also Rises, Men
Without Women, In Our Time, and A Farewell to Arms--with
their variety of voices and "subtle, shifting"
ironies--are dialogized. There is interaction between
characters and their utterances that reflect many
different viewpoints of which none are privileged. He
focuses on parody and metaparody, aspects of dialogism, to
reveal this multiplicity of "truths." Crowe explains that
metaparody occurs in "texts in which key voices may be
taken to be parodic of other voices and in which no single
voice takes a privileged, authorized position” (2).
Bakhtin’s parodic language is more subtle than what is
traditionally thought of as parodic: quieter ironies and
understatements can be parodic provided that an utterance,
a position, or an implied position are brought to bear on
another position, and the parodic position carries a
“higher semantic authority than the target position” (3).
Parody can become metaparodic when the “target position”
parodies the parodic, semantically higher position. The
task of parody is to de-privilege one understanding of a
position through its contrast with another possible
understanding (3).

Crowe asserts that this de-privileging of voices
embodies such characters as Jake Barnes in the profoundly
ambiguous story The Sun Also Rises. Jake, when measured
against the qualities, behavior, and dialogue of the other
characters, appears as the “higher semantic authority”
(72). However, through parody and metaparody, which
packages the dialogism, the reader soon sees the rust in
Jake’s shining armor. Crowe writes:

His reticence looks attractive compared to
Conn’s babbling; his usual control and good
nature even while drunk looks attractive
compared to Bill's rowdiness; his sure sense of what he likes (Paris, for instance) looks attractive compared to the Paris crowd's faddish taste. But beneath these appearances are quieter parodies of Jake's own attitudes.

(72-73)

Crow contends that Hemingway subtly conceals Jake's shortcomings in quiet ironies and parodies. For example, when Jake satirically chides Cohn's latest romantic philosophy, he seems to be telling the reader that he is wise about love, for he knows "what life holds" (73). However, the reader soon learns that Jake is no different than Cohn. Jake's relationship with Brett painfully illuminates this point. Jake's satire eventually ricochets off the other characters and rebounds straight at him; he becomes the secondary target for the parody (73).

Because metaparody is present in these earlier works, Crowe claims that the author demonstrates a dialogical imagination. This idea of de-privileging of one understanding in contrast to another possible understanding leads Crowe to conclude that in these four texts, Hemingway does not believe in the possibility of true statements; therefore, it is doubtful that his
characters can live by any true codes (4). He continues to argue that these four metaparodic writings are his best, for they convey the writer's dialogical imagination by "exposing the sandy ground underlying 'rock bottom truths.'" The dialogism accomplishes this by exposing the ambiguity of most human values (146).

According to Crowe, both Bakhtin and Hemingway recognize the inherent dangers of self-assured "truisms" that ignore the value of people. Crowe further believes that Bakhtin and Hemingway want people to be aware, to be alert, and to apply reason to situations and to "respond to circumstances in imaginatively humane ways" (146). In the first four books, Crowe maintains that Hemingway urges people to be imaginative, flexible, and alert. A person must avoid untruths whether they be political, societal, and religious. One should examine one's beliefs--always reassess self and the world and be prepared to change one's mind. And in the process of all of this, a human being is to take as much responsibility as possible for those who are companions. Crowe stresses, however, that a true code or injunction to live by in Hemingway's world and works is doubtful, and that the usefulness of his study illustrates the author's point about the
impossibility of true statements, the kind that reflect philosophical codes (4).

Crowe notes the unlikeliness of Hemingway, known for his brevity of writing, to be labelled as dialogic; however, he then stipulates that "dialogism is as much an attitude towards truth and ambiguity as it is a description of how many or how strongly voices are offered in literary works" (15). Bakhtin believes that the novel best represents the heteroglot (the many different voices) of the world.

Based on Bakhtin's concept, Crowe interprets the traits of dialogism as follows: ambiguity is always present; in an "ambiguous world there are only voices in dialogue," not truths by which a character can receive in order to perform decisions and acts of decisiveness and assurance. It is an exchange of views--a heteroglot or polyphony of voices seeking "truth or power over other voices" (5-6). Bakhtin emphasizes that this heteroglossia is a powerful force against monologism and dogma, for in such a text there are clashes between ideologies, none of which are privileged.

Crowe explains how double-voicing is another trait of dialogism. It is "Literary language constructed to reveal underlying strata of semantic positions" (42). He then
states that double-voicing indicates the distancing between narrator and character. It also brings the reader into the position of involvement, for she must discern for herself the positions being offered that are not necessarily truths (42). Crowe uses Gary Saul Morsen's words to explain the reader's role:

The audience of a doubled-voiced word is [. . .] meant to hear both a version of the original utterance as the embodiment of its speaker's point of view (or 'semantic position') and the second speaker's evaluation of that utterance from a different point of view. (42)

Distancing is crucial in dialogism, for if it is absent, Crowe professes that the character has lost his/her validity and has become only a mouthpiece. Authors of dialogized texts always maintain distance (7). In regards to distancing, Crowe writes:

This is emphatically true of Hemingway, who continually closes and expands the distance between his voice and the voices of his characters, exploiting differences between his values and those of his characters for the meaning of his words. (7)
Crowe uses *The Sun Also Rises* to emphasize how the double-voicing "allows the reader to hear the cruelty in Jake's 'pretty to think so' put-down" (7). Jake's constant struggle for control and dignity collides each time with his illusion for a rewarding relationship with Brett. Crowe also suggests that Jake begins to realize a larger truth that involves his responsibility to himself and others who may or may not deserve compassion. Brett certainly has not earned Jake's constant rescues; nonetheless, she is more needy than he, and that realization is what Jake seems to recognize in the end: "perhaps the most courageous act is to suspend one's own needs in favor of the needs of another" (71). The double-voicing in Jake's last words to Brett helps the reader hear the irony. He no longer shares Brett's self-pity or her self-delusions (91). His "caring act is balanced by his bitter words" (2). According to Crowe, it is a cruelty directed at the ambiguous world which does not necessarily reward acts of compassion.

Jake, like Santiago, struggles with self-deception and self-knowledge, and in the end, he chooses compassion. Self-awareness and self-deception are in continual exchange. Living in a world of ambiguity--where two bodies cannot occupy the same space and the same
time--one cannot be compassionate and wise simultaneously (1). Jake’s act of kindness costs him his balance of control, dignity, and wisdom--qualities needed for his own well-being. However, he gains awareness that he and Brett could never be happy together (91).

After revealing how these earlier characters represent dialogism, Crowe then delivers a broad-stroke assertion that Hemingway abandons this “dialogic imagination” in his later works, which includes *The Old Man and the Sea*. According to Crowe, Hemingway seems to have lost “faith in the notion of participation in dialogue as an active social dynamic in a complex human community” (10). He states that the male protagonists in these stories are singled-voiced. Simply put, they are mouthpieces for Hemingway to deliver his monologue about doom and man’s place in the world. He characterizes these monologues as having the following qualities: there are fewer voices; the ironies are not as subtle but have clearer targets; there is an emphasis on concrete imagery rather than on dialogue, and there is a “sustained thematic bitterness” (8). These writings are closed and reflect a “fixed game” wherein as Carlos Baker observes, “No happiness is complete; no human wish is more powerful
than the forces in life that destroy us" (qtd. in Crowe 9).

A Different Perspective:
The Old Man and the Sea:
A Dialogized, Open-ended Text

In this thesis, I challenge Crowe's assertion that The Old Man and the Sea is a singled-voiced work. My methodology is a qualitative approach in which I also use the Bakhtinian lens of dialogism, but I use another "optic fiber" of his theory to reveal an intriguing possibility in regards to the novella. Using Bakhtin's tripartite paradigm of the rhetorical circle that involves speaker-listener-hero, I contend that this text is dialogized and open-ended. Santiago is not Hemingway's mouthpiece. He too has distance from the narrator as evidenced by the presence of double-voicing. His voice is not privileged. It is shaped and affected by another rhetorical force that belongs neither to the narrator nor to the author but to the other hero in the tale--The Sea.

Perhaps, Crowe is partially correct in believing that Hemingway has "lost his faith" in human dialogism. Because of his "divided-heart," he gives nature (The Sea) a voice to dialogue with human beings. It is a voice that represents a "world that is neither wholly bitter nor
wholly idyllic. It is the real world, lovely and frightening and nourishing and deadly--but mostly confusing” (Crowe 17). It is a necessary voice to parody the closed system of society and man-made rules, a world in which Santiago also lives and represents. Through his interactions with The Sea, Santiago, like Jake, goes from self-delusion--seeing his worth only as a fisherman--to self-awareness--realizing that his worth lies beyond being a fisherman. Perhaps not to the same degree as Jake, but, nonetheless, he becomes aware of larger truths, for he participates in a grander scale of dialogue; a dialogue that contains the depth and breadth worthy of The Sea’s vast consciousness.

Hemingway uses an iceberg metaphor to describe his stories: one-eighth bobs up on the surface; seven-eighths lies below. Scholars have addressed this seven-eighths of Hemingway’s tales. Brenner asserts that the seven-eighths of the iceberg can easily be discerned through his psychoanalytical approach to the character study of Santiago (183-84). Sojka also discusses the iceberg effect of the author’s writings. Sojka contends that Hemingway, while writing with the goal of accuracy and truth--a “real old man,” a “real boy,” a “real fish,” a “real sea,” and “real sharks”--these “real” things
transform into universal conditions of life which reflect a struggle in voice (130). Crowe's viewpoint seems to encompass only the one-eighth of Hemingway's later fiction. The one-eighth of this tale contains the characteristics outlined by Crowe that would certainly qualify it to be an "undialogized" text. Santiago appears to have internalized dialogue without the presence of a real other, (other than the narrator, author, and reader). In The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin, Caryl Emerson explains inner dialogue in Dostoevskian heroes:

Without a doubt, the lonely microdialogue that plagues Raskilnikov is not answerable or responsible. It does not give real others the chance to intervene, talk back, offer help, pass condemnatory or merciful judgment, finalize an image. (151)

The Sea is the real other hero who intervenes, talks back, and finalizes Santiago. The ancient mariner's microdialogue is not unfinalized cacophony. Bakhtin defines microdialogue as "dialogized inner monologue [. . .] one that 're-creates' the autonomous voices of the participants" (qtd. in Emerson 139). Unlike Raskilnikov's microdialogue, answerability and responsibility infuses
the old man’s words. He interacts, not only with the author, the narrator, and the reader, but also with The Sea. The Sea’s seemingly autonomous voice spares Santiago from his would-be monologue in his “echo chamber of words” (Emerson 153). He answers The Sea, and The Sea responds and vice-versa. And in their response, each becomes responsible for the choices that they make.

Santiago addresses The Sea from the various positions in which he finds his self shifted into, and The Sea responds in a simultaneous manner. Its word, being the elastic, malleable structure that Bakhtin believes it to be, is made flesh through the creatures (especially the marlin and sharks) with whom Santiago interacts and co-exists. As stipulated earlier, dialogism isn’t about how many or how strongly voices are presented in a text. Dialogism is also about an attitude towards truth and ambiguity. If this be the case, the reader witnesses through the interaction between The Sea and Santiago that there is no one truth--no one privileged position; at best, there is only ambiguity in a multiplicity of perspectives.

The truth illuminates from different positions and from values attached to each position. The self makes choices, and embedded in those choices is a value system.
This "dialogue of ideas" opens up a text and allows the reader a greater depth and a more equal plane of participation (Emerson 128). Crowe acknowledges that this idea shows Bakhtin's respect for the reader's ability to make meaning, find meaning, and retain or alter her position (20). The reader's (the listener's voice) is dialogized along with the hero's and the speaker's voices in Bakhtin's rhetorical circle. These dialogized voices participate in The Old Man and the Sea, but no one voice is privileged in its perspective--neither Santiago's nor The Sea's; neither the narrator's nor the reader's.

Crowe perhaps doesn't recognize The Sea as a rhetorical force based on Bakhtin's paradigm of a spherical dialogism because, as he confesses, he is not certain that he believes in dialogism. He has persuasive doubts about "both the possibility and the desirability of a radically dialogized world" (17). What fascinates Crowe about Bakhtin's work is that it presents "a world of tensions rather than truths" (17). The tension that he is most interested in involves the conflict between "materialistic conception of the social and the nearly spiritual conception of the individual human value, the unfinalizability of the human consciousness" (18). Crowe's main concern with dialogism lies in his belief
that anyone who analyzes literature needs to reveal the system of valuation that informs one's judgments. Bakhtin's work is important because it "emphasizes human values while admitting (even celebrating) the indeterminacy of language" (24).

Regarding this "indeterminacy of language," a superficial reading of this tale indicates that Santiago is a hero of code playing in the fixed game of life. He uses skill and ritual to acquire his goal (the marlin), but his happiness is taken from him by the greater forces of life that destroy. However, when read more deeply, using the theory of dialogism, this interpretation is easily disputed. The open-ended, obscure story ending reinforces the adjective strange which is used repetitively in describing the old man and the marlin. It is a strange tale also--seemingly simple but not. Its ambiguous ending opens up the text for many different meanings of which the subject of doom is but one.

An argument for the study of hope could just as easily be made, for both possibilities--hope and doom--are captured (along with other interpretations) in the last imagery of the old man and the marlin. Santiago's body lies, Christ-like, on his bed. He dreams of an idyllic world wherein lions play on a golden beach. Juxtaposed to
this image is the skeletal remains of the great fish floating among the garbage in the harbor; a tourist ironically misidentifies it as a shark. This ending alone illustrates the emphasis of "human values while admitting the indeterminacy of language," for it boldly creates an image and an utterance that reflect how easily positions and dialogue can be misrepresented and distorted; it is the elasticity of the word. This is also illustrative of what Bakhtin and Crowe assert that "language conveys meaning, however unstable or difficult to construe properly" (17).

The reader from her position as active participant and observer partakes in this ongoing, taffy-pulling dialogue in a text which is always in flux and never an "either/or" duality. Dialogism strives for meaning but does not aim for one, unifying truth: "[. . .] there is no one meaning being striven for; the world is a vast congeries of contesting meanings, a heteroglossia so varied that no single term capable of unifying its diversifying energies is possible" (Holquist 24). Dialogism seems to reflect Hemingway's goal to make his fiction timeless: that it would be valid in "a year," in "ten years," and if stated "purely enough," for always (Sojka 31).
The Approach: Uncovering Bakhtinian Concepts

In order to support this challenge of revealing The Sea as a rhetorical force, I must answer two questions: how do I uncover the "ideological and stylistic profile" of The Sea? And how does The Sea shape the discourse in the novella? Chapter two of this thesis describes and applies Bakhtin's theory of dialogism and other related concepts such as self and other, answerability and responsibility, and author and hero. I explain his paradigm of the rhetorical circle which indicates that the hero can be a setting. Using these concepts to inform my thesis statement, I reveal how The Sea is the other hero in the story. In chapter three I perform a rhetorical analysis of the text implementing figurative language, imagery, irony, symbolism, and other stylistic devices to unveil the "dialogized" Sea as the hero with a determining force in the discourse. In chapter four, I convey the significance and implications of viewing setting as a rhetorical force in a literary work.

The idea that setting can be a subject with agency and voice expands the text to new interpretations by broadening the horizon of possible meanings and "truths." It dimensionalizes characters with whom it interacts,
transforming them, at times, as well as being transformed by them. It invites the reader into a larger arena of participation, for the reader's voice is a necessary element in the dialogism. It foregrounds the importance of style in creating a text, for it becomes obvious that style is not just window-dressing. It is one of the avenues taken by the hero to reveal its profile and rhetoric, and it provides the reader with a life-line into the depths of the text.
CHAPTER TWO

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN, DIALOGISM, AND

THE RHETORICAL CIRCLE: THE

CREATION OF A LITERARY HERO

When asked in an interview conducted in the spring of 1973 if he is more philosopher than philologist, Mikhail Bakhtin replies, "More of a philosopher. And such have I remained until the present day. I am a philosopher. A thinker" (qtd. in Emerson 6). By profession, Bakhtin was a philologist, an expert in the field of linguistics and literary scholarship; however, it is the philosopher's voice heard in his theories regarding language and literature; this voice never speaks of the world as an "either/or" duality. Bakhtin, the philosopher, transforms these two opposing mandates into a loophole of ideas and methods that dissolve this opposition into a paradigm of "both/and" (Emerson 5). He entertains little tolerance for people who do not want to increase life's possibilities and their own options in it, for he believes in human potential; realized or not, human potential is real. In an unfinalized world, people and things can change, even if only slightly (Emerson 37). From Bakhtin's perspective, literature reflects the unfinalized
world. It opens up other worlds of possibilities, for it contains the dialogized word which lies at the heart of Bakhtin’s rhetorical theory.

What Is Dialogism?

At its most abstract configuration, dialogism is an epistemology—a theory of knowledge. This knowledge imbues itself in dialogue, but being framed in philosophy, it goes beyond just words and mere talk. In Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World, Michael Holquist explores the full concept of dialogism by addressing its complicated nature. A dialogic relationship is not just dialogue or conversation. In Bakhtin’s thought, speaking and exchange are important aspects of dialogue; however, what pulsates at the core of dialogism is the kind of “relationship” conversation creates, and what conditions must exist in order for an exchange to occur. Holquist states, “That relation is most economically defined as one in which differences--while still remaining different--serve as the building blocks of simultaneity” (40).

Emerging from a time when science and philosophy were at odds, Bakhtin, inspired by science, creates the concept of dialogism that becomes the “master key to the assumptions that guided his whole career” (Holquist 15).
Leaving art and music behind, he focuses on the word as the closest representative of human consciousness, a concept shared by Lev Vygotsky, a cognitive psychologist, who proposed that thought and language come from the same consciousness: "A word is a microcosm of human consciousness" (Vygotsky 153); however, Bakhtin stipulates that it is a consciousness that cannot exists without the presence of the other. A healthy consciousness must interact with other viewpoints. Bakhtin asserts that the word is "the toughest, most elastic and trustworthy medium in which to store and share other people's worldviews" (Holquist 36). He postulates that the word is double-voiced and dialogic--there is always the essence of others in it. Bakhtin writes:

The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes "one's own" only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantics and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language [. . .] it exists in other people's contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one
must take the word, and make it one’s own. (qtd. in Schuster 532)

Clearly, according to Bakhtin, we do not get our words from a dictionary. We acquire them through the interactions with others. Within each word lies a tiny universe of diverse and sometimes contradictory “talking components” (Emerson 36). Charles Schuster refers to this characteristic of language as a “rich stew of implications, saturated with other accents, tones, idioms, meanings, voices, influences, intentions” (533).

In dialogism there can never be a voice speaking only to itself. Words are always directed at someone or something, and a reply is always expected. In The Dialogic Imagination, Bakhtin states: “The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly oriented towards a future answer word. It provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer’s direction” (280). Influenced greatly by Vygotsky, Bakhtin views language as a social act and, therefore, it is always dialogue and never monologue; in fact, Bakhtin believes monologue to be an illusion because a person who utters a “monologic speech” always wants a reply (Emerson 157). It is a world of heteroglossia because each time a word is spoken, its meaning proliferates as it wraps itself in new and
different contexts (Emerson 36). Simply stated, the same words spoken by different speakers will have different meanings.

Answerability and Responsibility:
The Creation of Self and Other

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries witnessed science coming to the forefront of critical thought with new discoveries regarding the world and nature. Inspired and motivated by these discoveries, Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism reflects the relationship between the human mind and the world. Einstein’s theory of relativity, which reveals how physical objects are not static matter, influences Bakhtin’s thoughts about matter. In realizing that matter contains no certainty, the binary distinctions between mind and matter, body and soul begin to disappear. There are no absolutes (Emerson 6). The world does not necessarily conform to laws written in stone, for the stone or the “rock-bottom truths” are really made of shifting sand, as pointed out by Crowe (146). In Einstein’s theory, the position of the observer is fundamental. There must be two different entities if motion is to have meaning. These bodies must not only be in a relation with one another, but that relation must also be observed and understood. Unlike Einstein’s
passive observer positioned at "a point equidistant between two railway trains," Bakhtin's observer is an "active participant in the relation of simultaneity." In his theory of dialogism, reality is not just observed; it is experienced (Holquist 21). However, Bakhtin rejects the idea of unity and oneness, for at the core of dialogism is the belief that separateness and simultaneity are basic, inescapable conditions of life. Bakhtin claims that there are differences that cannot be bridged (Holquist 20).

Like the theory of relativity, Bakhtin's dialogism argues that "nothing can be perceived except against the perspective of something else"; there exists no figure without its ground, for the human mind is biologically wired to see the world according to this contrast (20). Holquist further explains:

More specifically, what sets a figure off from its dialogizing background is the opposition between a time and a space that one consciousness uses to model its own limits (the I-for-myself) and the quite different temporal and spatial categories employed by the same consciousness to model the limits of other
persons and things (the-not-I-in-me) [. . .] and vice-versa. (22)

The world addresses a person (self) in the position in which one is located; it presents givens. Bakhtin defines this position as an "event of being" (Holquist 21). Because human consciousness seeks meaning, humans must answer the world from their place of addressability. In answering, the self creates its own life from the givens presented and gives meaning to the world.

According to Bakhtin, the answer is a deed--a physical action, a thought, an utterance, or a written text--that reflects or defines values from the perspective of the self's position. Although this position is unique, it is not privileged; there is "no alibi" in existence (Holquist 30). Because the situated place from which one perceives fundamentally colors one's perception, it shapes not only the meaning but also the responses. Answerability bridges the gap between the world and the mind.

Bakhtin borrows from biology to emphasize his no-alibi concept and the idea of responsibility which dictates that humans are "compelled to respond" (Clark and Holquist 66-67). All things that are alive must respond to their environment--response indicates life. Not to do
so indicates death or inanimateness; therefore, humans have no choice but to respond. They cannot choose not to be in dialogue, "not only with other human beings, but also with the natural and cultural configurations we lump together as 'the world'" (Holquist 29-30). This biological concept also supports Bakhtin's belief that self is dialogic--a relationship: "The self (the perceiver) and the other (the perceived) exist not as separate entities, but as 'relations' between two coordinates [. . .] each serving to differentiate the other" (Holquist 26). Without an environment in which to respond, there is no life. Self has no meaning "in itself." It needs a ground of contrast to see itself, and this ground of contrast is in the other. Self and other are envisioned as being at opposite poles; however, these poles are not binary. Self has boundaries that touch the borders of other which creates an ongoing, dialogic, both/and relationship (Clark and Holquist 49). Neither self nor other can exist without the opposite: self gives other meaning and existence through consummation, and other gives self its self by allowing it to see through its perspective (Rhodes 54).

Answerability also demands responsibility. Self is responsible for the answers that it gives the world, for
its consciousness shapes the world as well as its own life. However, self cannot address the world without responding to its own need for other. Bakhtin proclaims that self cannot have a consciousness without other: "There are no isolated acts in consciousness. Every thought is connected to other thoughts and, what is more, to the thoughts of others. Thus the world has 'being,' but consciousness is always co-consciousness" (Todorov 77). Self is a co-being with other. They share simultaneity without losing their difference. The two consciousnesses organize the world in time and space, but this time and space is different for each. Self and other may share an event, but they see it differently due to their separate physical and cognitive positions in time and space. These pairs of time and space are the coordinates for establishing the relation between self and other (Holquist 21).

Self has a time and space different from other. Self’s time and space are always opened and unfinalized. Self cannot consummate itself--it cannot see itself as an object, as a whole. In order for self to gain an identity, it must enter other’s consciousness, for it is only through the other that self can be finalized. By seeing the world through other’s eyes, self gains what
other sees. However, for this entity to gain a "surplus of seeing," it must return to its own consciousness. Upon its return, self brings back with it the additional perspective of other and the ability to see itself as an object. Self is able to see self as the other sees it. Self can also see other as subject as well as object (Todorov 78). To remain in other's consciousness would limit self to only other's perspective. This transgressient quality--to finalize other by being inside and outside--allows self to give "surplus of seeing" to other. With this additional sight, self can also be transformed by other's perspective. Self and other exchange "gifts of a perceptible self" (Todorov 79). Todorov writes:

Bakhtin conceives the mirror stage as coterminous with consciousness; it is endless as long as we are in the process of creating ourselves, because the mirror we use to see ourselves is not a passively reflecting looking glass but rather the actively refracting optic of other persons. In order to be me, I need the other. Thus, completing can also be good. (79)

Consequently, self and other embody a constant struggle between openness and closeness, finalized and
unfinalized selves--being and becoming. This relationship is never static. In the other there exists the possibility of completing the self, the I, and vice-versa. Self and other are examples of the centripetal forces that "seek to close the world in systems," and the centrifugal forces that "battle completeness in order to keep the world open to becoming" (Todorov 79-80). In the dynamics of these two entities lies dialogism's claim: all meaning is relative because it is the "result of the relations between two bodies occupying simultaneous but different space, where bodies may be thought of as ranging from the immediacy of our physical bodies, to political bodies and to bodies of ideas in general (ideologies)" (Holquist 20-21).

Bakhtin's Rhetorical Circle

Bakhtin's rhetorical circle illustrates the concept of answerability and responsibility. In Aristotle's tripartite paradigm of speaker-listener-subject, which informs Western rhetorical theory, the subject is something conveyed to the listener or reader by the author or the speaker; therefore, it is an object--passive and voiceless. It does not influence or shape the discourse. Bakhtin takes this rhetorical triangle and reshapes it
into a rhetorical circle. In place of subject, he substitutes the concept of hero. The hero becomes subjective and active and can exact a recognizable influence on the discourse. According to Schuster in his essay "Mikhail Bakhtin as Rhetorical Theorist," the speaker and the listener "engage in an act of communication which includes the 'hero' as a genuine rhetorical force. [. . .] The hero interacts with the speaker to shape the language and to determine the form" (531). Instead of being three separate points on Aristotle's rhetorical triangle, these three elements "whirl around the circumference" fusing together in a complex interaction that brings forth language and meaning. Each element is changed by "the semantic shaping given to it through the 'dialogic' interaction [. . .]" (532).

Bakhtin's idea of "no alibi" or answerability and responsibility also enters the dynamics of this circle. Each element must respond from its position in time and space, and each element is responsible for its answer. This circle construction also illustrates Bakhtin's belief in the importance of the observer and his/her position. As Holquist writes:
If motion is to have meaning, not only must there be two different bodies in a relation with each other, but there must be as well someone to grasp the nature of such a relation. [.. .] Bakhtin's observer is also, simultaneously, an active participant in the relation of simultaneity. (21)

This statement articulates the role of the reader who experiences text through the other elements.

Accompanying the thought of the hero as being an active, determining rhetorical force comes the most intriguing aspect of Bakhtin's paradigm: ideas, objects, and locations can be the hero (Schuster 531). This bold statement collapses the walled-in idea of the traditional hero and opens up the text to the possibilities of non-human entities possessing a voice and exerting a rhetorical influence. Based on this concept, The Sea, a place, is the non-traditional hero in *The Old Man and the Sea*.

**Author and Hero:**
The Sea as the Other Hero

As discussed previously, the trinity of speaker-listener-hero in Bakhtin's circle engage in dialogical interactions. Envisioned by Schuster as three
elements "whirling around the circumference," they "blur" and "fuse" together to form language and meaning (532). Situated in place and time, each element is answerable and responsible to the others; therefore, each element, speaker-listener-hero, can determine the text. It is easy to see the hero as a subjective, active other when the hero is a human character, "a living consciousness," with whom the author and the reader interact. In The Old Man and the Sea such a hero is Santiago; however, as previously noted, the hero can be a location, a place, in Bakhtin's rhetorical circle; therefore, The Sea is also a rhetorical entity, a hero, in the novella.

This story renders itself as a surprisingly challenging text in which to apply a Bakhtinian perspective. On the surface, it appears to be a monologue (a concept that Bakhtin denies existing in a novel or in real life); however, when informed by the idea of dialogism, Santiago's monologue transforms into a microdialogue involving the voices of The Sea, Santiago's society, Hemingway, the narrator, the reader, and others. According to Bakhtin, these are the voices that have "penetrated inside every word, provoking in it a battle and the interruption of one voice by another" (qtd. in Emerson 139).
Because Bakhtin believes that inside every word there is a "struggle for meaning," writers develop various attitudes toward this struggle. If an author "muffles" dialogue to discourage a response, the word is being "employed monologically" (Emerson 128). Hemingway appears to be guilty of this attitude until the reader hears the double-voicing in the microdialogue of Santiago. The reader then becomes aware that Hemingway opens the text and seeks a response.

The Sea is not just an object, a backdrop against which action and events occur involving the protagonist, Santiago. The title isn't The Old Man upon the Sea. The coordinating conjunction and alerts the reader to the fact that The Sea has equal subject status to Santiago, and, therefore, it should exert an active agency in the story. However, this appears to problematize the idea of dialogism, for, after all, the concept involves dialogue and language. How does a place, a supposedly non-living thing, talk? How does The Sea's voice whirl around the circumference and mingle with Santiago's, the narrator's, Hemingway's, and the reader's language?

The answer to these questions lies in the elemental aspect of dialogism: dialogism is not about words; it is about the relationship between self and other that
conversation and conditions create. Its logic neither restricts nor limits: there occurs a multiplicity of meanings in a universe of self and other, being and co-being wherein all elements interconnect as participants in events (Holquist 41). In reference to Bakhtin’s perspective about dialogue, Holquist writes:

[. . .] it is present in exchanges at all levels—between words in language, people in society, organisms in ecosystems, and even between processes in the natural world. What keeps so comprehensive a view from being reductive is its simultaneous recognition that dialogue is carried on at each level by different means. One of these means is natural language, others are analogous to natural language, and others have only the most tenuous relation to the way natural language works. Although it is the most powerful, natural language is only one of several ways that dialogic relations manifest themselves in the larger dialogue that is the event of existence. (41)

This broader view of dialogism makes it clear that dialogic relations are not restricted to language or
dialogue; consequently, by what means does The Sea manifests its dialogic relations in the "larger dialogue" in *The Old Man and the Sea*? In order to answer this question, the concept of author/hero relationship must be discussed.

The self finalizes and consummates the other and, in turn, can be finalized and consummated by the other (Holquist 84). However, because the self perceives the other from a situated place and time, it never sees the other in its entirety. The self's point of view acknowledges certain aspects of the other at the expense of ignoring other aspects. Reduction of "the world's variety and endlessness" is the price paid for these choices. On the other hand, Bakhtin believes that all novels are dialogized and that "novelness is the body of utterances that is least reductive of variety." One can explore through literature the world's possible meanings; it is a "perceptual activity" that "enriches the world's communicability" (84-85). In this dialogized milieu, the author and the hero serve similar roles as self and other, for they have a "profoundly active" relationship wherein both are mutually shaped by the other, and each are answerable (Rhodes 56). However, an important difference
exists: because of his/her creative stance, the author sees the hero in his, her, or its entirety.

Todorov, in his book *Mikhail Bakhtin: the Dialogical Principle*, explains how the author is able to perceive the other. He/She does so through a two-step activity. The author enters the hero's consciousness by putting himself/herself in the place of the hero-as-other (Todorov addresses the hero as a human character only). However, the author cannot remain in this place of identification and empathy. In order to complete the hero, the writer must return to his/her place of consciousness; he/she must be external to the hero. "He is the other bearing the transgressive elements that the character needs in order to be complete" (99).

Hemingway can create a subjective sea because he steps aesthetically inside its consciousness and identifies with it. Then in the movement of abstraction--returning to his position of consciousness--he is able to personify the sea, for he has the transgressive element to complete her. In life, the sea for Hemingway is an authentic "good place" (Stoneback 204). It represents a primeval, feminine force, free from the corruptions of modern technology. It is a refuge, the "ultimate unspoiled world of nature" (Capellan 64).
The author views the sea as female, for it is primarily a nurturer, a giver of life. In *The Old Man and the Sea*, Hemingway steps into this feminine consciousness, and then he steps out. In gaining insight, he breathes life into The Sea as evidenced in the following description: "Just before it was dark, as they passed a great island of Sargasso weed that heaved and swung in the light sea as though the ocean [were] making love with something under a yellow blanket [. . .]" (72). This imagery personifies The Sea as a lover. She is *la mar*. The plural verb *were* suggests that The Sea, through the act of love, brings forth all creation, all life.

As soon as Santiago's skiff passes through the undulating grass, he catches a beautiful golden, purple-spotted and striped dolphin. He has a choice: aesthetically enjoy the dolphin's beauty or kill and eat it. The need to survive sacrifices the need for beauty. As perceived in these lines, The Sea's "stylistic profile" holds its own values and terms that dialogizes with Santiago (with whom Hemingway has also performed the two-step process), the narrator (Hemingway), and the reader. In their dialogue there will be choices made and responsibility exacted. Santiago's and The Sea's relationship will be one of beauty and brutality. Because
of the author’s gain of “surplus of sight,” the reader will come to know The Sea as more than just a nurturer, a provider for Santiago’s livelihood. Through dialogism, she becomes more than a refuge, a place.

It is through this process that the hero becomes autonomous from the author. The hero becomes a separate entity acting out its own agenda. This separation of hero from narrator is evident at the beginning of the tale in regards to Santiago and his connection with the land and his society. On land, he appears older and more helpless than he does when he interacts with The Sea. His deep-creased scars from handling heavy fishing lines are not fresh. The narrator describes them as “old as erosions in a fishless desert” (10).

This image contrasts dramatically with the image of Santiago interacting with The Sea. On land not only does Manolin try to protect Santiago, boost his ego, and give him hope, but the narrator tries to do the same. For example, when Manolin offers to get him four fresh sardines for bait, the old man’s pride responds, “One.” Then the narrator’s voice overlaps Santiago’s consciousness, reassuring the reader that “His hope and his confidence had never gone. But now they were freshening as when the breeze rises” (13). However,
Santiago’s action betrays the narrator’s stated confidence when he compromises with Manolin and settles for acquiring two sardines. Santiago, being separate from the author, is not as certain nor as confident as the narrator states, for it does not take a lot of persuasion from Manolin to convince the old man; Santiago quickly accepts two fish, indicating that he knows that he needs help. The narrator steps back immediately into Santiago’s psyche and intentions to justify the old man’s actions: “He was too simple to wonder when he had attained humility. But he knew he had attained it and he knew it was not disgraceful and it carried no loss of true pride” (14).

The overlapping of the narrator’s voice with the hero’s is a strong indicator of dialogism. It also reveals the separation of narrator and hero. This overlapping or double-voicing can best be described as the presence of two consciousnesses uttering the same words. In its more subtle form, the two consciousnesses are interwoven in word choices, syntax, and figurative language that can create multiple meanings as found in irony, satire, and parody (Schuster 531). Through the double-voicing of Santiago and the narrator in the above examples, the reader hears that the loss of pride is more important to the narrator than to Santiago. At this
point, the narrator acts like a parent who needs to justify the actions of his/her child.

The separation of author and hero occurs also when the reader hears two consciousnesses’ differing viewpoints. The narrator states, "No one would steal from the old man [ . . . ] though he was quite sure no local people would steal from him, the old man thought that a gaff and a harpoon were needless temptations to have in a boat" (15). Santiago’s "quite sure" backtracks onto the narrator’s "No one would steal," leaving a trail of two perspectives for the reader to follow. The narrator may be sure that no one will steal from Santiago; however, Santiago is not so certain.

Imagery and action contribute also to Santiago’s autonomy. No matter how the narrator attempts to show Santiago as undefeated, the imagery and Santiago’s action convey a different perspective. For example, the reader learns very early in the story that the old man’s patched sail looks "like the flag of permanent defeat" (9). The narrator keeps the sail furled to conceal the defeat, but the last imagery of Santiago on land is of him carrying the furled sail on his shoulders. The old man struggles, figuratively and literally, carrying the burden of the mast, the burden of defeat, on his shoulders; it is a
burden that Santiago feels intensely while on land and dealing with his fishing society.

Schuster explains that when speaker and listener engage with the hero, they become "charged by the hero’s identity" (531). During the exposition of the story, the narrator’s voice overlaps into the conscious thoughts of Santiago to reveal this "charge" from The Sea’s identity. In direct contrast with the land, Santiago becomes more vitalized and alive when interacting with The Sea. This rejuvenation reflects in his skills and knowledge of The Sea’s nature and the love and the respect that he has for her. Through double-voicing, the reader learns how the narrator and Santiago perceive The Sea: it is not an it. She is la mar, a personified female captured in the feminine pronouns of she, her, and la. This is how those who love her see her. This perception is counterposed to the younger fishermen’s opposite view; they see the sea as el mar which is masculine. The sea is a "contestant or a place or even an enemy" (30).

Schuster also writes that speaker and listener change through their interaction with the hero. Hemingway establishes the effect The Sea has on Santiago in the above scene. He identifies the younger fishermen as "those who used buoys as floats for their lines and had
motorboats” (29). This implies that the reason they perceive the sea as masculine is because they are not in tune with her natural rhythms and cycles which reveal her true consciousness, whereas Santiago, in his primitive skiff using lines looped on “green-sapped sticks,” is in tune and connected with her: “But the old man always thought of her as feminine and as something that gave or withheld great favours, and if she did wild and wicked things it was because she could not help them. The moon affects her as it does a woman, he thought” (30). This dialogue is extremely important because it establishes the connectedness that Santiago has with The Sea, and it allows for interesting imagery and symbolism to manifest The Sea’s voice, revealing simultaneous dialogical interactions between her and the old man.

Santiago’s and The Sea’s connection as self and other are earlier suggested through the author’s use of synecdoche–the eye motif that implicates a play-on-words with the personal pronoun I. This pattern can be likened to what Holquist equates with the “eye of the fates” in Greek mythology. Three old women must share one eye; therefore, each woman sees through the shared vision of the other two. This fate can be compared to the dialogism of self and other. In order for the self to see self, it
must appropriate the vision of the other (Holquist 28). In order for the I to see itself, it must do so from the perspective of the other.

In describing Santiago, Hemingway reveals, "Everything about him was old except his eyes, and they were the same color of the sea and were cheerful and undefeated" (10). The Sea is never defeated; it is a primordial force of being and becoming. This play-on-words of I and eye suggests the dialogism of the I in the other. Santiago has the eyes of The Sea and, therefore, can be finalized by her. He can enter her consciousness and see his self through her, and what he sees may be more than a fisherman. He may experience a transgression of consciousness and be transformed by it, if only slightly.

The eye motif continues. Hemingway makes the reader aware that even though Santiago fished for turtles, his eyesight is still keen. The connection with The Sea is once again established because he keeps them in good condition by drinking daily shark oil. Santiago’s vitality is further associated with The Sea through the eyes, for when he is sleeping, he appears older. "The old man’s head was very old though and with his eyes closed there was no life in his face" (19).
The eye motif illuminates an insightful vision of Bakhtin's: perception is never absolute or pure, and it is always influenced by the position from which one is doing the perceiving (Holquist 152). This idea of no absolutes and of the possible deception by appearances echoes in the double-voicing of the narrator and Santiago when they announce that the beautiful Portuguese man-of-war is "the falsest thing" in the sea (Hemingway 36). The great sea turtles with whom Santiago compares himself (he has the heart and the calloused skin of sea turtles) close their eyes when they eat them. This action makes Santiago very happy (36). It also indicates that falsehoods must be destroyed with eyes shut. Perceptions from positions can deceive; perception may not recognize falsehoods. David Patterson writes in Literature and Spirit: Essays on Bakhtin and His Contemporaries:

The fictional structure of truth does not lie in artifice and falsehood but in the open-endedness of truth as what is not yet, unfinalize and forever in question. Like the character himself, it is in a continual state of development, unfolding and living in a process of hearing and responding. As something yet to be fulfilled, truth is thus dialogical. Or
perhaps better: truth lies in the dialogical quest for truth, a quest that, Bakhtin argues, characterizes discourse in the novel. (71)

In Bakhtin's rhetorical circle, Santiago's and The Sea's voice continually interact in a "dialogical quest for truth." However, it is a truth that will always be perceived differently.

The Sea and Santiago experience the quest for truth simultaneously but separately. The Sea and Santiago will never be one; however, through their both/and connection as self and other, they give meaning to one another. The Sea is Santiago's ground of contrast from which he gains a clearer image of himself— he is more than a fisherman. He is a human being capable of dreams and of knowing and loving the beauty of the world of which he is a vital element. By engaging in this dialogue, The Sea becomes more than la mar, a nurturer and provider. Her primordial, ongoing voice speaks with the centripetal and centrifugal forces of life itself. These forces dramatically reveal the seemingly contradiction in the both/and relationship between such dualities as: life and death, chaos and order, and sin and redemption.
CHAPTER THREE

IMAGERY OF MOVEMENT AND LINES

THAT MIMIC SPEECH ACTS AND

DOUBLE-VOICING THAT INDICATES

THE PRESENCE OF THE OTHER

Old men ought to be explorers Here and there does not matter We must be still and still moving Into another intensity For a further union, a deeper communion Through the dark cold and the empty desolation, The wave cry, the wind cry, the vast waters Of the petrel and the porpoise. In my end is my beginning. --from T. S. Eliot's "East Coker" (qtd. in Baker 289)

T. S. Eliot's words capture the spirit of this thesis: The Sea is a dynamic voice that interacts with the ancient mariner, Santiago. Together, they create a deeper communion and a text that is not single-voiced. Their conversation is one of being and becoming--endings and beginnings, beginnings and endings--each evolving from the other. Santiago's dialogue with The Sea literally begins
with movement which reflects what Patterson writes: "Dialogue is movement into the open, leaving behind all protection, every guarantee. Once more we realize that dialogue is vulnerability" (75-76). The old fisherman allows the current of The Sea to take him out farther than he should be, which literally places him in a vulnerable position. His skiff, like a pen, glides across its paper-flat surface, which has "occasional swirls of current" (Hemingway 30). This forward movement creates an imagery of horizontal lines. The Sea's swirling current, its consciousness, affects Santiago: it carries him beyond his intended spot for fishing.

Santiago's response is in the form of vertical lines. With intention and meticulous care, he places his baited lines while still under the influence of "the current" with whom he is drifting and interacting. The narrator painstakingly elaborates on the "depths" of the lines: forty fathoms, seventy-five, one-hundred, one-hundred twenty-five fathoms. The writing imagery continues in the simile describing these fishing lines: "[. . .] as thick around as a big pencil" (32). He keeps them with precision, straight up and down, and at their proper depths (32). The double entendre of "lines," "depth," and "precision" reinforces the writing imagery
and thus alludes to a form of communication between Santiago and The Sea.

The imagery of the horizontal and vertical lines also mirrors the Bakhtinian model of dialogism and speech acts. Emerson explains:

In the Bakhtinian model, every individual engages in two perpendicular activities. He forms lateral ("horizontal") relationships with other individuals in specific speech acts, and he simultaneously forms internal ("vertical") relationships between the outer world and his psyche. The double activities are constant, and their interactions in fact constitute the psyche. The psyche is thus not an internal but a boundary phenomenon. (qtd. in Patterson 121)

Through the described imagery, the reader beholds the two perpendicular activities which suggest the beginning of Santiago’s and The Sea’s discourse. The current and Santiago form a primitive lateral engagement through the connecting horizontal line of The Sea’s surface and the skiff. An internal relationship begins with the placing of the vertical fishing lines. These lines connect the fisherman’s psyche to The Sea’s consciousness. Through the fisherman’s ritualistic behavior, the reader shares
his confidence and comfort; yet, at the same time, she anticipates a growing intensity between The Sea and Santiago as captured in the visual of his small skiff adrift upon the vast ocean.

There exists both contrast and sameness in the rhetoric of these opposing lines. Santiago executes his lines with straightforward purpose. His language is obvious and to the point as illustrated in the implied pun: he makes certain that his hooks are pointed down into the water. The Sea’s horizontal and vertical lines present themselves aesthetically. Her language is more subtle yet just as purposeful and to the point as reflected in the sun’s rays that penetrate and hurt the fisherman’s eyes:

The sun rose thinly from the sea and the old man could see the other boats, low on the water and well in toward the shore, spread out across the current. Then the sun was brighter and the glare came on the water and then, as it rose clear, the flat sea sent it back at his eyes so that it hurt sharply and he rowed without looking into it. (32)

The Sea’s vertical line materializes in the rising sun which soon transforms into horizontal rays that are
reflected by the flat Sea. The horizontal lines continue to manifest themselves through the line of the boats "spread out across the current." The reader envisions the smooth flowing line of Santiago's skiff going with the current. These smooth horizontal lines differ from the straight up-and-down lines of Santiago's psyche. It is the psyche of the fisherman performing the ritual of setting out his lines. He exerts control. He does not want the current to disrupt his exactness of his lines nor distract him from his purpose. He avoids the penetrating rays, for he does not want to be "blinded" by another discourse.

In the narration of his action and in the words of his inner speech, the reader sees and hears Santiago's closed psyche: "He kept them straighter than anyone did [. . .]. Others let them drift with the current and sometimes they were at sixty fathoms when the fishermen thought they were at a hundred" (32). It is clear that the old fisherman wants to end his bad luck. He needs to catch fish, so he can identify himself as a fisherman once again. However, when his and The Sea's vertical and horizontal lines constantly intersect, perpendicular relationships occur which reveal Santiago's "boundary psyche." When he opens up during his interactions with
The Sea (in other words, when he dialogizes with The Sea), he reflects a different point of view.

The opening of his psyche unfolds gradually, for not all intersections produce this shift in perspective. Santiago’s ability to read natural signs—to understand the language of The Sea—alerts the reader to the deepening and the broadening of the initial intersection. The creatures that fly above her and swim below express The Sea’s rhetorical force. As in the Christian doctrine wherein Christ becomes God’s word made flesh, the creatures are The Sea’s words incarnated; they are her words made flesh, “a carnate, material grounding of the utterance” (qtd. in Clark and Holquist 86). Her “stylistic profile” encompasses not only these living forces but also other phenomena of the natural world: weather, lighting, colors, the sun, the moon, and the stars. As previously noted, Hemingway’s world “uttereth” language and “sheweth knowledge” (Scott 19).

At the beginning of the tale, The Sea’s language foreshadows the consequence of excess. Santiago uses the sign, but he does not understand its true meaning or message. The old man sees a man-o-war sea bird pursuing fish. The bird circles ahead, makes vertical drops, and then circles again. Santiago addresses The Sea and
himself: "'He's got something,' [. . .]. 'He's not just looking'" (33). He rows closer to use the bird for his own fishing endeavors. The bird dives into The Sea after a school of flying fish. In Santiago's thoughts, the listener hears him read the sign accurately: "The bird has no chance. The flying fish are too big for him" (34). He watches the fish break the water "again and again and the ineffectual movements of the bird" (34).

In dialogism, words are directed at the other and there must be a response. The Sea responds to Santiago by showing him the folly of the sea bird. Santiago's own words acknowledge that the bird has no chance; the fish are too large for him. His vertical drops (like Santiago's) are ineffectual movements. The sign is clear, but the old man does not see the parallel between him and the bird. Like the man-o-war, he stands no chance; however, his "no chance" refers to remaining in a closed mind. The marlin will be too "big" for him in more ways than just size. It will challenge and broaden the old man's psyche with larger concepts. The analogy between Santiago's vertical drops of line and the bird's vertical plunges unveils itself in the overlapping of the two entities in Santiago's inner words. His thoughts begin by
observing the bird pursuing the flying fish and then a
double-voicing occurs:

He watched the flying fish burst out again and
again and the ineffectual movements of the
bird. That school has gotten away from me, he
thought. They are moving too fast and too far.
But perhaps I will pick up a stray and perhaps
my big fish is around them. My big fish must be
somewhere. (34-35)

Santiago’s consciousness merges with the bird’s in
the pronouns me, he, and I; it is as though these words
are also the thoughts of the man-o-war who chases the
fish.

The Sea points out the consequences of
excesses--excesses in movement, size, and ego. Santiago’s
reply forms in a quasi-anadiplosis of “my big fish”: “But
perhaps I will pick up a stray and perhaps my big fish is
around them. My big fish must be somewhere” (35). What
Bakhtin refers to as the “elasticity” of words reveals
itself in figures of speech, or as Arthur Quinn states,
“figuring of speech” because tropes vibrate with being and
becoming; they hold the “limitless plasticity of language”
(2).
Hemingway's usage of tropes molds the connection between Santiago and nature. It is clear that Santiago wants his big fish; a big fish he wants. In desiring his fish, Santiago answers from the position of being a fisherman. His thoughts (in reference to fishing) express this perspective: "that which I was born for" (40). His choice to pursue his big fish shapes his responsibility. As earlier noted, Bakhtin views answerability as more than just response--with response comes responsibility. Not only do self and other co-exist in a dialogic unity of responding to each other, but also both entities must "own their actions" and take agency in creating their lives (Rhodes 54).

In the story, Santiago must own his own actions because if he chooses to respond as a fisherman, not as a naturalist, he will be responsible for the consequences of that choice. The relationship between The Sea and him will be one of adversary, not brother. The Sea's response will parallel the old man's, for in their interaction of self and other, each are affected and changed. Santiago will be as surely captured by The Sea as the marlin is by him. As Crowe noted in The Sun Also Rises, Jake cannot be kind and wise at the same time. It appears that Santiago cannot be a brother to nature and a fisherman at the same
time. Both reflect the physics of the time: two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time; however, in the dialogism between The Sea and the man, changes transpire. Santiago is not the same fisherman at the end of the story as he is at the beginning, and The Sea is not the same sea. He is not a feeble, has-been of a fisherman, and The Sea is not a beloved, fickled female. Both have transcended their closed identities, for the reader detects something deeper about the both of them.

The most dynamic intersection of lines happens when marlin and man interact. Santiago’s psyche constantly shifts in their perpendicular relationship. The dialogism begins when the marlin nibbles at the fisherman’s line. The fish’s response, at first, is timid and uncommitted. This tone reverberates in the words “softly,” “no strain,” “no weight,” “lightly,” “held the line delicately,” a “tentative pull” (41). A delicate pull becomes a hard one which causes Santiago to speak to the fish directly, coaxing and enticing him: “‘Come on,’” the old man said aloud. ‘Make another turn. Just smell them. Aren’t they lovely? Eat them good now and then there is the tuna. [. . .] Don’t be shy, fish, Eat them’” (42). The marlin reacts by pulling delicately again. Then there is no response. Santiago waits patiently for the marlin to take
his turn. Then he feels the gentle touch on the line. He is happy when he declares, "It was only his turn [. . .] He’ll take it" (43).

The denotative and connotative meanings of "turn" creates two simultaneous images: the fish’s actual turning movements in the water and the implied image of the turn-taking aspect of a speech act. Santiago responds, then waits patiently for the marlin to reply, and vice-versa. The double entendres reflect Bakhtin’s view of utterances in literature. They cannot be separated from particular subjects in specific situations. Literature communicates. Words are "active elements" in a dialogue exchange. Their meanings exist in several different levels at the same time (Holquist 68). This simultaneity is observable; therefore, it is knowable through the reader’s perception.

The conversation at this point is light and cheerful--almost like a courtship; however, it soon becomes more serious when the marlin commits himself by taking the baited line. He makes a choice. He answers the fisherman, and, therefore, he becomes responsible for his own actions. He locks himself into the role of being the great fish, Santiago’s prize. He is now a foe, neither friend nor brother. He will have to fight for
survival. This responsible position is symbolized in the transformation from light pulling into one of weight and pressure: "He [Santiago] was happy feeling the gentle pulling and then he felt something hard and unbelievably heavy" (43).

Responding to the weight of the fish, Santiago must let his lines "slip down, down, down" (43). The repetition of "down" intones the depth in which Santiago must return his "lines." From the marlin's position (The Sea's perspective as represented through the marlin), the great fish will shape the fisherman's dialogue into an imagery of movement which reveals surface, depth, and height--up and down--circling and shifting. They will touch-communicate through the one line that connects them to each other like an umbilical cord.

The dialogism intensifies in the symbolism of the extra coils of line that are needed in response to the weight of the marlin. The old man feels the pressure of his turn in the following lines:

It was the weight of the fish and he let the line slip down, down, down, unrolling off the first of the two reserve coils. As it went down, slipping through the old man’s fingers, he still could feel the great weight [. . .]. (43)
Each time the weight increases, Santiago gives more lines. The fish responds by going deeper down. The old man readies three forty-fathom coils of line, and then he addresses the fish using an anaphora: “‘Eat it a little more,’ he said. ‘Eat it well.’” Then in his thoughts the listener hears the treachery that lies behind the third “eat”: “Eat it so that the point of the hook goes into your heart and kills you, he thought. Come up easy and let me put the harpoon into you. All right. Are you ready? Have you been long enough at the table?” (44). When Santiago shouts out, “Now!” it signifies his ineffectual vertical pull. He tries to bring the marlin in, but nothing happens. The marlin is too big and too strong. It responds by moving away slowly:

His line was strong [. . .] he held it against his back until it was so taut that beads of water were jumping from it. Then it began to make a slow hissing sound in the water, and he still held it, bracing himself against the thwart and leaning back against the pull. The boat began to move slowly off towards the north-west. (44-45)

Hemingway paints the paradoxical picture of a fisherman who, like the marlin, is caught in his own
lines. As previously stated, paradox and irony are strong indicators of dialogism. Paralleling Santiago's action of bringing in his big fish, the marlin catches the fisherman and pulls him farther out. The Sea answers him in the image of an anastrophe: man catches fish; fish catches man. This paradox does not escape the old man, who says aloud: "I'm being towed by a fish and I'm the towing bitt" (45).

These pulling-apart-and-bringing-together oppositional forces displayed by man and fish portray the concept of centrifugal and centripetal forces that create irony. Bakhtin expounds that at the highest level of simultaneity in dialogue lies two opposing tendencies: centrifugal and centripetal forces. Centrifugal forces work to keep things apart; centripetal forces strive to keep things together. These forces "energize language" and give it its power (Holquist 69). These elemental dynamics embody themselves in Santiago's centripetal effort to bring in the marlin, and the marlin's centrifugal effort to stay apart; however, in the centrifugal force of pulling away, lies the centripetal force because the marlin is taking Santiago and the skiff with him. In this simultaneous contrast, irony and paradox present themselves. The reader discerns that what
is done to the marlin is also done to Santiago. The fisherman's identity alters, and his monologue deprioritizes and transforms into dialogue.

In his essay entitled "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel," Bakhtin stresses that discourse signifies encounter and vice-versa. Discourse highlights the difference that makes encounter possible even with oneself. "Discourse is the road through the other that leads to oneself" (Patterson 102). The motif of meeting combined with other motifs--search and discovery, acquisition and loss, recognition and non-recognition--realizes the dialogized encounter (Bakhtin, Dialogic 97-98). The marlin and the man's first meeting reflects the motif of search and discovery. Unlike the Greek tragedies wherein the hero is acted upon by the suddenness of fate or gods calling the shots, it is through Santiago's effort and choices made as a fisherman--his quest for the big fish--that brings about this encounter. In their initial interaction, he recognizes the marlin only as his somewhat mystical, great fish; however, the Bakhtinian idea of finding oneself through the other begins to take form in Santiago's subtle psyche shifts. These vacillations will eventually lead him to recognize the marlin and himself in broader terms.
through the motif of acquisition and loss. His conscious change in position frames itself first in a physical change of position caused by the tension in the line:

[. . .] the line that was across his shoulders now. The sack cushioned the line and he had found a way of leaning forward against the bow so that he was almost comfortable. The position actually was only somewhat less intolerable; but he thought of it as somewhat almost comfortable.

(47)

Subsumed in the oxymoronic last two lines is a mirror image of Santiago's "somewhat comfortable" psyche which fluctuates from the influence of an emerging new discourse. Santiago and the marlin (The Sea) are in the double activity zone of Bakhtin's perpendicular model. Santiago is being horizontally pulled towards a new direction--the marlin's "true course"; at the same time, both he and the fish are connected to the vertical line that goes straight down into the deep consciousness of The Sea.

The dialogism begins with what Bakhtin terms as "hearing with our tongues": speaking and listening are simultaneous, and we hear by responding (Patterson 100). When Santiago hears the playfulness of the porpoises, his
response reflects a shift in self. Hemingway constructs this scene by first juxtaposing it with Santiago’s repetition of the word “remember” (48); however, these “remembers” connote practicality and duty. The old fisherman must “remember” to eat the tuna to stay strong. He reminds himself three times because he feels his “straight, up-and-down” position of being a fisherman is “slanting” towards another awareness.

The porpoises evoke another kind of “remember” as in the memory of brotherhood and at-oneness with nature. This memory is said not in thought but announced in external speech: “‘They are good,’ he said. ‘They play and make jokes and love one another. They are our brothers like the flying fish’” (48). The outer speech then turns inwardly, and the reader hears Santiago’s thoughts. His consciousness is merging with the marlin’s in the form of sympathy. He begins to pity the great fish that he has hooked: “He is wonderful and strange and who knows how old he is, he thought. Never have I had such a strong fish nor one who acted so strangely” (48). The repetition of the word “strange” as adjective and adverb links the marlin with Santiago who earlier refers to himself as a “strange old man” (14). This connotation is not the “strange” as in weird or bizarre. On the
contrary, this word seemingly suggests an aspect of the mystical—the spirit of nature itself.

Santiago’s consciousness continues to alter. The manner in which the marlin takes the bait triggers another memory. He does so as a male. The old man continues to reflect on the fact that “he pulls like a male and his fight has no panic in it” (49). Then he recalls another time, in which the identity of the marlin is implicated: he and Santiago have met once before when Santiago harpooned and killed his mate. The male marlin had stayed with her loyally and had even jumped high out of the water to see where she was. Santiago remembers three things: it was the saddest thing that he had ever seen; the marlin was beautiful, and he had stayed with his mate (50).

The old man’s guilty conscious defines itself in the implied metaphorical image of brotherhood. He is literally and figuratively carrying the weight of his brother on his shoulders and back: “[. . .] and felt the strength of the great fish through the lines he held across his shoulders moving steadily towards whatever he had chosen” (50). The ambiguity of the antecedent for the last pronoun he creates a question in the reader’s mind: does he refer to the marlin or to Santiago? This vagueness allows for an overlapping to occur which
indicates a simultaneous dialogue is transpiring. Whose choice—the marlin’s or the old man’s? The he is dialogized. It is not an either/or; it is a both/and. Santiago and the marlin have made their choice, and they will suffer the consequences of such choices together.

The shift in Santiago’s psyche transforms from sympathy to guilt, to confession, and then to regret. The reader enters his thoughts to witness his confession:

“When once, through my treachery, it had been necessary to him to make a choice, the old man thought” (50). Under The Sea’s rhetorical force of tightly pulled, tense lines, Santiago uncomfortably tears himself away from his position of fisherman and confesses more, not aloud, but to himself and to the two other listeners, the narrator and the reader:

His choice had been to stay in the deep dark water far out beyond all snares and traps and treacheries. My choice was to go there to find him beyond all people. Beyond all people in the world. Now we are joined together and have been since noon. (50)

This confession is so difficult that he must use the hyperbole, “beyond all people in the world,” and the anadiplosis, “beyond all people,” to force it loose.
Immediately following this acknowledgment of their bond, Santiago’s regretful consciousness is heard, but it begins with the adverb, perhaps, which expresses an ambiguous extent or degree of the modal and auxiliary verbs should have and the adverb not. This word is then paired with the contrasting coordinating conjunction, but, which introduces the justification for his choice and signifies a reshifting in his perspective: “Perhaps I should not have been a fisherman, he thought. But that was the thing that I was born for” (50). The shift is completed when the listener hears the voice of the fisherman in the non sequitur that follows the last line above: “I must remember to eat the tuna after it gets light” (50). We have come full circle, back to the original, practical, duty-filled “remember.”

Santiago’s action reinforces the fisherman’s perspective. He cuts all his other lines. He commits himself totally to the marlin, who is only an object. At this point, he rids himself of all other stimuli and focuses on his big fish. In fixating on the marlin as an object, Santiago returns to his consciousness without a “surplus of sight.” He purposely distances himself from the other which Bakhtin equates with isolating the self from oneself. When this happens, there is fragmentation.
The individual is "paralyzed by monological mimicry or muted by fear of vulnerability" (Patterson 109). This fearful and vulnerable mimicry resounds in Santiago's nine repetitive, mantra-like wishes for Manolin which coincide with the fisherman's closed psyche:

1. "I wish I had the boy" (45). This is said after Santiago hooks the marlin and is being pulled out to sea.

2. "I wish I had the boy" (48). He states this after reprimanding himself for daydreaming about baseball. Santiago has hooked a great fish, and he reminds himself to pay attention as a fisherman should.

3. "I wish the boy was here" (50). The old man utters this third wish after remembering the butchering of the female marlin. He remembers how they "begged her pardon and butchered her promptly" (50).

4. "I wish I had the boy" (51). He states this wish after he cuts all the lines.

5. "I wish the boy was here" (56). Santiago, distracted by a warbler, philosophizes about its vulnerability; the fish lurches and almost pulls the old man overboard. He reminds himself again
to pay attention as a fisherman, not as a naturalist or philosopher.

(6) "If the boy was here [. . .]" (62). His left hand cramps from holding onto the fishing line that connects him to the marlin. He wishes for Manolin to rub the vulnerable, injured hand.

(7) "If the boy was here [. . .]" (83). Santiago wants him to wet the coils of the line. Then the old man repeats the line twice, changing was to were: "If the boy were here. If the boy were here" (83).

These last three wishes for Manolin figuratively attach themselves to the visual image of the line that goes "out, out and out" (83). The words and the image that they evoke are ones of vulnerability and hidden fear being felt by the old man.

The slanting of the line indicates the altering discourse of the marlin's. The fish swims at a lesser depth. Their connecting, vertical line becomes horizontal. In this in-between state of slanted line, the old man's discourse fluctuates between a stance of brotherhood and one of fisherman. The contradiction resounds poignantly in Santiago’s direct address to the marlin: "'Fish,' he said, 'I love you and respect you very
much. But I will kill you dead before this day ends’” (54). The redundancy of kill and dead is necessary, for, like the hyperbole and the anadiplosis previously used, Santiago must convince himself that he will do this act. As soon as he makes these two opposing declarations, the listener hears him think: “Let us hope so” (54). The pronoun us is ambiguous, and, therefore, dialogized. Who is this us and what is it for which we hope? That Santiago loves and respects the fish and will allow it to live, or that he will kill him? From a brother’s perspective, he will hope for love, respect, and life. From a fisherman’s stance, he will hope for a clean, easy kill.

The line continues to slant; it is a centripetal force bringing fish and man closer together until they meet briefly on the horizontal plane before the fish jumps and arches into the air:

The line rose slowly out steadily and then the surface of the ocean bulged ahead of the boat and the fish came out unendingly and the water poured from its sides. He was bright in the sun and his head and back were dark purple and in the sun the stripes on his sides showed wide and a light lavender. His sword was as long as a
baseball bat and tapered like a rapier and he rose his full length from the water and then re-entered it, smoothly, like a diver and the old man saw the great scythe-blade of his tail go under and the line commenced to race out.

(62-63)

The description of the marlin’s first appearance mirrors the birthing process. Once he leaves The Sea, the marlin takes on a new identity. While the marlin is deep in the womb of The Sea, the old man views the fish as almost mythical: he’s beautiful, loyal, brave, and noble. When man and fish come eye-to-eye, the encounter, the discourse--the motif of meeting--deepens and intensifies slowly. Using Bakhtin’s idea of chronotope not being viewed as “a coordinate in space and time but as a node or nexus in discourse,” Patterson states: “If signification consists of a transfer of the word from mouth to mouth, it also lies in the meeting of the one and the other face-to-face” (103). Santiago, at first, sees the fish only through the eyes of a fisherman. All aesthetic hues wash out in the old man’s matter-of-fact observation: “He is two feet longer than the skiff” (63).

Through the narrator’s transgressent eyes, the reader sees an “unending,” unfinalized other. Bakhtin believes
that in dialogism, the need exists to "specify relations between individual persons and particular entities as they constitute a simultaneity" (Holquist 150). What we see and how we see depends upon from where we see. “Beginnings and ends lie in the objective (and object-like) world for others, but not for the conscious person himself” (165). Consequently, consciousness cannot perceive beginning or end; “it is experienced as infinite, revealing itself only from within” (165). The marlin has been hidden in the darkness until now. When it breaks the surface, it does so "unendingly." The adverb is dialogized. It is The Sea, through the marlin, referencing itself because a self, an I, is not finalized. The marlin is only finalized or closed-off through Santiago, the other. As the other, he consummates or finalizes the marlin: the marlin is not endless; he is two feet longer than the skiff. The old man’s remark is significant because it reveals the point of view of the fisherman, not of the brother. He doesn’t comment about the fish’s magnificent beauty. He doesn’t recognize the self in the other. If he did, his choice would be to cut the line; by freeing the fish, he frees himself. Instead, he chooses to deceive the fish by never letting it know its own strength. Ironically, it will take every fiber of
the fisherman’s strength to bring his fish home. Embedded in this irony rests another paradox: he brings home the size which is measured by the sword, the skeletal body, and the tail, but he does not bring home the magnificent beauty which is endless and immeasurable yet temporarily lost in the marlin (but not in The Sea which is endless and still existing).

When the marlin re-enters The Sea, the slanted line returns and so does a shift in Santiago’s position. The reader knows that the beauty of the marlin has not gone completely unnoticed by the old man. The substratum of his empathetic words holds this recognition: “If I were him I would put in everything now and go until something broke. But, thank God, they are not as intelligent as we who kill them; although they are more noble and more able (63). The wanting to see himself in the other incarnates in the opposing images which are juxtaposed: the beauty of the marlin is in stark contrast to the beat-up exterior of the old man who is scarred, wrinkled, and deformed by a cramped hand. These images, posed simultaneously, illustrate another Bakhtinian concept: dialogism is “based on the assumption that knowing an entity (a person or thing) is to put that entity into a relation of simultaneity with something else.” However, simultaneity
is not a relation of equality or identity (Holquist 156). This idea echoes in Santiago’s thoughts: “He jumped almost as though to show me how big he was” (64).

Then the old man’s inner words slip into the marlin’s viewpoint when he tells himself and the listener what the marlin would see and think. His “if I were him,” becomes a stronger utterance of “I wish I was the fish”:

I wish I could show him what sort of man I am.
But then he would see the cramped hand. Let him think I am more than I am and I will be so. I wish I was the fish, he thought, with everything he has against only my will and my intelligence.

(64)

In the sentiment of the last two lines lies the heart of dialogism: we find ourselves in others, and others find themselves in us. Self and other are “bound together in a dialogic unity in which they constantly respond to each other. Self gives other meaning and thus other cannot exist without the self’s consummation. Other gives self self and thus the concept of self cannot exist without the other” (Rhodes 54). Santiago’s identity is at the crossroad of both his and the marlin’s consciousnesses.

Santiago’s answerability towards the great fish will come from the choice made by the fisherman. It is a
choice made again, again, and again over a lifetime shaped by being a fisherman: "'I’ll kill him though,' he said. 'In all his greatness and his glory’" (66). This response is not without responsibility and a value system. In his position of “no alibi,” Santiago realizes that the killing of the fish is unfair, but from his particular situation, it is the only choice: "Although it is unjust, he thought. But I will show him what a man can do and what a man endures" (66). The old man’s position--a position that is always a being and becoming--presents the unjust aspect of his action. Curiously, he does not express his open-ended, non-finalized self. The narrator speaks about Santiago proving himself as a fisherman: "The thousand times that he had proved it meant nothing. Now he was proving it again. Each time was a new time and he never thought about the past when he was doing it” (66). The narrator informs the reader about the cycle because the fisherman never thinks about it while he is doing the deed.

However, the old man does realize that his situated place must redefine itself again and again. As the skiff moves ahead, so does his thinking. The Sea captures the shadow of a plane which scares up a school of flying fish and provokes a collage of reflective thought in Santiago.
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The old man wonders what The Sea would look like from above. This wishing for a new perspective stirs up memories of another time when he sees The Sea and its creatures from high above a cross-trees of a mast-head on a turtle boat (71-72). His view becomes one of aesthetics. He speculates and speaks about the colors of the fish. Hemingway underscores this "shifting of position" dialogue with the physical vacillating movements of Santiago. The old fisherman moves, with difficulty, from the bow to stern, stern to bow; he repositions the lines from his left hand to this right and vice-versa. The double entendre of "shifting lines" and "shifting positions" is Santiago’s response, physically and dialogically, to The Sea’s physical and rhetorical force. As a result, he is in a constant state of flux.

When the reader hears Santiago again wish for a different perspective, regret colors the tone and the mood of his utterance. Santiago lies at the bow of the boat when the first stars appear. The stars in the night sky are a parallel world to The Sea and its creatures; however, it is a distant world associated with man’s state of rest and dreams; it is a world of ideals. Santiago calls the stars his "distant friends." Then he immediately proclaims aloud: "'The fish is my friend, too'}
[. . .] 'I have never seen or heard of such a fish. But I must kill him. I am glad we do not have to try to kill the stars’” (75).

The must kill directive comes from the survival code--life lives off of life. The dialogized we tells the listener that she is included, for this is the law for all of mankind and living entities--it is the scheme of things. However, Santiago wishes that this world could be different; he wishes for a world wherein it would be impossible “to kill the sun or the moon or the stars” (75). This empathy transfers to the marlin who has had nothing to eat. By using and instead of but, Hemingway indicates that the following lines, which represent two different positions, are equal in value. Both are truths from a different viewpoint: "Then he was sorry for the great fish that had nothing to eat and his determination to kill him never relaxed in the sorrow for him" (75).

In regards to the marlin, Santiago’s thoughts continue to fluctuate between the practical and the ideal:

How many people will he feed, he thought.

But are they worthy to eat him?

No, of course not.
There is no one worthy of eating him from the manner of his behaviour and his great dignity.

(75)

The question-and-answer construction alludes to the impression of double-voicing. Who asks the questions? Who answers? The Sea and its creatures and the natural world exert a rhetorical force which shape both the questions and the answers that Santiago’s words express. The reader perceives that Santiago, the man, is deeply affected by these encounters. These questions and answers apparently come from a different consciousness, one with boundaries. It asks him why he is doing what he is doing; however, he dismisses these thoughts when his inner dialogue resigns, “I do not understand these things” (75). He cannot remain in the world of ideals—a world that is eternal. He lives regretfully in time and place. This regret reverberates in his continued thoughts: “But it is good that we do not have to try and kill the sun or the moon or the stars. It is enough to live on the sea and kill or true brothers” (75). Santiago’s thought, “I do not understand these things,” mirrors the marlin’s position stated by the old fisherman: “The punishment of hunger, and that he is against something that he does not comprehend, is everything” (76). Both man and fish share
the same yet different positions of simultaneous incomprehension.

While dreaming of his ideal world where he watches happily lions frolic on a golden beach, a powerful jerk on his lines awakens Santiago abruptly and collapses his dreamstate. The marlin's horizontal line goes out furiously, cutting and burning the old man's hand deeply. This action reminds him painfully that his choice in the real world is that of fisherman. Pain is a reoccurring motif in this tale because it dramatizes the two paradoxical forces--the centripetal and centrifugal. According to Heidegger, who shares Bakhtin's ideas, "Pain is the joining agent in the rending that divides and gathers. Pain is the joining of the rift [. . .] pain joins the rift of the difference" (qtd. in Patterson 110). Santiago's and the marlin's pain ironically connect them while reminding them of their separateness.

Awakenings are another motif that reflect Hemingway's belief that man's greatest sin is unawareness (Crowe 5). Only in wakefulness can the self take on the "responsibility within the dialogical relation that determines who I am" (Patterson 110). The greater the awareness, the greater the responsibility. Santiago's response also asks for a response. Bakhtin writes in
Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics: "Only in communion, in the interaction of one person with another, can the 'man in man' be revealed" (252). It is only through pain and awareness that Santiago sees a bigger picture of himself—a wholeness where there was once only fragmentation. Consequently, he acquires a greater burden of responsibility as witnessed in his probe into the nature of sin.

The reply to Santiago's response forms in the horizontal line that transforms into vertical jumps that burst from The Sea again and again. The marlin's vertical jumps match Santiago's horizontal pulls, again and again, until his face presses onto the bow of his skiff (82). Both consciousnesses, The Sea's and Santiago's, meet at this perpendicular plane of interaction and express themselves in the double-voicing of the pronouns we and us: "This is what we waited for, he thought. So now let us take it" (82). From this point on, the dominant force is centripetal circles and pulls. Fish and man will soon be brought together, and Santiago will establish himself as fisherman once again. The speech act becomes circling turns executed by the marlin and pulls performed by the fisherman to get the fish closer to the boat and Santiago's intention. Santiago's exacting influence
resonates in his repetitive chant: "I moved him [. . .] I moved him. [. . .] I moved him" (91).

The joining of Santiago's two perspectives, one of fisherman and one of brother, occurs when he addresses the marlin with a question from the fisherman's position, but then he answers the question from a transgressed viewpoint. He has "surplus" of vision for he sees the marlin, not only objectively, but also subjectively; he also sees himself and the situation from the marlin's and thus The Sea's point of view:

Fish, the old man said. Fish, you are going to have to die anyway. Do you have to kill me too? You are killing me, fish, the old man thought. But you have a right to. Never have I seen a greater or more beautiful or a calmer or more noble thing than you, brother. Come on and kill me. I do not care who kills who. (92)

The marlin's near-final speech act reveals its unfinalized state. It starts to pass the boat. It is "long, deep, wide, silver and barred with purple and interminable in the water" (93). The old man finalizes him as an object by lifting a harpoon and driving it into the great fish's heart. This vertical act connects the two psyches as expressed in the double-voicing of the
lines "He felt the iron go in" (94). The he is dialogized—referring to both the marlin and Santiago. The marlin's climactic speech act abides in an oxymoronic image that creates an almost mystical scene:

Then the fish came alive, with his death in him, and rose high out of the water showing all his great length and width and all his power and his beauty. He seemed to hang in the air above the old man in the skiff [ . . . ]. (94)

The "coming alive with death" strikes a familiar Bakhtinian cord of dialogism. The oxymoron suggests multiple meanings: at the literal level, the marlin puts forth a last burst of energy for survival; at a more subtle level resides the idea that the marlin as self brings life to Santiago as other—he dies for the sake of the other. Santiago comes alive through the marlin's death because he gains a "surplus of sight." Their relationship is dialogical, unfinalized. Through its death, the old man forges a greater understanding of himself. The oxymoron also brings the reader back to the motif of meeting. Loss is the opposite side of acquisition; therefore, this motif alerts the reader to the probability of Santiago losing the fish. However, because of the dialogism that transpires, the reader
senses that with that loss comes perhaps a deeper acquisition of something more valuable for Santiago to possess: a deeper understanding of himself and the world.

The centripetal force is complete when Santiago latches the great fish to the side of his boat. They are now two parallel lines. When the old fisherman looks at his lines, they mean nothing because there is no "his" lines anymore. The blurring of fish and man, self and other, highlight the following description: "With his mouth shut and his tail straight up and down we sail like brothers. Then his head started to become a little unclear and he thought, is he bringing me in or am I bringing him in?" (99). This coinciding of positions holds the promise of self-sacrifice. Santiago, like the marlin, must "die" from himself in order to possess a clearer vision of self. According to Bakhtin, "[. . .] the more of the other, the more of the self" (qtd. in Patterson 112). Santiago accomplishes this through the surplus of sight. The transgressed vision remains with Santiago as he vocalizes the importance of the marlin’s position. He is not an "object" being towed. He is a subject of perhaps more noble worth than Santiago who confesses to trickery:
If I were towing him behind, there would be no question. Nor if the fish was in this skiff, with all dignity gone, there would be no question either. But they were sailing together lashed side by side and the old man thought, let him bring me in if it pleases him. I am only better than him through trickery and he meant me no harm. (99)

Clearly, two perspectives speak: Santiago’s and the narrator’s as witnessed in the personal pronouns I and me and then the abrupt switch to the third person pronoun they. Both viewpoints share the same opinion about the subjectivity of the marlin.

As in the beginning, imagery unveils that whatever is done to the marlin will be done to Santiago. The shark attacks fully realize this maxim; they come in vertical and horizontal lines which speak a different rhetoric. It is the rhetoric of “owning one’s own action,” of experiencing the consequences of choices made from positions of no alibis. In this penetrative dialogue, the fisherman reaches a fuller sense of self-awareness and responsibility. This interaction wounds him, and it is only through this wounding that the self can enter a
"dialogical relation where the other moves into me and signification thus occurs" (Patterson 110).

The marlin’s blood, “dispersed in the mile deep sea” (100) is the sharks’ invitation to participate in the on-going dialogue. They symbolize The Sea’s intention of reclaiming what is hers. They are the centrifugal force that pull apart that which was brought together. Because the marlin represents The Sea’s words made flesh, she retrieves every word, every ounce of flesh, leaving Santiago transformed by their interaction of other and self. It is through this discourse that Santiago experiences expiation and possible redemption. He is finalized not only as a fisherman but also as a human being who has been given “surplus sight.” Through this extra sight, Santiago sees his actions from The Sea’s viewpoint, and, therefore, he continues to be both a “being” and “becoming” entity.

The abruptness of this centrifugal force clashing with the centripetal force bounces off the walls of the disconnected structure of the following two sentences: “The old man looked at the fish constantly to make sure it was true. It was an hour before the first shark hit him” (100). The pronoun him is dialogized again to give the both/and option: when the shark hits the marlin, he hits
Santiago. The first shark surfaces vertically from The Sea, and then he swims on a horizontal plane—a straight line—following the scent of the blood. The Sea's dialogue is straight-forward, purposeful, and forceful as represented in the type of shark that first attacks. It is no accident that the shark is a Mako who is beautiful and built like a swordfish except for his jaws. Unlike the last aesthetically phrased discourse represented by the marlin, The Sea's forceful rhetoric lurks in the implied pun, for it has "teeth and bite in it" now. Santiago will not experience the same give-and-take speech act as he did with the marlin.

After the shark takes his forty pounds of flesh, Santiago's forceful response is the harpoon to the brain, not the heart. The Mako violently swims out but then dies and sinks slowly into the dark water. Vertical-line-to-vertical-line are matched, consciousness-to-consciousness. Santiago realizes that what happens to the marlin happens to him: "When the fish had been hit it was as though he himself were hit" (103). The Sea is not only taking back her words but also Santiago's. Her influence forces him to review his actions and his words until he is left silent. This event transpires each time the marlin is attacked and stripped
of more flesh. When there is no more flesh--no more words to be said--Santiago possesses no words, no thoughts, and no emotions. However, this silence does not occur until the old man reflects upon and feels the responsibility for his choices.

With this first encounter, Santiago can no longer look at the marlin. He is filled with regret and wishes for an ideal world: "I wish it had been a dream now and that I had never hooked the fish and was alone in bed on the newspapers" (103). Then he states out loud addressing The Sea: "'But man is not made for defeat,' [. . .]. 'A man can be destroyed but not defeated" (103). He returns next to thoughts of regret for killing the fish. The Sea's answer appears in the form of dentuso sharks that are cruel, strong, and intelligent. Santiago anticipates their turn. He prepares himself by lashing a knife to the butt of the oar. When Santiago tells himself that not to have hope is a sin, he opens up a floodgate for philosophizing about the nature of sin which leads to the old man's confession. The dialogue becomes like the description of the sharks--cruel, strong, and intelligent.

He first denies having any understanding of sin, or that he even believes in its existence. Then he thinks that "perhaps" it is a sin to kill the fish. Next, he
justifies his action by saying that he kills the fish to feed people and to keep himself alive. This statement follows a broad generalization which expresses that everything is a sin. The conversation ends with the fisherman telling himself not to think about sin, for there are people who get paid to do so (105). From this position, he declares in the dialogized second person pronoun which represents the voices of family and community (society): “You were born to be a fisherman as the fish were born to be fish. San Pedro was a fisherman as was the father of the great DiMaggio” (105).

In anticipating the next shark attacks, Santiago continues to think about sin. In his thoughts, the second person pronoun is dialogized. This time it is the voice of The Sea who, along with Santiago, speaks directly to him:

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. You loved him when he was alive and you loved him after. If you love him, it is not a sin to kill him. Or is it more? (105)

By not using the personal pronoun I, Santiago’s inner dialogue reflects the presence of The Sea’s
consciousness. He peers at himself through The Sea’s eyes (which is reinforced by the eye motif), and thus he is addressed in second person. It is the last question that haunts and crucifies the old man. This is the climax of signification resulting from the deep penetrative dialogue.

The crucifixion comes in the form of the galanos sharks who are scavengers. The sound uttered by the fisherman captures the wounding. When he sees the sharks, all he can say is “Ah.” This is the noise made “as a man might make, involuntarily, feeling the nail go through his hands and into the wood” (107). This represents the “opening of the wound,” the “tearing away” of the self in order to move into the dialogical relation of the other (Patterson 110).

After the execution of this attack, a quarter more of the marlin vanishes along with its magnificent color. Santiago apologizes directly to the fish, revealing his regret: “‘I’m sorry about it, fish. It makes everything wrong.’ [. . .] ‘I shouldn’t have gone out so far, fish,’ he said, ‘Neither for you nor me. I’m sorry, fish’” (110). The tearing away of the marlin’s flesh simultaneously exposes Santiago to more truths about himself and the world.
The next two *galanos* come in double force, side-by-side, and head straight for the skiff. After they are finished, half the fish is destroyed. Again, Santiago apologizes, but this time he merges with the fish: "'Half fish,' [. . .]. 'Fish that your were. I am sorry that I went too far out. I ruined us both. But we have killed many sharks, you and I, and ruined many others'" (115).

In the darkness of midnight, The Sea's language shapes itself into a pack of sharks that form only "lines in the water" (118). These last lines remove most of the remaining flesh and rob Santiago of all speech, thought, and feelings: "He sailed lightly now and he had no thoughts nor any feelings of any kind. He was past everything now [. . .]" (119). He and the marlin are seemingly one--wounded and wordless.

In the silence of The Sea's current, the old man returns safely to the harbor. His thoughts re-form, and he thinks about the wind being a friend (sometimes) and "the great sea with our friends and enemies" (120). Then a question materializes which seems to come from the blurring of the three elements: the hero, the speaker, and the listener. It echoes in the dialogized second person pronoun: "What beat you?" Santiago's response is "'Nothing,' [. . .]. 'I went out too far'" (120). This
Ambiguous answer suggests Santiago's possible transformation. At the literal level, the fisherman chastizes himself for going beyond his limits: too big of an ego, too big of a fish, too far out at sea. He loses what he gains in this transgression. At a deeper level, Santiago claims that nothing beat him, for he "went too far out" within himself and within nature. As a result, he gains more than he loses. He acquires a surplus of sight which transforms him by the interaction.

According to Patterson, guilt and fault lies in the failure to "open up enough for the other to enter the same" (110). Replying, being in a dialogical relation, is "one avenue of redemption" (110). Santiago takes that avenue by opening up himself for a dialogical relationship with The Sea and therein lies his possible redemption. He appreciates what he has: Manolin's love and respect and hope in the future where he will continue to participate in the forces of being and becoming. This is noted in the following line: "He noticed how pleasant it was to have someone to talk to instead of speaking only to himself and to the sea [. . .] 'I missed you,' he said" [addressing Manolin] (124). Perhaps Hemingway is correct: human beings cannot be defeated; they can only be destroyed, for in a dialogical world, their conversation continues.
In dialogism there is never an "either/or"; there is a "both/and" that encompasses many possibilities. The ironic ending implies that dialogue always runs the risk of being misinterpreted. This misinterpretation happens at the linguistic level and is mimicked at the imagery level. The tourist literally misunderstands the Spanish-speaking waiter and thinks that the marlin is a shark: "I didn’t know sharks had such handsome, beautiful formed tails" (127).

Juxtaposed to this imagery is Santiago’s prone body asleep dreaming about his idyllic place—lions on a golden beach. He embodies seemingly Bakhtin’s assertion that there are differences that cannot be bridged (Holquist 20). It is only in our dreams that an ideal world—where nature and humans co-exist in harmony—can form and live. The dialogized ending opens up the text to many worlds wherein the ideal is dreamed about and wished for, and the real is interacted with others and perceived from different positions and points of view; different truths and interpretations, some of which may be false or misinterpretations or dreams. In dialogism it does not matter, for it is up to each person to make the words one’s own and to accept the responsibility and consequence of that action.
CHAPTER FOUR

A DIFFERENT RHETORICAL FORCE:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HERO AS

A PLACE

If the reader regards The Sea as a voiceless, unparticipatory object—only a setting in which the events and actions of Santiago transpire—the text loses a dynamic, influential rhetorical force and, therefore, narrows in scope, depth, and dimension. The story, like Santiago's skiff, just floats along the surface. When one views The Sea through the Bakhtinian lens of the rhetorical circle, it metamorphoses into a notable voice "blurring" and interacting with the other speakers and listeners: Santiago, the narrator, Hemingway, and the reader. Angel Capellan acknowledges the idea that The Sea is more than a setting. In his chapter "A Primeval Man in a Natural Environment," he states that Hemingway's landscapes, seascapes, and cityscapes are never backdrops. They become an "integral and essential constituent" in understanding "the function, the psychology, and the symbolism of the protagonist" (65). Interestingly, Hemingway refers to the earth in The Sun Also Rises as the hero because it "abideth forever" (55).
The Sea also abideth forever, and its primordial voice evokes meaningful and continual communion.

The Sea's exacting voice infuses its own terms and values into the text and, consequently, shapes the discourse in the following areas: (1) It opens up and broadens the text by presenting a multiplicity of ongoing interpretations, thus expanding the field of participation for the reader who is a dialogic element in the whirling rhetorical circle; (2) it dimensionalizes characters with whom it interacts, possibly transforming them through the acquirement of a "surplus of sight"; (3) and it foregrounds the importance of rhetorical style in creating a text and developing characters. It requires the reader to explore the effects of word choices, syntax, double-voicing, figurative language, irony, parody, satire, puns, and symbolism to help discover meaning. Style clearly becomes more than just window-dressing.

The Opening up of the Text and the Broadening of the Reader's Role

Because The Sea is an influential rhetorical force, The Old Man and the Sea becomes more than Santiago's journey of transgression, crucifixion, and redemption. Through the created contradictions and ambiguity, an open-ended, being-and-becoming story emerges to be
reinterpreted each time it is read. This perspective brings the reader’s role as active participant to the foreground. It is not a passive role, for the reader must interact, answer, and be responsible for choices made. The reader’s voice resonates in the “blurring of voices” in Bakhtin’s rhetorical circle. Emerson writes:

Authoring is the particular deed whereby Bakhtin shows the various ways in which meaning can take on flesh. That which in his epistemology is modelled as the I/other distinction becomes in his aesthetics the distinction between the author, who occupies a position analogous to self, and the hero, who occupies a position analogous to the other. This movement is rehearsed each time the text is read, as the reader becomes the flesh of the author’s meaning, a self-transgredient to the text’s otherness. (87-88)

Clearly, the reader shapes the discourse and, consequently, the possible meanings of a written work; the reader (the other) finalizes the text.

Bakhtin uses Dostoevsky’s novels to illustrate how dialogism expands the text and the reader’s role by freeing the characters from “predetermined roles.”
Because his stories are about "unresolvable paradoxes and parables rather than certainties handed down as law," both author and hero "genuinely learn from the process of defining each other" (Emerson 127). Dostoevsky invites his heroes and his readers to experience the "richer, more opened-ended discrimination" of ideas rather than events (Emerson 128). According to Bakhtin, ideas are "richer than experiences" because ideas contain more potential for communication on "shared ground" (Emerson 128). Because of this greater potential created by the dialogue between author, hero, and reader, more space opens up in which the reader can become an equal participant as opposed to a vicarious spectator (Emerson 128). Because dialogism invokes a multiplicity of different viewpoints, these perspectives stimulate the reader's thoughts and imagination. The struggle for meaning lies in the growth of ideas that these different viewpoints present (Emerson 139); therefore, all elements in the rhetorical circle participate equally in that struggle to make meaning.

Apparently, Hemingway understands the reader's equal role in the narrative. John Atkins comments in The Art of Ernest Hemingway that the author allows, through his sparse description of his characters, the reader to share in the creation of them. The reader fills in "the sketch
he has begun” (64). Although Atkins does not refer to this interaction as dialogism but attributes it to Hemingway’s simplicity of style, the reader dialogues with the other elements: she interacts with mannerisms, gestures, and speech. By doing so, she contributes to their meaningfulness.

From a horizon of possibilities, The Old Man and the Sea arises as a story of ideas, limited only by one’s vision. This is not a romantic sea adventure wherein the action sweeps the reader away through an act of escapism. The reader is an equal communicator who listens and contributes a response. She neither has to be Cuban nor a fisherman in order to understand Santiago and the ideas formed in this story. The reader must respond; she has no alibi and, therefore, is answerable and responsible for her response. The reader fulfills Bakhtin’s belief that an event becomes aesthetic if there is an “outside consciousness” viewing the event, and, thereby, providing a sense of the “whole” to these happenings (Emerson 136). The novella’s dialogism entices the reader to venture forth into the realm of Hemingway’s submerged iceberg. Like Santiago’s bait lines positioned in the dark, unknown fathoms, the reader allows herself to sink--forty, seventy-five, one hundred, one hundred twenty-five
fathoms--into the depths of this fictional world wherein
the denizens of ideas and possibilities live.

The Dimensionalization
of Characters

The expansion of possible meanings in a text and the
reader’s role intimately intertwine themselves around the
dimensionalization of the characters. Without The Sea’s
rhetorical force, Santiago appears as a monological
mouthpiece for Hemingway in expressing regret and doom
about the natural world. He represents Hemingway’s
predetermined role of the hero of code and ritual. Crowe,
who sees The Old Man and the Sea as a monologue and who
does not perceive The Sea as a character, would perhaps
argue that Santiago carries out what Emerson refers to as
a “Ptolemaic” worldview: “An author sits at the center of
things like Jehovah, passing out bits of consciousness
piecemeal to the characters taking shape under the
authorial pen [. . .] so that the cast of characters could
obediently act out its predetermined roles” (127). As
previously demonstrated, however, Santiago and The Sea are
separate from the author and act from their own centers of
being. The dialogic interactions of Santiago and The Sea
loosens Santiago’s position from any pre-ordained role or
plot. Hemingway does not create Santiago or The Sea from
above, but instead he creates them by stepping inside their consciousnesses and then stepping back outside to define them. This transgredient process breathes life into the both of them. As a result, the characters are dimensionalized and exert an influence in the text.

This character enhancement begins in a paradoxical manner. The more Santiago interacts with The Sea, the less fisherman and more human being he becomes. Who (and perhaps where) is Santiago between fishing? The Sea forces him to confront that question when she takes him out into her vastness. By doing so, she influences Santiago to see from different positions, figuratively and literally. The Sea acts as a centrifugal force that wants to keep herself and Santiago open to becoming. On the other hand, Santiago represents the centripetal force that wants to keep himself in a closed system--being a fisherman. In the roles of self and other, Santiago and The Sea continually redefine and reshape each other. When these two forces clash, Santiago appears to be the most dimensionalized.

This confrontational rhetoric incarnates in the shark attacks. The Sea reclaims her previous words and rephrases them in a newer and stronger rhetorical force. Through the transgredient process, Santiago acquires a
"surplus of sight" as witnessed in his double-voiced dialogue on the nature of sin. The reader sees a glimpse of Santiago as more than a man locked into his societal role of fisherman, and The Sea as more than a provider of fish; it is free from the confines of providing Santiago with a living. The Sea silences Santiago and in doing so, she is silent. It is in this silence that the reader can hear the buzzing of ideas that hint at meanings and interpretations. To not acknowledge The Sea as another hero, another character with a voice, reduces the richness of ideas and confines Santiago to a lone voice, a doomed fisherman who loses to objective forces that are bent on his destruction in the fixed game of life.

The Importance of Style in Creating Text and Developing Characters

"Not everything that matters can be pointed to on a page," writes Charles Schuster in reference to style. "Indeed much of what really matters in writing is immanent. We attach metaphors to such concepts in order to understand them--metaphors such as voice, style, tone, and image" (538). Perhaps because Bakhtin was more a philosopher of language rather than a philologist, he viewed style as a language. Schuster explains that Bakhtin believed that "to create a style is to create a
language for oneself" (533). The Sea’s language, as previously delineated, materializes through stylistic elements of which Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism is the master key which unlocks its stylistic profile. This profile is further defined—its edges sharpened—by the stylistic devices of imagery and figurative language, especially in the form of metaphors, metonymies, and ironies. Without being sensitive to these devices, The Sea would remain a background, an object with a mute voice, and the text would lose a vital rhetorical force.

Style breathes life into The Sea giving her a subjective voice, a form with content and intentions that interacts with Santiago, the narrator, and the reader. These intermingling voices echo in the double-voicing or heteroglossia heard in the story. When viewed through the Bakhtinian lens, style is truly an intricate part of content and cannot be separated from it. It is not an added spice; it is an essential ingredient. Style enriches and deepens content’s meaning by revealing or hinting at what is hidden in the words, actions, and silences of a text. Style helps the reader see the invisible seven-eighths of Hemingway’s iceberg.

Roderick P. Hart explains in Modern Rhetorical Criticism that “Despite centuries of interest in
rhetorical style, it remains elusive. Turner [1973] notes that some would do away with the concepts completely, treating it like physicist’s ether, a seemingly important but impossible-to-find phenomenon” (133). Schuster points out that traditional rhetorical theorists “tip-toe around” the importance of implicit meaning. They prefer the Aristolelian paradigm which relies on the explicit, denotative meanings that can be concretely supported by “evidence” from the text (534).

Aristotle’s paradigm can certainly be used to analyze *The Old Man and the Sea* for its explicit meanings; however, this paradigm is not adequate for an analysis that seeks to illustrate that The Sea is a rhetorical force, a “hero.” As previously discussed, Aristotle’s paradigm uses the concept of subject, not hero. The speaker and listener talk about the “subject”; it is powerless to exert influence upon the narrative. Schuster acknowledges this inadequacy also when he explains that in discussing language that is “multi-modal or text that conveys tonal variations, parody, irony, ambivalence or ambiguity,” Aristotle’s paradigm does not measure up to this task (535). It is when the reader uses Bakhtin’s rhetorical circle paradigm that the “blurring” elements can be interpreted in the light of dialogism.
In understanding the idea of dialogism--languages mingling with other languages--it seems as though style is a product of those interactions, and, therefore, it speaks of different perspectives, ideas, tones, and suggestions. It appears that stylistic devices are what Bakhtin had in mind when he urges readers to be "sensitive to the ideological implications of language," and that one should read for "tone and suggestions" (Schuster 540). Through dialogism, the reader can become more sensitive, not only through the symbolic and the oblique qualities of text, but also through the heterolgossia or the double-voicing heard.

Double-voicing can go unnoticed or be perceived as a different narrative orientation. For example, Fredrik Brogger in analyzing "Big Two-Hearted River," explores the narration by using Gerard Genette's narrative theory of heterodiegetic narration and internal focalization (an angle from which things are viewed in the story). What Bakhtin would view as double-voicing, Brogger sees as interplay. He employs this theory to explain the interplay of the narrator's voice, one that puts forth no judgment nor expectations from nature, and Nick's voice, one that defines and judges nature through his needs (22). He suggests that "Big Two-Hearted River" is a
heterodiegetic narrative in which the narrator is absent from the story but still tells the story through Nick’s perspective (internal focalization) (21). Michael Toolan shares a similar view of focalization. He terms the double-voicing aspect of a narrative a dual-foci (2). Once again a-who-tells-and-a-who-sees perspective explains the voices in narration. Neither Toolan nor Brogger consider the possibility that two consciousnesses may be seeing and telling at the same time from different perspectives. By failing to do so, one viewpoint is prioritized at the expense of the other, and, therefore, the implication of the contrasting voices is not fully realized. As a result, interesting relationships and ideas remain in the shadows of the text. Interplay suggests a relationship; dialogism creates a relationship.

In traditional narratological terms, much of The Old Man and the Sea’s text appears as third-person narration describing Santiago’s physical and mental actions. Most of Santiago’s “interior monologue” apparently reflects the narrator’s voice. The third person pronouns he, him, and his replace the personal pronouns I, me, and my. The following line expresses this pronoun choice: “But he liked to think of all things that he was involved in [. . .] he thought much and he kept on thinking about sin.
A Bakhtinian reading alerts the reader to an interesting change that suddenly occurs in the lines that immediately follow. The third person pronoun he transforms into the second person pronoun you: "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 [...]" (105). This important passage, which initiates the discussion about the nature of sin, is not offered as interior monologue; if it were, Santiago would have used the personal pronoun I. Through the concept of double-voicing, the second person pronoun you seems to contain the essence of another's consciousness; it is an accusatory voice. It is the voice of The Sea's merged with Santiago's and the narrator's language. It is Santiago's voice also because he has acquired a "surplus of sight" at this moment. All three voices whirl around the circumference of Bakhtin's rhetorical sphere, exerting influence and intentions. Because of the dynamics of this interaction, Santiago's thoughts become dialogized and are, therefore, more conflicted, more powerful, and more intense. They bubble in a broth of differing tones and intensions. This intensity overflows from Santiago's outburst in defense of himself which he utters aloud and in the first person pronoun I. The I positions the old
man against the others: "'I killed him in self-defense,'
[. . .]. 'And I killed him well'" (106).

Obviously, style is not just something intriguing or
interesting in and of itself. Style, if it is truly a
part of content, must take the reader to those hidden,
elusive realms of the text to uncover possible meanings
and to reveal layers to the characters. W. Gibson, in
"Tough, Sweet and Stuffy: An Essay on Modern Prose
Styles," formulates the idea of three rhetorical voices:
tough, sweet, and stuffy. According to his criteria, a
tough talker is one who is "clear-headed," "experienced,"
"close-lipped," "knows what he knows and not afraid to
share it" with authority. He or she is "self-absorbed"
and "sure-footed." His or her language is one of people
subjects, to be verbs and other finite verbs,
monosyllables, and fragments; phrases are short, and
sentences are compound or simple rather than complex (qtd.
in Hart 141-42).

Hemingway is known as a tough talker. His tough
voice dialogizes with Santiago's not-so-tough voice. This
dialogism becomes apparent in the exposition of the tale
when Hemingway is more certain and sure-footed about
Santiago than Santiago is. The reader becomes subtly
exposed to these two viewpoints of Santiago and is left
wondering about Santiago’s truer nature. This belief dramatically revisits the story when the old fisherman boast, “‘But man is not made for defeat,’ [. . .]. ‘A man can be destroyed but not defeated’” (103). It seems that this tough voice does not entirely belong to Santiago; it belongs more to Hemingway. This speculation becomes a confirmation when Santiago confesses to Manolin, “‘They beat me, Manolin,’ [. . .]. ‘They truly beat me’” (124). If the reader considers Hemingway’s tough voice, she senses that Santiago’s bravado is not truly owned by him; it is an infusion of the writer’s perspective. Therefore, the contradictory statement comes as no surprise, for it reflects Santiago’s position, not Hemingway’s.

The use of the oxymoron is another good example of style revealing a deeper and bigger picture which lies within the text. When the marlin “comes alive with his death in him” (94), and when Santiago expresses the fact that “fishing kills me exactly as it keeps me alive” (106), these oxymoronic statements are more than intriguing through their startling oppositions. They alert the reader to a more provocative, philosophical layer to the story that takes the reader beyond the smaller picture, the concrete world of the marlin and Santiago. The reader enters the larger, abstract world of
ideas--that life and death may not be as opposite as one thinks, for it appears that in life there is death and in death there is life.

The metaphorical images found in Hemingway’s novella reflect many of the metaphorical families categorized by M. Osborn in his book Orientations to Rhetorical Style. Among those used are: water and the sea, light and dark, the human body, animals, above and below, forward and backward, and natural phenomena. Hart uses Osborn’s categories as a helpful system for examining metaphors. These patterns endure because of “the primordial pictures that they paint” (147). Hart captures the importance of imagery when he describes it as the following: “[... ] imagery can propel rhetoric like nothing else can. It becomes a kaleidoscope for the mind’s eye, allowing audiences to see ideas that otherwise would be inert and lifeless” (150).

It is no accident that The Old Man and the Sea positions itself in two opposing metaphorical images: one of land (society) which emblematically represents the mechanical and centripetal forces of rigidity and control, and the other of the sea (wild nature) which is the primordial, centrifugal forces of flux and freedom. On land, Santiago appears more as an object--something upon
which things are acted; he is boxed-in, confined, and restricted to being a fisherman. This world judges him by that identity alone. Even Manuel, who loves him, appears to value him mainly for his skills as a fisherman. The mechanistic force grinds out its metaphorical image as a factory that processes fish: "Those who had caught sharks had taken them to the shark factory [. . .] they were hoisted on a block and tackle, their livers removed, their fins cut off and their hides skinned out and their flesh cut into strips for salting" (11). This scene parodies the emotional treatment that Santiago receives from other fishermen (especially the younger ones) in his society because he has not caught a fish in eighty-four days. What will happen to him if he can no longer fish? Will he be hoisted up and stripped of his pride and then taken care of by Manolin? Where and how will he fit into the structure of his fishing society if he is no longer a contributing member? This is why Santiago is not as confident as the narrator or Hemingway. The imagery vividly supports what is alluded to in Santiago’s words, thoughts, and action.

The narrator’s simile in describing Santiago’s scars on his hands as being as fresh as “the erosions in a fishless desert” is layered with imagery. Because deserts
were once ancient seas, the reader perceives not only the "oldness" of the scars and the implication of the old man's bad luck, but also she understands the hidden and profound concept of things being in flux and being temporary--nothing remains the same, not even The Sea.

Interacting with The Sea, Santiago energizes in this naturalistic, primitive imagery. He becomes more alive and more of a subject who seemingly wants to be taken farther out and challenged. He experiences a freedom in conflict; he can choose to struggle and compete with "contrasting ideas and interests" (Lodge 61). In Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, Bakhtin initially credits Dostoevsky for stepping outside his characters and allowing them more freedom to answer back. They are not in the shadow of the author. His prose represents a composition of diverse voices and "the possibility of employing on the plane of a single work discourse of various types, with all their expressive capacities intact, without reducing it to a common denominator [. . .]" (200). Santiago is not in Hemingway's shadow; he is not reduced to the common denominator of being only a fisherman.

David Lodge points out in his book After Bakhtin the usefulness of using Bakhtinian concepts as tools to
analyze literature. He focuses on D. H. Lawrence’s fiction and concurs that a Bakhtinian reading presents a new understanding of his narratives. In the past, Lodge claimed that Lawrence held a tight grip on his characters. Under the influence of dialogism, Lodge now suggests that Lawrence’s characters (especially those in Women in Love) are freer. Their speech “generates and sustains a continuous struggle between competing interests and ideas” (61). Lodge argues that Bakhtin’s following description of Crime and Punishment also pertains to Women in Love. Bakhtin writes:

Everything in this novel—the fates of the people, their experience and ideas—is pushed to its boundaries, everything is prepared, as it were, to pass over into its opposite [. . .] everything is taken to extremes, to its uttermost limit [. . .]. (61)

This passage also describes Santiago’s and The Sea’s interactions which meet and “pass over” into each other’s opposition. They are pushed to their limits by extreme oppositional forces.

The animal imagery in this story serves as one of the means by which The Sea expresses its rhetorical force; as noted earlier, they are her words made flesh. The birds,
the dolphins, the flying fish, and the marlin speak of wonder, beauty, mystery, fragility, and brotherhood. The sharks speak a different rhetoric--one of aggression, punishment, answerability, transgression, and atonement. The Portuguese man-o-war speaks of falsehoods--what one sees is not necessarily the complete picture or truth. These metonymies complicate and layer the text and give aesthetic sophistication to the rhetoric. They allow the reader to see the deeper images of possible meanings. For example, if the sharks and the marlin are The Sea's rhetoric expressing different tones and perspectives, than the tourist's comment becomes even more poignant, for, she, as Santiago does, misinterprets or confuses or fails to distinguish the difference between the words.

Bakhtin believes that style in language is a way to "perceive the interpretative richness of discourse" (Schuster 533). Seen from the vantage point of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, style can never be viewed as a separate element from content or language. It is style that captures the richness of The Sea's symbolism that helps to articulate its discourse; a discourse spoken with the intensity of centrifugal and centripetal forces, wherein order and disorder abide. In "A Rhetoric of Place I: The Properties and Uses of Place in Literature,"
Leonard Lutwack relates that the sea's formlessness has always symbolized the "ultimate disorder in man and the universe" (47); W. H. Auden describes it as the "primordial undifferentiated flux" (qtd. in Lutwack 47). This symbolism lies deep within the human being's psyche, a psyche that does not grasp ideas only through normal boundaries and language. Style is part of the elasticity of the word that allows the human psyche to stretch and expand—to recognize and appreciate thoughts and ideas that can be packaged differently in a text. In support of this notion, Schuster comments that rhetoric should not "attach itself to empirical formulas and rigid taxonomies" (538). If Lev Vygotsky and Mikhail Bakhtin are correct in their belief that language and thought both arise from the human conscious, language and style mirrors that consciousness, and, therefore, they cannot be restricted to the narrow confines of grammatical and linguistic conventions. Style is what beckons the reader to approach and to come closer to that consciousness which is always in flux—always a becoming.

The Sea is not a backdrop. It is not an object. It possesses a consciousness expressed through its unique stylistic profile that dialogues with Santiago. Terry Williams states that "Hemingway's language has its roots
in place" (17). Like a Cezanne impressionistic landscape, Hemingway's settings are alive; they pulse; they breathe (11). The Sea pulses and breathes. Both she and Santiago inhale and exhale each other in a conversation which is forever ongoing and never maimed by one ideology or all-encompassing truth. This dialogism is an exercise in awareness, something that Hemingway prized highly. Their voices, along with the narrator's, Hemingway's, and the reader's continually whirl around the circumference of Bakhtin's rhetorical circle, transforming it into a sphere of possibilities of deeper but ever-shifting truths.
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