



Posthumanist Tension In Moby Dick: Herman Melville's Manifesto Against Anthropocentric Delusions

Author- LAKSHANA

Co-author- Dr. SUFINA

ABSTRACT:

This research paper examines the complex interplay between Herman Melville's sharp critique of anthropocentric ideologies and his palatable advocacy for post-humanist perspectives in *Moby Dick*.

Anthropocentrism is chiefly a worldview that places humans at the center of existence, asserting human dominance and hubris over nature and other non-human entities. Per contra, posthumanism reinforces the interconnectivity and equity of all living beings, which dismisses human exceptionalism. Rather than leaving his work any simpler, Melville has significantly blended these aspects, making *Moby-Dick* a more rigorous fiction that confronts the anthropocentric mindset of his time—an era that witnessed the rise of modernity—while still remaining relevant to contemporary human-nature conundrum.

Through an eco-critical analysis of the novel's plot and its dynamic characters, this paper will reinterpret *Moby Dick* as an early post-humanist manifesto, urging for a strong re-evaluation of humanity's place in this vast world.

Keywords: Anthropocentrism, posthumanism, interconnectivity, eco-criticism, nature, modernity.

Herman Melville's *Moby Dick* has been a quintessential American fiction, earning tremendous acclaims from around the world. It is difficult to pinpoint at exactly only one of the innumerable factors that could be attributed to its greatness, and, perhaps, invariably, Melville's efficient way of allowing room for 'Animal Studies' in *Moby Dick*, has largely contributed to its lasting value and pre-eminence. Animal Studies have penetrated into literature, particularly through eco-critical lens, ever since the primordial times, be it through medieval parables or bestiaries, and also ultimately finds its contiguity up until now in the modern era.

Moby Dick can carry numberless, indeed, fathomless conceptions, brought forth by many different interpretative approaches, and so does it even under the lee of eco-criticism and animal studies in literature. Imbuing 'anthropocentrism' in *Moby Dick* is one such approach, and is going to be the first and foremost focus of this paper. Anthropocentrism refers to the viewpoint that humans are the primary entities in the world and that every other species merely revolve around them, akin to how planets revolve around the Sun, wherein sun is the superior one dictating the fates of the revolving globes. The word 'anthropocentrism' is derived etymologically from the Greek word 'anthropos' which means 'human', 'centri' which means 'centered' and 'ism' naturally means a system of belief and at the end, it is undoubtedly representing the belief that centralizes the humankind and lands their interests, values and welfare above other non-human entities.

The moral status of the human beings, their roles and place in an existential sense have oftentimes been the subject of discussion since time immemorial. Anthropocentrism is the commonest notion that came out as one possible comprehension for these relentless controversies of what humans are and where do they possibly stand in a hierarchy, if one originally exists or perchance had existed previously. Many scholars and philosophical thinkers such as Aristotle, Descartes, and Francis Bacon maintain that "all animals must have been created by nature for the sake of man", thereby promoting anthropocentric thoughts into action. Even the Cornucopians [proponents of economic anthropocentrism], believed humans are at a higher moral standing than the other beings, and this way they are given grand privileges to satiate all their needs, notwithstanding if that comes at the detriment of other living beings. Aside from this, many ethicists have also found out that anthropocentric roots had originated from the creation story scribed in the book of Genesis in the Judeo-Christian Bible, which says that humans are created at the hands of God and so they have the divine right to wield dominance over all other living creatures. Genesis 1:26 professes, "God said, 'Let us make man in our own image, in the likeness of ourselves and let them be the masters of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven, the cattle, and all the creatures that creep along the ground.'"- this seems to vouch for anthropocentric beliefs, making the Christian faith as a religious, historical and all the more importantly, a dogmatic source of the anthropocentric perception of the world.

Now how is one going to get the sensibility of anthropocentrism in *Moby Dick*? The paper will now probe deeper into the 'anthropocentric delusions', something that is obliquely conceived in the columns of *Moby Dick*. The novel is largely about the whaling world, the whalers aboard the ship *Pequod* led by Captain Ahab, the harpooners and their sharp serrated harpoons. As *Pequod* departs from Nantucket, an island off the coast of Massachusetts, voyaging through the Pacific, Atlantic and the Indian oceans, Ishmael the narrator, a seasonal sailor, intensely opens up the world of whales and whale hunting, wherein whale hunting is the major driving element; primarily the foreground and partly the background of the plot.

The word 'whaling' immediately resonates the sound of something cruel and inhumanely prospect and so are the whalers customarily frowned upon with disgust and contempt. Notwithstanding this, Ishmael passionately associates the supposed aesthetics and thrills of whaling. Melville has put Ishmael deliberately to have someone to wonder why people have to declare that whaling has no aesthetically noble connotations associated with it. He asks if whaling is not respectable and forthwith asserts, "whaling is imperial!" (Melville 135). "By old English statutory law, the whale is declared a 'royal fish'" (Melville 135). These assertions clearly lay the stage for anthropocentric expressions. Why whales are royal? Royal because they are bringing about a gazillion of bounties at the feet of whalers, they bequeath, to the human community, an overwhelming list of extractions and by-products – 1.) Whale oil- taken out from the blubber of the whales; used for lighting lamps, lubrication, et cetera, 2.) whalebone- AKA baleen, obtained from the mouths of whales, used in products like corsets, umbrellas, and girdles, 3.) Spermaceti- Wax extracted from the heads of the whales, used in candles, cosmetics, et cetera, 4.) ambergris- a rarefied substance found in the stomachs of sperm whales, used for perfume productions. These whales are hunted down by tenacious harpooners, the serrations gashing open the tight musculature of the giant species, blood oozing out and spouting into volcanoes, and finally their careens being pecked, nibbled and thrashed further down, not only by humans, but also by the insatiate sharks, and other cerulean species. This ominous endeavor of hunting down whales in *Moby Dick* for the purpose of human sophistication, their alleviated poise and composure has the verisimilitude of human evilness and their diabolic nature, which ultimately becomes an active trait of anthropocentrism.

Moving further, we have the "monomaniac" Ahab, the captain of *Pequod* who is on his unremitting pursuit of killing the eponymous whale, *Moby Dick*, which once chopped off his leg in one of his previous hunting escapades. Ahab is extremely vindictive toward *Moby Dick* so much so that he is insanely pursuing to kill it no matter what havoc this might stir ergo. Taking revenge on a whale? Now, with these scenarios taking place, *Moby Dick* prompts readers to contemplate what an animal means and in particular, what a whale means to the whalers and to the common people as well. It is widely debated that animals might "mean", or "intend", or "signify" things beyond what humans have imposed on them. As Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert (professors of geography and earth science) asserted:

"If we concentrate solely on how animals are represented, the impression is that animals are merely passive surfaces on to which human groups inscribe imaginings and orderings of all kinds. This question duly raises broader concerns about non- human agency, about the legacy of animals, and the extent to which we can say that animals destabilize, transgress or even resist our human orderings, including spatial ones" (Philo and Wilbert).

That is exactly how whales were being dictated upon in *Moby Dick*. Ahab has drawn an imaginary boundary or ambit into which he considered whales had to fall into; just non-human entities bound to hunting and not entities subject to aggressive attacks or justifiable retaliation upon those that had previously nudged at and provoked it. Many such evidences of animal attacks or parry, better described as "resistance" or "defiance", have been witnessed, and many sections of communities have begun to debunk the ostensibly obvious notions of the taken for granted status of humankind in the world, wherein animals are merely agencies to our dictations. How can sailors in the ship expect to make the whale absolutely not "unruly", while the natural propensity of it is to be bulbous and defiant? The manifold questionnaires that may possibly erupt from this eco-critical premises are much to do with environmental ethics and as strong assertions to how anthropocentrism has played a highly impactful role ever since modernity came into existence.

Now that 'modernity' has been cited, delineating deeper into the complex nexus between modernity and anthropocentrism is almost commendable.

Sociologist Bruno Latour, expounded that a rigid severance between nature and society, non-humans and humans - a process he sought as 'purification' is so vital to modernity, whereas on the other hand it eschews 'translation' - the affinity between the human and the non-human domains. A staunch parallelism could be drawn from this aspect to that of the events that unfold in *Moby Dick*, the maddening demand of Captain Ahab for the whale to succumb to his regulations or best, to his "monomaniacal" quest of vengeance and sanguinary thirsts.

No one could rebel against the fact that *Moby Dick* or generally any other whale, or any other animal species has ever attacked humans out of revengeful wrath or bloodthirsty savagery, rather they do so only as acts of defiance or more appropriately for their own sustenance. Whales attack other fishes and mammals in the oceans, to quench its hunger and in doing so they do not gain any sadistic pleasure as humans do. This claim paints a picture where humans are the immediate, chief "savages" and of course not the whales.

As Melville in his book says:

"Human madness is oftentimes a cunning and most feline thing. When you think it fled, it may have but become transfigured into some still subtler form" (Melville 221).

"Aye, aye! And I'll chase him round Good Hope, and round the Horn. And round the Norway Maelstrom, and round perdition's lames before I give him up. And this is what ye have shipped for! To chase that white whale on both sides of land, and over all sides of the earth, till he spouts black blood and rolls fin out" (Melville 196).

"There is no folly of the beasts of the earth which is not infinitely outdone by the madness of men" (Melville 463).

Thus, what discerns humans from other species that makes the former as the patronizing paramount and the latter as docile agents? Rene Descartes, an accomplished French scientist and thinker in this regard, contented that human intelligence and their heightened cognitive abilities are the most vital reasons attributed to humans' superiority in the world. He says that humans are capable of employing reason, logic and volition, but animals on the other hand, are living around only instinctively. Immanuel Kant, a prominent Enlightenment philosopher too vouched for anthropocentrism, strongly emphasizing human autonomy and dignity.

The evolution of anthropocentrism is all the more inundating, considering the trajectory of human development and the significant improvement in their self-awareness. Early Homo Sapiens like the Neanderthals relied on the nature for survival but were not anthropocentric, rather they saw themselves as part of nature, much like other species. But around 70,000 years ago, earthly humans were subjected to the phase of Cognitive Revolution, which propelled them to form abstract beliefs, and consider themselves as distinct from other animals. Then emerged the Agricultural Revolution, 10,000 years ago, wherein domestication of plants and animals led humans to exert control over the environment. Following the footsteps of these, rose the religious and mythological influence such as the Mesopotamian and Egyptian myths that elevated human-centric viewpoints. Empirical ascents such as Cartesian Dualism – which posits a clear cleavage between mind and matter, advocated for the idea that humans are something extraordinary and superior to other species and the environment. Further, during the Renaissance period in Europe between 14th and 17th centuries there was a sudden decadence in humanly endeavors, abilities, and achievements. Scientific revolutions, Enlightenment era, Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, and the subsequent

capitalist ideals have all been crucial proponents of sole humanism. This humanistic tendency at a full-fledged degree appreciated anthropocentrism. Followed by increased industrialization and modernization in 20th and 21st centuries, anthropocentric attitudes have been on a precipitous rise. In essence, those which stemmed as aspects of human survival have slowly been rendered into human superiority.

Now, having seen the origin and the over-paced progress of anthropocentric system, it becomes quite imperative to peep into how this system has poignantly crept up unto the contemporary synopsis. Is it going to sound overtly purported to state that humans of all backgrounds, ethnicity and race, have strongly been adhering consciously or unconsciously to anthropocentric beliefs? It sounds as if no one would argue against this assertion, considering the following scenario: Imagine a situation where a five- year old infant is being asked who, among a man and a dog, he might want to save from drowning in a pond. In the blink of an eye, say the child wishes to save the man. Who could have possibly taught him to regard that the man's life is of more value than that of the dog's, so that he feels impelled to salvage the man, causing him to forsake the animal in its gallows? Could the answer simply be because the child probably felt inclined to save the man, who is of his own species, the ultimate "human" species, the "homo sapiens". But this idea does not seem much sensible.

Perhaps, the truth is that, undeniably, the child has an inexplicable credence that humans are far more invaluable, internalized in his or her mind. Either the society in which the child was born and bred, or his own inherent volition, is attributed to his resolution to side with a human fellow in crisis, rather than with an animal in crisis.

The latter also would hint at a possible idea that anthropocentric behaviors are heritable too. How eccentric the whole aspect is! Heritability of Anthropocentrism? That demonstrates the significant progression of the same. Simply put, all humans in the world right now have anthropocentric beliefs entrenched in their minds, at least to some extent, by default. Now going further, when these seemingly little and oblique anthropocentric tendencies are stretched to the extreme, it would certainly cause massive ripple effects, such as the subsequent feud between nature and humans, the nature VS man arena; a timeless dichotomy that represents itself in the epoch of Anthropocene.

The premise of anthropocentrism is not just something of a convention that had been ruling the world, it is that which has made the routine of the world to have it in the position of what it is today. A definite parallelism could be drawn between the anthropocentric expressions in the novel and the contemporary synopsis which is replete with nature exploitation and destruction in the name of modernization and development. For instance, technological domination is at its pinnacle now; with the ubiquitous trend of artificial intelligence, its rapid advancement and automation. Technological advancements carried out with prudence and caution will make lives sustainable. But in today's world, human beings seem to trespass the boundaries of technological immersion than is necessary for them. Many seem to be ignorant of the possible ramifications of extreme tech stack, and disregard the ethical concerns associated with modern prowess, leading to energy exploitation and environmental destruction. Moreover, a vast number of industries and factories, such as the whaling industry in the novel, and the ongoing modern innovative institutions, exploits earth's natural resources and habitations for the sake of economic well-being. Anthropocentrism is all the more pertinent today in the ongoing climate crisis, an epoch where ecological balance is dropping down in an alarming rate. Climate instability, sea-level rise, global warming, coral reef deterioration, ocean acidification and harm to marine species, melting polar ice, marine heatwaves, droughts, increasing floods, hurricanes, typhoons, escalation of wildfires in places like the Amazon, Australia, California, and Siberia, deforestation, biodiversity loss, species extinction, desertification, arctic and Antarctic changes that pose severe threats to indigenous arctic species, glacier retreat in the Himalayas, Andes, and Alps, leading to freshwater decline, crop failures, health crisis, illnesses, displacement, economic strain, and an overwhelming, overall rupture in the entire system of the world. On top of this, human disconnect from nature has become a crystal-clear setback today. The clout of cyber age has led to a subtle ignorance about the natural world's role in balancing life forms. Thence, the need for unanimous action to transition toward eco-centric lifestyle over ego-centric lifestyle is more urgent now than ever. *Moby Dick*, the novel has achieved its sole purpose in bringing forth the awareness and the needed concern to prioritize planetary health and a rational shift in values, arresting mass attention worldwide. The monomaniacal quest of Ahab, the incessant life zeal of the whalers and their chasing behind the whales, are betokened to anthropocentric point of view in *Moby Dick*, yet with any nebulous loose points left apart, that would be delineated in the due course of this paper under a contradictory advisement, which is downright post-humanism.

Posthumanism, word termed by the postmodern theorist Ihab Hassan, evidently has its earlier use in the 1970's. Posthumanism is essentially a philosophical and critical idea that came into emergence as a response to anthropocentrism, in the 21st century. The word 'post' followed by 'humanism' clearly suggests that this is an epistemology that focuses something beyond human exceptionality, something that is not anthropocentric, and not human-centred. Posthumanism clearly subverts anthropocentrism and calls for rethinking of the dominant humanistic axioms and challenges the preconceived notion of what humans are and what they actually once believed they are. While humanism, which was a mere conjecture, sets humans above everything else in the world, post-humanism arrived out of the emerging environmental and ethical awareness and practical scantness of the former; that is, humanism. Since its inception in the Renaissance, humanism found expression as it was believed 1.) humans are autonomous from nature, and 2.) uniquely capable of and motivated by speech and reason, and hence exceptional. Whereas, posthumanism reinforces that humans are entangled with the environment. Post-humanism seeks to blur the binaries between humans and non-humans, including nature and even machines. Hüsing, a scholar, adds, "It pushes against that idea that human is the key", and says, "no, actually everything matters." (Husing). Lisa Yaszek adds, "Rather than asking how much we can produce and sell, we ask, 'what do we need so we all have enough?'" (Yaszek). Posthumanism has become the subject of scientific and philosophical breakthroughs, gaining the interest of a multitude of academic institutions, lyceums, and scholars.

Key posthumanist thinkers such as Donna Haraway (Key work: *A Cyborg Manifesto*, 1985), Rosi Braidotti (The Posthuman, 2013), Katherine Hayles (How We Became Posthuman, 1999), Cary Wolfe (What is Posthumanism, 2010), Bruno Latour (We Have Never Been Human, 1991), Jacques Derrida (The Animal That Therefore I Am, 2006), Francesca Ferrando (Philosophical Posthumanism, 2019) and Eduardo Kohn (How Forests Think, 2013) have contributed diverse, and multifaceted perspectives to posthumanism.

"Modernity is often defined as the breaking down of boundaries between nature and culture." (Latour 33)

Latour's assertion is about how modernity reshapes the relationship between humans and their environment. In the modern times, there is a slight decline in the distinction between the natural world and human-made systems, known as the culture. Urbanization has altered how humans interact with nature, as they per chance often shape, control, and exploit it.

"Posthumanism destabilizes the human as the self-appointed measure of all things." (Ferrando 18)

The tragic downfall of Ahab in *Moby Dick* highlights the destabilization of humanity as the "measure of all things". This reinforces the insignificance of humanly endeavors in the face of nature's vastness.

"We share with other life forms a capacity to interpret the world in ways that go beyond human exceptionalism." (Kohn 12, *How Forests Think*) The non-human world is way more autonomous and might just as well challenge the supposed human exclusivity.

Disclosure of post-humanist ideologies in Melville's *Moby Dick* requires a prudent study of what Melville tries to represent through the events and the interspersed digressions in the novel as well. Melville has admittedly attempted to denigrate the human-centeredness in *Moby Dick*, first of all through an ambiguous narration in Ishmael's shoes. Ishmael was earlier shown to express a sense of enthrallment at the pursuit of whale hunting. But of late, in the novel, he slowly succumbs to his own evolving sense of what it means to be a human and where humans stand in the entirety of nature. He very diligently attempts at cetology and the taxonomy of the different kinds of whales that are insofar known to humans. The Folio Whale: The Sperm whale, the Right whale, Fin-back whale, Humpback whale; famous for its valuable oil as described in the text as, "he is the most gamesome of species and light-hearted of all the whales, making more gay foam and white water generally than any of other of them" (Melville 167). Razor-black whale, Sulphur-bottom whale, The Octavo Whale, Black Fish Whale, the Grampus, Narwhale, Killer Whale, Thrasher whale, The Duodecimo Whale, Huzza Porpoise, Algerine Porpoise, and the Mealy-mouthed Porpoise. A whole lot of species, their anatomy, their propensities and their unique qualities have all been passionately disclosed to the readers through the eyes of Ishmael- but why so? One possible reason could be that Melville wants to distort the perception of anthropocentrism as his early act of dissent against human centeredness, by stripping off the coat of human superiority, by advancing forth the mightiness of whales and how significant and majestic they are actually in their own oceanic homestead. Indeed, for why Ishmael has to stoke the allure of whales and their humongous diversity and manifoldness, when he actually relishes whale hunting might be because he, this way he wants to laud the eminence of whales, the sea mammals as humankind's grandeur agents and not as separate natural entities, bobbing about in the water. But, later on, Ishmael is exposed to epiphanic

moments, where the reality of whaling, of whales, and more particularly of humans themselves, dawn upon him.

As he says: "Consider the subtleness of the sea; how its most dreaded creatures glide under water, unapparent for the most part, and treacherously hidden beneath the loveliest tints of azure. Consider also the devilish brilliance and beauty of many of its most remorseless tribes, as the dainty embellished shape of many species of sharks. Consider, once more, the universal cannibalism of the sea; all whose creatures prey upon each other, carrying on eternal war since the world began" (Melville 332).

Ishmael seems to be enlightened of what nature is and how mightier and more powerful it is, that humans can't even fathom the darker side of nature or peradventure even about the unexplored parts of it. This paper also comprehends how the size of whale demolishes the supposed haughtiness of the humankind. Ishmael lately seems to come up with emerging convictions that the whale is only an "animal". It could also be not decried to say that the novel divests the whale of all symbolic attributions embellished upon him by the sailors, especially Captain Ahab's own ideological projections, and with this sort of representation, *Moby Dick* effectually challenges the readers' way of evaluating these animals, emphasizing their resistance, defiance, and more aptly their escapism from the human imposed system of allegiance. This estimation is seen in the end of the novel, when *Moby Dick* is thoroughly on his way to thwart down Pequod and the other comparatively tiny humans into nothingness, for its characteristic wilderness is acutely justified and, at the climactic death of all the sailors that had been handy to Ahab's monomaniacal desire to kill *Moby Dick*, the justification is well reflected.

"The living whale, in his full majesty and significance, is only to be seen at sea in unfathomable waters; and afloat the vast bulk of him is out of sight... and out of that element it is a thing eternally impossible for mortal man to hoist him bodily into the air, so as to preserve all his mighty swells and undulations" (Melville 321).

Ishmael's enlightening utterance in chapter IV, is nonetheless aspiring to Posthumanist initiative. It is fairly certain that post-humanism suggests an interconnection between human and non-human, yet this cognizance can bump into difficulty and this is met with, in *Moby Dick*. In accordance with this, the narrative brings back the earlier time when humans knew they were one among many other animals. One can presume that post-humanist views are somewhat obscured in between the lines such as this:

"It was the whiteness of the whale that above all things appalled me" (Melville 225)

Ishmael's fear and revulsion towards the whale, as clearly seen in his statement could be his non-humanist reevaluation of his thought processes, a crucial aspect that could be attributed to the evincement of post-humanism.

Aside from this, Ishmael's survival at the end of the novel represents hope through close introspection on the importance of the natural world. In fact, *Moby Dick* could be considered a powerful metaphor as an awareness, and to learn from humanity's blunder. Perhaps, in the face of ongoing global crisis, society has started taking actions to curb the anthropocentric mindset and to a broader posthumanist shift. Many contemporary movements, and policies on ethical treatment of animals are urging humans to embrace the interconnected relationship with nature and each other. These posthumanist ideals when adopted collectively can lead to ecological harmony and a sustained balance between human needs and the well-being of non-human life. These ideal posthumanist paradigms have been well reiterated through the downfall of the anthropocentric delusions abound among the characters in *Moby Dick*, and this critique in the novel is not just a historical artifact, but yet functions as a visionary prognosis.

"Gifted with such wondrous power and velocity in swimming, as to defy all present pursuit from man; this Leviathan seems the banished and unconquerable Cain of his race, bearing for his mark that style upon his back" (Melville 165).

"There are certain queer times and occasions in this strange mixed affair we call life when a man takes this whole universe for a vast practical joke, though the wit thereof he but dimly discerns, and more than suspects that the joke is at nobody's expense but his own" (Melville 274).

"I prospectively ascribe all the honor and glory to whaling; for the whale- ship was my Yale College and my Harvard" (Melville 135). - Ishmael.

Withal, the journey on the whale ship has been as edifying as Yale and Harvard.

CONCLUSION

Extrapolating from the paper's studies, the conclusion is drawn upon the anthropocentric delusions and a counterfeiting post-humanist tension, embodies within the ethos of eco-criticism. The discourse is thoroughly enriched with the critique on the hubris of anthropocentrism, illustrating its ramifications on nature and bets the human kind to reconsider their place in the cosmos. Further, at the crux of post-humanism as represented in the paper, in *Moby Dick*, lies the need for a greater change in the world, towards which already many have started treading. As such, *Moby Dick* is ergo accredited for its congruence with both ancient and contemporary environmental ethics and justice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Moby Dick, vastly considered as one of the most complex, classic American novels of all time, offers a relentless ground for scholarly researches. The special arena of post-humanism and anthropocentrism, separately, has been not any less the sole focus of researchers who seek to interpret *Moby Dick* in their shoes.

Post-humanism emerged as an intellectual movement, particularly to debug humanist perspectives and even the critics have turned their interests toward post-humanist frames to vet literary studies, such as *Moby Dick*, putting into words the relationship between humans, non-humans, and the natural world.

Such is the case for anthropocentric presence in *Moby Dick*. There is ample amount of space for investigating *Moby Dick* in anthropocentric grounds, to shackle the delusions of the same and massively critique the human pre-eminence and hegemony. Every analyst seeks to highlight on Herman Melville's world in which human characters are confronted with their own insignificance, a strong lash-out against anthropocentrism. Teresa Shewry (2013), explores how Melville represents the ocean as a metaphor for the colossal, indifferent forces that stays farther from human comprehension and control. Shewry's viewpoints pinpoint how *Moby Dick* posits challenges to the overlying blanket of anthropocentrism.

While these research works have been effectual in providing valuable visions and acumen of anthropocentrism and post-humanism as could be interpreted within the mesh of *Moby Dick*, there remains gaps in literature, particularly in the view of how various researches present a broader, confluence piece of appraisal on the select novel. This paper, for instance, could stand apart in its way of conjugating environmental ethics, animal studies and a touch of bio-centrism, ethics, identity, technology and cultural essence of humans, along with the primary theories of anthropocentrism and posthumanism.

Scholars such as Laura Doyle (2008), have initiated to transcribe these intersections, but yet, heretofore, there is a need for a more collaborative work that could possibly enlighten the world that anticipates for more contemporary post-humanist concerns with the interplay of perceptions. Post-shumanist studies are on-going stream of pursuit and *Moby Dick* in all likelihood will remain a key text for present and future undertakings, while also bridging the gap between traditional interpretation and modern contexts, and perhaps a more holistic and well-rounded exegesis will score a win-win status, in the field of literary and interdisciplinary studies.

REFERENCE:

Primary source: Melville, Herman, 1819-1891, *Moby Dick*, "Munsey's Magazine", vol.18. 1897.

Secondary sources:

Azizmohammadi, F., & Kohzadi, H., The Impact of Anthropocentrism on *Natural Environment from the Perspective of Margaret Atwood*. "The Anthropologist", Taylor and Francis vol.17(2), 2017, pp.647–653.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2014.11891474>.

Armstrong, P, *What animals mean, in Moby-Dick, for example*. "Textual Practice", Taylor and Francis, vol.19(1), 2006, pp.93–111.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236042000329663>.

Hurh, P. *Expanding to bulk: scale and the challenge of posthuman ethics in Moby-Dick*. "Textual Practice", Taylor and Francis, vol.35(11), 2021, pp.1781–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2021.1968181>.

Copeland, M. W. *Literary Animal Studies in 2012: Where We Are, Where We Are Going*. "Anthrozoös", Taylor and Francis vol.25(sup1), 2015 pp.s91–s105. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175303712X13353430377093>.

Oscherenko, G. *Environmental Justice and the International Whaling Commission Moby-Dick Revisited*, “Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy”, Taylor and Francis, vol.8(2–3), 2007, pp.221–239.

[https://doi.org/10.1080/13880290590965311.](https://doi.org/10.1080/13880290590965311)

