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I hold that Melvillean society consists of paradoxical relationships between civilization and barbarianism, evil and good, the corrupt and the natural, the individual and the collective, and the primitive and the advanced. Because these terms are arbitrary and, in the context of the novels, somewhat interchangeable, I explore Melville's thoughts as those emerge in the following groups of novels: *Typee, Omoo,* and *White-Jacket* demonstrate the paradox of Melvillean society; *Redburn, Moby-Dick,* and *Mardi* illustrate the corrupting effects of capitalism and individualism; and *The Confidence-Man, Israel Potter,* and *Pierre* depict a collapsed paradox and the disintegration of Melville's society.
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CHAPTER I

MELVILLE AND SOCIETY: NECESSARY PARADOXICAL INTERRELATIONS

Herman Melville valued knowledge, total knowledge, which he believed is only obtained through experience. However, knowledge was not to be placed upon a shelf to admire or upon a pedestal to idealize. If knowledge remained "dormant," it was of little use or application. Melville believed that for knowledge to be useful it must be shared with and communicated to others. Melville lived the life of experiential, shared knowledge: he was, at one time or another, a whaleman, a sailor, a deserter, and a social critic who wrote about his experiences and observations. As a result of Melville's travels, he was, and continues to be, an insightful critic of Western society and the conditions influencing society's improvement or demise. For example, Typee examines the intrusion of white civilization into a barbarian culture; Omoo, how the primitive life can be destroyed; and White-Jacket, the social relations of a man-of-war. Melville's greatness, in his early fiction, resides in his ability to examine profoundly universal elements of paradigms of society, while his subject was particularly American and generally Western. However, while Melville examined how individuals lived in particular, he never forgot that individuals live constantly in debt to their social surroundings. Because Melville examined society, his important insights demonstrate why his contemporary, modern world, and especially America, was not the best of societies.

Significant scholarship details Melville's concept of society. With the Melville revival of the early 1920's, and more intensively in the early 1930's, scholarship has
concentrated upon many topics and different approaches to Melville's fiction. The Melville revival was marked by biographical relationships between Melville-the-historical-man and the Melville the author of fiction. The interim years of scholarship have concentrated upon the societies Melville describes as primitive, utopian, corruptive, antimessianic, and individualistic. Recent research has attempted to place the critic above Melville with "cookie-cutter" consistency. Unlike previous scholarship, this study will not seek to label Melvillean society as others have nor will this study place the biographical Melville in his literary texts; instead, I will examine holistically what is necessary for Melvillean society to function and offer a hypothesis about Melvillean society as it pertains to paradox in Melville's fiction. As previous research deems Melville's society as primitive, individualistic, primitive, corruptive, evil, and good, I will demonstrate that Melvillean society is a compilation of the above paradoxically interrelated with one another to construct a social paradigm.

To examine Melvillean society and its necessary contradictions, I will approach them paradoxically. While, as Aristotle asserts in *On Sophistic Refutation*, paradox leads to fallaciousness (165b, 172b, 174b), I will demonstrate that the contradictoriness of a paradox is necessary and represents a valid presentation of Melvillean society. As Melville asserts in *Typee*, truth is located between extremes—a paradox. Another reason for examining Melville's society paradoxically is that paradox forces a reader to contemplate knowledge which is contrary to commonly held beliefs and attitudes. Paradox, therefore, expresses knowledge and insights that reach beyond common sense and existing beliefs and creates a perspective that challenges traditional ways of thinking. Thus, paradox is epistemic.

Paradox contains two contradictory statements describing a single entity or subject. Commenting upon Kant's interpretation of paradox, one scholar posits "the irreconcilability of two deductions both apparently necessary." "Meaningful Statement[s]"
result from the pairing of opposites, and because antipodes describe the same entity, a "tension" results which forces the reader or critic to contemplate a new understanding of a given subject. Because of this tension, a critic must "suffer through the intellectual contradictions" to gain new insights. Still, not all critics hold that a paradox needs to remain "tense"; Cleanth Brooks declares that a paradox gains its greatest descriptive power when opposing positions are fused into one statement, and Mark Paul Moore believes that a paradox must be fused into one statement for readers to determine the paradox's meaning—a non-contradictory statement. Such definitions, however, fall short of accuracy, for when a paradox is fused into one "non-contradictory" statement, the paradox becomes static; because a paradox is a forceful, necessary contemplation, I believe that a "fused paradox" ceases to contain the same forcefulness of an "active, dynamic paradox"—one that has not and cannot be resolved. In my analysis of Melville, therefore, I will not attempt to fuse the civil with the barbaric, the innocent with the corrupt, the individual with the collective, the primitive with the advanced, nor the evil with the good; I will instead demonstrate how, through the tension between and among the different societal elements, Melvillean society is constructed.

Melville's earliest novel, *Typee*—and to some extent—*Omoo*, and *White-Jacket* offer up a functioning Melvillean society. For the maintenance of Melville's society, requisite paradoxical relationships between civilization and barbarianism, evil and good, primitive and advanced, innocence and corruption, and the individual and the collective occur and recur. While I will examine characters and narrators, their attitudes and insights into society will not necessarily be those of Melville; his evaluation of society will be an amalgamation of his characters' societal attitudes. A critical examination of Toby will demonstrate that he symbolizes the civilized, individual, advanced, and evil parts of the Melvillean, paradoxical society. Tommo represents a vacillation among most of the societal elements: at times, he is a civilized man determined to advance with stereotypical
Western evil; otherwise, Tommo exhibits primitive, barbarian, collective, good traits. Marnoo embodies Melville's paradoxical concept of society: he is simultaneously a civil barbarian who is interested in preserving the collective individual while advancing the goodness of the primitive life.

Toby's actions, his association with Tommo, and his perceptions or preconceptions of Typee primarily represent the civil, individual, advanced, and evil parts of Melvillean society. As a result, Toby symbolizes a limited construction of the societal paradox—essentially embodying the civilized part of Melville's societal paradigm. As Toby utters "[a] baked baby," he demonstrates the Western perspective and its hold upon him and his perceptions (T'95). Instead of believing that he has been served a pig, Toby's comment illustrates that he perceives the Typeans as cannibalistic savages—information which is second-hand, learned from others aboard the Dolly.

While Tommo realizes that cruelty is also evident in Western civilization, Toby's vision of the Typean conduct is conditioned by his membership in Western society. Tommo recognizes that colonization of the barbarians allows for "communal tragedy." Examples of the destruction include: King Kammehammaha III who lost the "noble traits" of barbarianism but does not acquire the "graces of the civilized being" (T'189). In Omoo the narrator likewise comments that the missionaries have "restrained the vices of theft and incontinence," but they have done so "with a great deal of evil." Similarly, Toby exhibits little civil grace and never seeks to acquire any of the noble traits of the barbarians. Tommo also comments that he is aware that the Sandwich Island natives have been civilized into "beasts of burden" (T'196). Here, Melville demonstrates that culture and missionary work are opposed to one another and produce dire consequences for those who are to be "civilized"; Toby's stereotypical reaction to the Typeans and his future desertion evidence the inimical relationship between culture and missionaries—Toby is concerned about improving his own lot without regarding the end results. Toby echoes
what White-Jacket asserts regarding American society: that irresponsibility in judgment leads to the destruction of the Constitution and, by extension, American society. While Tommo comments upon how the South Sea Natives are civilized, civilization is "judged by its treatment of the natives. Because Typee is perceived ideally, its "brightness" reflects upon "the darkness of civil[ization]". Possibly, because Tommo fears native retribution, he is timid about progressing further into a vale of questionable hospitality. In contrast, Toby understands no alternative to secure their survival. Toby wishes to risk the possibility of capture by the cannibals, and he descends from his morally superior vantage. Tommo has apprehensions of being a meal when the two are "captives" of the Typeans. While Tommo fears being eaten and Toby utters facetious remarks, Melville considers the sins of the pervading civilized to be more egregious than the sin of the barbarian. Toby, however, believes that his survival is dependent upon his progress away from the Dolly and towards an uncertain destiny--Happar or Typee; Tommo also thinks his survival is dependent upon his progress away from his journey's beginning (T 54, 59). However, Toby is willing to "sacrifice" Tommo's health for his release. Toby's behavior demonstrates, to a lesser extent, how individuals will sacrifice a "man or two" in order to obtain their desires (W-J 197).

As Tommo succumbs to the pain of his infected leg, he partially acclimates to Typean life, and in doing so, Tommo "creates" paradoxical tension between the advanced and primitive. It is important to note that before Tommo and Toby descend from the mountains, both are determined to survive by making progress towards the vale that they believe will offer them comfort. While John Samson argues that Melville does not support a "progressive idea of history" because Typee is a part of Nature, I assert that Melville does believe in a "progressive idea of history" because Typee, while not as technologically advanced, is also a progressive culture. Similarly, Gorman Beauchamp echoes D. H. Lawrence when he states that Melville "couldn't go back." My point is
that Toby's belief that his survival depends upon making progress away from where he begins his journey (Nukuheva) coincides with Melville's progressiveness. However, we should not be so quick to label Melville as "progressive" because Melville does not fully accept much that is not qualified.

Like the other parts of Typee which Melville examines, "progressiveness" is probed to demonstrate its limitations and consequences. Tommo believes that civilization is his only hope of curing his leg. "[T]he inefficiency of anything the native could do to relieve" (T104) Tommo's leg leads to his despair because he limits his possibilities and excludes the barbarian ways--he does not allow the Melvillean paradox to operate. T. Walter Herbert comments that, because Melville explores civilization and, as I argue, the progressive idea of survival for Toby and Tommo, he subverts civilization. However, Melville does not subvert civilization; rather, he presents its limitations: less barbarian happiness, intrusion into the barbarian world, and possible destruction of the barbarian. Civilization is able to "cultivate" the mind of the barbarian, but at what price? Tommo contemplates this situation (T124) but does not draw any conclusions. However, what is evident from Tommo's thoughts is that Melville does accept civilization to the point at which it ceases to be more helpful than destructive; in other words, when civilization leads to man's exploitation, Melville's qualified acceptance of civilization does not include man's degradation. Ray B. West argues that Melville reveals the primitive idyll.16 However, as with his treatment of civilization, Melville does not accept primitivism without a significant qualification: cannibalism is not viable.

Toby, as a member of Western, progressive civilization, is concerned with his own self-interest, and like the degraded sailors in *Omoo*, Toby looks contemptuously upon the inferior barbarians (O25). While Tommo wants Toby to journey to Nukuheva and return with "proper medicines," Toby, as D. H. Lawrence comments about Melville, cannot return to the savages. Toby's actions demonstrate man's individual mindset; he is
determined to obtain his own escape at the first opportunity and at Tommo's expense. What Toby does not understand is that the individual is not able to control his own actions without the aid of others. While Toby's "escape" is communally allowed, he does not return to Typee to fulfill his obligation to Tommo. However, Toby represents Melville's disdain for unqualified individualism. Melville was aware that man is "born, lives, and dies in constant debt to the social community." Although Toby's actions are counter to Melville's concept of individualism, his actions represent the dangers of unqualified individualism. 17

While Tommo chooses Toby as a companion because he believes that he will make an able friend, this choice leads to Tommo's imprisonment in the vale and to Toby's escape. Tommo at first congratulates himself on his selection of a travelling companion. However, once Toby obtains his freedom, he does not return for Tommo, who now questions his choice. While at the beginning of Typee, Tommo does abandon the collective--the Dolly--he does so to escape a negative collective endeavor. What underlies Toby's actions is his individualism, and Tommo, who seeks a fellow deserter, thinks collectively, in some measure, as demonstrated by his definitive belief that Toby and Western medicine can help him. Charles Roberts Anderson comments that Melville's individual is limited "to some extent ... by a force similar to Emerson's Over-Soul" 18--an evil force. As Toby abandons Tommo, Toby demonstrates that he will leave his friend in order to secure his own freedom, while he does not realize that his own freedom from the Dolly is directly related to Tommo. Toby disregards society's trust. Toby's actions demonstrate that he is an "unsubmissive individualist" who rejects social expectations. 19 Toby embodies the "Ourselves are Fate" assertion in White-Jacket (321); he relies upon himself and his abilities to obtain his escape.

Although Toby is a progressive, civilized individual, he does, for Tommo, represent freedom because Tommo associates his freedom with the sea--the place to
which Toby escapes and where Tommo wants to go. What Toby fails to comprehend is that man is continually part of a social whole. Melville does assert that the individual has much to offer the society without being a slave to the collective or being an unsubmitting individualist. As an example, *White-Jacket* demonstrates that individuals influence society in proportion to what they have to offer society. Jack Chase is respected by the others because his talents enable efficient sailing of the *Neversink*, and he attempts to improve the other sailors primarily because their improvement will be a positive reflection upon his merits as a sailor (*W-J* 15). Similarly, Bembo, a harpooneer, though not civilized, is "held superior to the sailors" because his abilities are more valuable to a whaler than are those of the other sailors (*O 71*). However, Toby refuses to participate knowingly in the social framework. Since Toby does not have much to offer society, he should not be a valued member or be expected to contribute to the improvement of society because, as his actions illustrate, he abandons other societal members who are in need. He represents only parts of the Melvillean societal paradox—an individual who cannot escape Western civilization and the concept of progressive survival.20

After Tommo realizes that Toby has deserted him and when he believes that his situation cannot further deteriorate, Tommo is compelled to embrace the barbaric, innocent, and primitive components of Melvillean society. Tommo takes it upon himself and turns to the barbarians who are now Tommo's only possibility of survival, which demonstrates Joseph A Ward, Jr.'s comments that hopefulness is an evasion because man's natural state is to suffer, or F. O. Mathiessen's echoing assertion that "Ourselves are Fate." In doing so, he realizes that people must be valued over abstractions and that the need of human relationships must take precedence over ideologies.21 As a result, Tommo acclimates to the Typean life and hospitality and symbolizes the barbarian, primitive, and collective parts of the Melvillean societal paradox.
When Tommo participates in the barbarian life, he becomes a critical examiner of the civil and the barbaric. Tommo analyzes and criticizes the "white civilized man" as "the most ferocious animal on the face of the earth" (T 125); declares that the missionaries, although they believe that they achieve "much good," nevertheless produce evil (T 197); believes that "Civilization" has scattered her vices and withheld her virtues (T 198), and examines repeatedly the system of taboo and wonders about the significance of tattooing (T 221, 224). While Tommo denounces most of civilization's intrusions into the barbaric world, he is less able to make conclusions about Typean life and customs. He knows that taboo controls the natives, but he does not know its origin; he is also convinced that tattoos have a religious relevance, but "it always appeared inexplicable to [Tommo]" (T 221). As a result, Tommo is a reliable narrator to the extent that he offers few definitive conclusions about the Typeans, civilization, he mostly condemns. As T. Walter Herbert explains, Melville, in Tommo, combines the "beachcomber" with the "sophisticated gentleman-at-large" in order to gain a valuable insight into Typean life. Similarly, John Samson argues that the native must be perceived "realistically" or our perceptions will stagnate. After Tommo acclimates to barbarianism, he becomes the "beachcomber-gentleman," which allows for more valuable perceptions about Typee. Instead of remaining a Western, civilized man, Tommo learns more about Typee by participating, although within limits, in Typean life. Without Tommo's participating in barbarianism, he would only reiterate Western stereotypes. In contrast, Tommo learns from his experiences, although he is unable to draw conclusions. This should not be deemed a weakness in him as a narrator or a critic; his understanding that he can not definitively explain all barbarian circumstances should lead us to believe that he knows his limits and explains what he can. 22

The paradoxical tension of Melvillean society is evident when Tommo questions which vale he and Toby are looking upon and about to descend--Typee or Happar (T 66).
At this point Tommo still clings to his civil perspective from his morally condescending vantage. As T. Walter Herbert similarly comments, when Tommo "falls into the Typee's hands," he explores the paradoxical elements of "island paradise." Once Tommo sheds his Western exterior and redresses himself, his leg quickly heals, and he believes that he is in a "Happy Valley" (123, 124). This change allows for Tommo to begin to appreciate and examine the attributes of barbarianism. Before doffing native dress, he was too frightened by Typee and the Typeans to "learn" from them; but shortly after his leg heals, Tommo recognizes the tranquility of the barbarians in comparison to the "hundred evils" of civilization (124). Tommo's simple change in dress leads him, towards the end of his native habitation, to gain a "higher estimation of human nature" (203). By Tommo acclimating to barbarian life, we gain a better insight into and learn more about Typean life at the expense of the civilized world. When Tommo does acquiesce to barbarianism, he demonstrates how those who are "impatient to the restraints of civilization" "are occasionally found quite at home upon the savage islands of the Pacific" (28). Free from the intruding constraints of civilization, Tommo is now able to act and to participate in barbarianism, and as a result, his actions demonstrate the tension of Melville's society because at times his actions are free from Western constraints and at other times his actions are dominated by his Western perspective; Tommo's vacillation demonstrates the necessity of paradoxical behavior in society.

The Typeans treat Tommo respectfully, although Tommo cannot understand why these strangers are kind to him—he has nothing to offer them in return (118, 120). John Samson describes Tommo as "the fickle civilized" as a result of Tommo's action and his incomprehension of the Typean kindness. Still, in Tommo's response to Typean kindness exists a critique of civilization: he reveals that, in aiding others, civilized people have ulterior intentions and motives. The missionaries seek to "christianize" barbarians but have imperialistic motives. In contrast, Tommo does not perceive any ulterior
motives, but Toby, the Western civilized man, believes that the Typeans feed them in order to fatten them up for a future epicurean delight (T 94). Similarly, the natives in *Omoo* equally treat all who need assistance (T 132).

Although Tommo doffs native clothing, his acclimation to Typean life is partial because he still believes that barbarianism has little to offer him; he remains a civilized man who does not allow barbarianism to penetrate his "civilized" world. He "re-attires" himself in order to "preserve" his clothes in a "suitable condition" in case he needs them for future civilized matters, and his clothes are "a little altered" from the normal native custom (T 121). Although Tommo attempts to dress "natively," he only partially immerses himself into Typean life—he becomes neither completely civilized nor barbarian. As John Samson notes, Tommo cannot escape his Western perspective. However, when Tommo, at the Feast of the Calabashes, dresses "natively," he respects indigenous culture (T 161-62). As Herbert notes, once Tommo "detaches himself from his accustomed mode of life, the more he discovers that the Typees are virtuous." But Tommo learns more than merely Typean Virtue; he discovers that the Typean life can offer a necessary element for Melvillean society and realizes that the Typees can aid him particularly.

Shortly after doffing new clothes, Tommo's leg heals, and he believes that a full-recovery is eminent (T 123); Tommo's change demonstrates that barbarianism is necessary to Melvillean society because he begins to rely upon those who can help him; he also seeks to assimilate to Typean life. John Samson notes that because the missionaries are idealistic in their endeavors, they alienate themselves from those they are trying to help. The opposite applies to Tommo: in his pursuit of survival, he becomes less idealistic about civilization and more pragmatic about barbarianism. In effect, Tommo is still operating within the civilized paradigm because he assimilates to Typean life with an ulterior motive—his survival. However, he does not incorporate the missionaries' depravity into his
pragmatism. Tommo's recovery also demonstrates Melville's assertion that civilization is ill because a healthy, physical state leads to a felicitous existence—a recapitulation of Rousseau (T127). Although Tommo is healthy, his acclimation is only partial. He believes that his only hope of survival is to "induce the natives to believe that [he] was reconciled to [his] detention" (T144). White-Jacket similarly asserts that "while on board the frigate [his] liberty of thought did not extend to liberty of expression" (W-J 65).

Tommo's preoccupation with escape demonstrates his partial acclimation and civilization's continued hold upon him. Similarly, John Samson maintains that Tommo "preserves ... his own culture" and only partially perceives the "natives' culture."^{30}

Tommo's assimilation to barbarianism occurs shortly before the Feast of the Calabashes. As Tommo sheds his altered native dress (removes his large tappa robe), he symbolically acclimates to the barbarian life. His change is greatly appreciated by the Typeans; but, more importantly, it signifies Tommo's barbarianism. By acclimating to Typean dress and culture, Tommo does not, I maintain, become a barbarian—as if a conversion were in any way possible. I do, however, assert that by Tommo's removing "civilization's" final exterior, he participates in and learns from Typean life and gains a better understanding about what the barbarian has to offer civilization, in particular, and society, in general.^{31}

Tommo realizes that Mehevi is "king" of Typee (T 187); and although Tommo gains this information after he comes close to the barbarian ways, the manner in which he uses his newly discovered knowledge represents Tommo's continual "eye" upon Western culture. Tommo decides that Mehevi needs to be courted in order to assure his eventual freedom (T 187). Tommo's political courting of Mehevi underscores Tommo's affirmation of the barbarian life and reiterates Tommo's membership in Western civilization.^{32} As a result, Tommo's acclimation to the barbarian life is ephemeral, after he discerns who could be responsible for his future freedom. Although A. N. Kaul notices
the importance of friendship for Melville, here again, we witness that civilized people have ulterior motives for their action: missionaries are imperialistic; Tommo seeks escape.

Two events, especially, influence Tommo's retrogression to his fully civilized perspective: the natives' wish to tattoo him and Tommo's affirmation of cannibalism. Tattooing is understood by Tommo to have religious significance—a belief posited by sailor stories. And because the barbarians seek to tattoo Tommo, his desire for escape is revived (T 220). What is interesting to note is that the "barbarian" Typees now "civilly" intrude upon Tommo's life in similar missionary fashion—they seek to mark him imperially as one of them. Therefore, Tommo's ambiguous portrait of barbarianism results from his approach to or preconceptions with the Typeans and their treatment of him.

Because the Typeans intrude upon Tommo and want permanently to mark him, he changes from feeling accepted to feeling alone—the lone, white, civilized man on the island (T 231). This shift from being a part of the collective whole to an individual demonstrates itself in Tommo's revived interest in cannibalism. Tommo, although he does not witness the practice, begins to hope he never will; he begins to conclude that cannibalism has occurred because he empirically observes what he believes is a cannibal feast (T 237). Later, he thinks he observes human remains of flesh and bones; he finds what he takes to be convincing evidence of Typean cannibalism (T 238). In contrast to Montaigne, who accepts cannibalism in comparison to the torturing and maiming performed by "civilized Europeans" as a lesser evil, Melville cannot acquiesce to mindless torture of human beings. Tommo becomes painfully aware that, along with "mindless" and "soulless" happiness, an equally terrifying amount of evil can occur. In contrast, Ray B. West, Jr. asserts that cannibalism is a form of innocence because it is "a-human." However, I believe that cannibalism for Melville is not innocent, and in the end, Melville does not accept the cannibal aspect of barbarianism because its bestial aspects stand outside of the Melvilean societal paradox. As a result of Tommo's renewed interest in cannibalism, he
believes that in spite of all the Typean hospitality, his ultimate fate is certain—the main course on a cannibal table. What began as Tommo's barbarian life ends when his foremost fear is "actualized" with evidence of a cannibal feast. His transformation back to a civilized man is complete.

After Marnoo informs Tommo that he is to be eaten (7'241), Tommo's Western perspective dominates his thoughts, the limited Melvillean paradox collapses, and he decides to escape; however, his first attempt ends in failure. During Tommo's successful escape, he literally strikes out at his barbarian existence and, in essence, denounces barbarianism en masse. With the information that strangers had entered the bay, Tommo is fully determined to reach the sea—his symbol for escape. When he does so by determination, Tommo has only one objective—freedom from the Typeans (7'248). He seizes the boat-hook and lashes out at Typee in the person of Mow-Mow, the strongest Typean; he symbolically strikes a blow against barbarianism and its cannibalism. For Tommo and for Melville, there is no turning back to the child-like existence of an Edenic paradise, as James Baird asserts. Tommo's actions represent the contrasts between "native felicity" and missionary distortions and evil and good. Therefore, Tommo, unable to overcome the sinisterness of the Typeans, escapes his cannibal imprisonment because he cannot extenuate or ignore their cannibalistic proclivity.

In contrast to Tommo's illustration of civilized barbarianism and Toby's representation of Western civilization, Marnoo symbolizes Melville's societal paradox—the civilized barbarian who individually advances the collective whole while keeping evil and corruption to a minimum. Marnoo's physical symmetry illustrates his completeness. Marnoo is of "perfect height" and "had he been a single hair's breadth taller, the matchless symmetry of his form would have been destroyed." Marnoo possesses "feminine softness" and the chiseled appearance of an "antique bust" resulting from "the most favorable developments of nature" (7'135). While Marnoo's physical consonance symbolizes the
paradox of Melvillean society—possessing both the feminine and the antiquity of a "Polynesian Apollo"—the declaration that his symmetry would be destroyed, had he been a "hair's breadth taller" (T 135), demonstrates the tension of the societal paradox. If one aspect of society, like Marnoo's physique, is changed, the societal paradox is similarly affected and destroyed; a minute adjustment in one feature of the societal paradox influences the other parts of society. Destruction of the paradox invites the domination of one aspect. Marnoo temporarily effects this when he intercedes for Tommo's release.

Marnoo's discourse with the natives demonstrates that he is at ease with his surroundings and that he is a social and hospitable man. He retells the island events to the Typeans and then commences to have a lively discussion with them; he calls them by name—an indication of respect for the individual—and addresses the females as well as the males. In more general terms, Marnoo's actions demonstrate that he understands the importance of the individual feeling unique within a community. Marnoo addresses each person on an equal basis—men and women. As Baird states, "[t]he restoration of man to equality reinstates him as natural man, good, free, intelligent, religious, happy."41

Because Marnoo enters the village freely and because Tommo has never seen this stranger before freely conversing with the Typeans, he decides that Marnoo possesses "uncommon talents; and [is] gifted with a higher degree of knowledge than the inmates of the valley" (T 138). Marnoo shows that even among the barbarians knowledge is respected—it is not only for the civilized. The Typeans are intrigued by the news that Marnoo tells them and demonstrates their appreciation of knowledge of island events. At this point in Marnoo's arrival, Tommo fears this stranger, possibly because Marnoo has not yet demonstrated his civilized attributes—he has ignored Tommo's presence and only addresses the Typeans (T 138). After Marnoo inquires, "You like this valley?" Tommo recognizes an opportunity for his own self-advancement--escape—as well as Marnoo's worth as interlocutor with the Typeans. Marnoo's ability to move freely about the island,
his respect for the individual and community, his symmetrical physique, and his knowledge of island events and the English language (T 138, 139, 140) symbolizes how an individual is improved by interaction with the other tribes of the island and with civilization—the barbarian is improved without destroying the barbarian. A civilized man who has the barbaric freedom to act—or a barbarian, who understands that actions must be tempered by civil statutes and expectations—is necessary in order to maintain the Melvillean societal paradox because without the paradox, society is destroyed and the opposing aspects intrude upon one another instead of paradoxically interacting. Marnoo also illustrates the contention that "the only way to civilize a people, is to form in them habits of industry" (O 189). Marnoo's industry is possible because he can freely move about the island and converse with the islanders and foreigners alike—he knows their languages. Although Tommo at first regards Marnoo as a threat, the cause of Tommo's reaction is arguably two-fold: first, Marnoo possesses what Tommo desires—freedom of movement; second, since Marnoo's arrival, Tommo had been ignored, especially by the Typean women.

Tommo's reaction to Marnoo changes significantly when Tommo discerns that he can relate to Marnoo linguistically. Tommo describes how "the natural quickness of the savage [can  be] wonderfully improved by his discourse with the white man" (T 140). This improvement manifests itself in Marnoo's "partial knowledge of a foreign language" (T 140) which elevates him above the other islanders. At this point, Marnoo exemplifies a representation of an "ideal community." Once he inquires about Tommo's release, Marnoo demonstrates the dialectical movement, or what I term paradoxical tension, between a corrupt civilization and an ideal community. Unfortunately, for Marnoo, Tommo, at the moment of his nascent acclimation to barbarianism, asks Marnoo to intercede for him in order to obtain freedom from the Typeans. Because the civil side of Marnoo intrudes upon the Typeans, Marnoo "grows" that one "hair's breadth taller" which
leads the symbolic representation of Melvillean society to dysfunction and the destruction of the societal paradox. After Marnoo inquires about Tommo's freedom, the necessary tension of the societal paradox collapses. Tommo's intercession is perceived as a "civilized" intrusion into the Typean culture. Marnoo is an islander, but when he intrudes into the collective for the benefit of the individual without regarding how the Typean collective will react, he no longer maintains his "taboo" status (T'141), he has corrupted the collective society with evil intentions, as perceived by the Typeans, which destroys the societal paradox. In effect, the Typeans interpret Marnoo's actions as an intrusion, evidenced by their negative reaction to his request. The barbarian part of Marnoo is what allows him to act; however, the intellect, the civilized, should monitor these actions. As Jack Chase must leave the "well-regulated" frigate in order to assist the "Rights of Man [sic] and the liberties of the world" (W-J17 & 77), and as the Tahitians are described as people of impulse because they do not reflect, so Marnoo's barbarian (his uncivilized, non-regulated) attribute enables him to act. The Typean community regulates how one should act through an intricate and inexplicable system of Taboo. In stark contrast to the state aboard the *Julia*, the absence of laws or regular discipline allows for the "greatest uproar" (I'13). For Melville and others, a regulating system is essential for a functioning society, without one, anarchy reigns.

The taboo system is exactly what Marnoo disregards, and his actions, if he does not discontinue, will result in the loss of his taboo status. Marnoo also disregards his internal monitoring, which creates the tension of the societal paradox, he does not realize that the consequences of his actions destroy the paradoxical tension. Similarly, Typean taboo or civilized statutes create the external tension of the collective upon the individual and deem actions good, evil, corruptive, or innocent. R. E. Watters asserts that "the community may sometimes impede a man's search for absolute heavenly virtue, but its
regulations do promote his earthly well being. Marnoo ignores the community in order to intercede for Tommo, and therefore, his "earthly well being" is threatened by the collective.

When Marnoo does respect all parts of society, he possesses "superior acquirements" and "knowledge" (T 143), and he is esteemed by the Typeans. In contrast, Typee, according to some scholars, explores three levels of society: the pristine primitive, the contaminated primitive, and the protested civilized. However, I maintain that if one combines these levels of society, Melville's paradoxical society is constructed and is illustrated in Marnoo, who before intercession is a "pristine primitive" and who, while acting on behalf of Tommo, contaminates the primitive. However, Marnoo learns from his mistake and becomes the civilized barbarian who realizes the importance of not intruding upon the collective without regard to the collective. Marnoo's actions require: (1) the barbarian freedom to act and the civilized intellect to monitor his actions; (2) the concept of advancement to promote progress and primitivism to recognize progress; (3) the collective to contribute his individual talents and the individual to achieve the collective variety; (4) the good to progress towards and the evil to censure; and (5) the innocence to be protected and the corrupt to be punished.

Marnoo's actions illustrate how a properly functioning society exists. Without the tension of the opposites, the paradox collapses. Also, when an individual only participates in one part or limited parts of the paradox, society does not exist because the tension necessary for the paradox has not been achieved. As a result, civilization or barbarianism follows. Tommo exemplifies living a life singularly. First, he is a civilized man; second, he acclimates to the barbarian life; third, he strikes out at the barbarian life and returns to the civilized. In contrast, Marnoo embodies the paradoxical tension before and after Tommo's intercession. Before, he monitors the paradoxical tension; after, society monitors what the individual disregarded. During Tommo's intercession, Marnoo does not respect the
primitive side in him, and he suffers the consequences. In order for Melvillean society to function, the individual must internally monitor himself and his actions, and the society at large must monitor the collective individuals. Paradoxical tension allows monitoring to occur because a person must contemplate opposite aspects of his decisions in order to decide upon his resulting actions. During Marnoo's intrusion, he disregards the internal monitoring, and the external is vehemently interposed.

In conclusion, while some scholars have understood Melville's concept of society based upon the action of the missionaries and Tommo, and others propose Melvillean society based upon the exalted barbarian, I contend that both of these are partially applicable, if qualified. When we examine only the Rousseauistic happy, healthy barbarian who occupies his time with enumerable pleasures (T 127, 150), we could conclude that Melvillean society is a one-sided proposition, and we could label the barbarian world as utopian with no need for padlocks or a "community of goods" (T 201). And in light of A. Robert Lee's observation, the barbarian world is destroyed by the "ubiquitously maleficent" white intrusion and, therefore, should not be accepted as Melville's approach to society. In contrast, were Melvillean society based upon Western civilization, this society would be rampant with evil and corruption. The paradoxical Melvillean society contains parts of all the above, but the key to a functioning society is the tension created by the opposing parts. The virtue of the barbarian, the intellect of Western civilization and the survival of the "heathen" are all necessary components of Melville's society. To exclude or suppress any of the parts--civilization, barbarianism, individualism, collectivism, good, innocence--is to destroy society, and these elements create an environment which controls the corruption and evil. In Melvillean terms, society is a Monkey-Rope situation which requires all participants to work together to keep the rope tense and functional. While I have detailed Melvillean society in the context of Toby, Tommo, and Marnoo, further study of other Melvillean characters is warranted. As we
learn about civilization from Tommo's comments regarding barbarianism, we can equally
learn more about barbarianism by examining how Typean men treat Typean women and
control one another with Taboo. This should demonstrate that the men intrude upon the
women like the Western man intrudes upon the Typeans. Similarly, just as Marnoo
illustrates Melville's societal paradox, so Jack Chase demonstrates Melville's concept of
society; he is simultaneously an "ordered man" and a "leader of men." In broader terms,
*White-Jacket*, like *Typee*, explores the interrelations of individuals within a social
framework; further scholarship will reveal the inherent paradoxes necessary for social
cohesion. Society is like the Chinese puzzle in *White-Jacket*: it contains "points of
opposition" which unite in a "clever whole" (*W-J* 164). Such is Melvillean society, a
construction of necessary, paradoxical interrelations.
NOTES


2 R. E. Watters comments that "[l]ittle heed was taken of Melville's dissenting reminders that man is born, lives, and dies in constant debt to the social community of his fellows," "Melville's Sociality," American Literature 17 (1945): 33-49.

3 Beginning with Raymond M. Weaver's Study, Herman Melville: Mystic and Mariner (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1921), a Melville Renaissance began; with the publication of Charles Roberts Anderson's seminal Melville in the South Seas (New York: Columbia UP, 1939), the revival of Melville studies "weighed anchor." In the interim years of scholarship, studies of Melvillean society have been limited to examining one aspect or a small number of parts of Melville's concept of society. A. N. Kaul, The American Vision: Actual and Ideal Society in Nineteenth Century Fiction (New Haven: Yale UP, 1963), concludes that the most important theme of Typee is "social", while the barbarians practice of cannibalism should be tolerated, civilization is deemed corruptive (225-26); F.O. Mathiessen, American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman (London: Oxford, 1941), stresses civilization's all-pervading force of moral decay (402); Gorman Beauchamp, "Montaigne, Melville, and the Cannibals," Arizona Quarterly 37 (1981): 293-309, advances civilization's corruption of cultural innocence (307); Nicholas Canaday, Jr., "Theme of Authority in Melville's Typee and Omoo," Forum (Houston) 4 (1963): 38-41, declares that statutory limits of civilization are necessary in order to preserve truth and justice (38-9). Canaday too closely connects Melville with his character creations, similarly, Wai-Chee Dimock, Empire for Liberty:
Melville and the Poetics of Individualism (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989), coronates "King" Melville as sovereign over his characters and concludes that Melville's authorial act is supremely individual; in contrast, James Duban, Melville's Major Fiction (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1983), illustrates how individual talents should be "preserve[d]" and "encourage[d]" for the improvement of a "republican government" (71); John Samson, White Lies (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989), is critical of civilization, but the individual "naturally subjects" himself to society's "natural unit--the family" (41); T. Walter Herbert, Marquesan Encounters (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1980), exhaustively studies civilization's effect upon Marquesan life and determines that civilization is aberrant and leads man "from his innate moral sense" (167). Therefore, civilization is not morally superior but is destructive and should not be preferred over other organizing paradigms (172, 181). Herbert too closely associates the opinions of the narrators with Melville's concept of society, and no solution to the "civilization problem" is offered. For comments about "cookie-cutter" consistency, see Duban's "Some Pilgrims Progress in Melville Studies," ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance 37 (1991) 71-88: and for commentary about critics empowering themselves over Melville, see Duban, "Chipping with a Chisel: The Ideology of Melville's Narrator's," Texas Studies in Literature and Language 31 (1989): 341-85. In contrast, I maintain that Melville's society is constructed of paradoxical tension between and among the individual and the collective, the civil and the barbaric, the primitive and the advanced, the evil and the good, and the innocent and the corrupt.

For an accomplished discussion of paradox, see Mark Paul Moore, "Rhetoric and Paradox: Seeking Knowledge From the 'Container and Thing Contained'," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 18 (1988): 15-30, especially pages 19-25. Although Moore less than convincingly concludes that a paradox should, in the end, be found non-contradictory and combined into one statement, he presents the epistemic qualities of paradox.


While Melville's major novels examine and judge different societal elements, readers should not empower themselves over Melville's art or Melville's thoughts with those of his characters or narrators. For example, to assume that Melville and Ahab espouse the same opinion about individualism incorrectly "labels" Melville an Emersonian self-reliant individualist. R. E. Watters notes that Melville only accepts Emerson's self-reliant individualism with one extreme qualification: "cosmic and social forces limit one's free will" (32). Similarly, Wai-Chee Dimock asserts that authorship, for Melville, was "almost exclusively an exercise in freedom" (7), although she consistently shackles Melville to specific characters, thereby limiting Melville's insight and genius. See Samson p. 11; Duban, "Chipping," p. 364.
T. Walter Herbert notes the arbitrariness of "civilized" and "barbaric" whose meanings are dependent upon how one examines another societal system pp. 21-22. Herbert continues to assert that one can only examine another society after knowing one's own society in detail pp. 21, 22, 155. Because Melville attempted to be an objective critic of society, a study using these terms is possible. I also realize that "civil" and "barbaric" are arbitrary terms; but since I propose to study Melvillean society and gain an understanding of Melville's insights, it is necessary to use Melville's terms—not our perceptions of what we believe he thought. Melville states in *Typee* that the term "savage" is incorrectly applied and is aware of the multiple significations of meaning for words (27, 125, 224). Because Melville was attentive to the ambiguity of language, he was probably careful in his word selection also.

John Samson notes that Toby's comments reflect the sailor's perspective of stereotyping the Typeans, while Tommo presents a more forgiving missionary perspective (*WL* 27).

A. Robert Lee, *Herman Melville: Reassessments* (Totowa: Vision and Barnes and Noble, 1984), 19. T. Walter Herbert notes that the missionaries and the native's culture are inimical and one is destroyed—the native culture, 154.


A. N. Kaul remarks that Tommo's remarks and apprehension reflect the cruelties of Western civilization (229). Melville notes that as Tommo and Toby stand above the vale, they occupy a morally condescending vantage (*T* 56) and only after the two enter the vale, are they able to learn from or about the Typeans—they remain in their stereotypes.
otherwise. Gorman Beauchamp, "Montaigne, Melville, and the Cannibals," declares that although Tommo and Toby occupy the moral high-ground, Melville's rhetoric conveys his belief that cannibals are preferable to a Western man (306).

14 John Samson, *White Lies*, 48. For examples of Typee's progressiveness, one may note the Typeans marveling at Tommo's sewing, the pop-gun wars, and the candles fueled by nuts that are strung together.


17 Tommo comments that the "proper medicines" to cure his leg are only available from Western civilization (7'98). R. E. Watters, "Sociality," reiterates Melville's belief in the "social" when he states that man is "born, lives, and dies in constant debt to the social community" (33).


19 For Tommo's thoughts about Toby as a companion and as a social traitor, see *Typee* pp. 62, 109. R. E. Watters demonstrates that Melville's concept of the individual is a social approach—men may be individuals, but they also must rely upon each other and "submit" to the social unit (43,48).

20 For Tommo's thoughts about Toby, the sea, and freedom, see *Typee*, 246. Duban, *Melville's Major Fiction*, offers different approaches to individualism and the collective. He notes that the individual may, in Cooper's words, become a slave when he concedes to society and, in Toqueville's words, "abjure his quality as a human being, if he intends to stray from the track it (the majority) lays down" (71). However, Toby's self-interested actions demonstrate how an individual who does not willingly and knowingly participate in
the social majority injures the whole. His actions also represent Melville’s qualification of individualism and civilization—the individual should contribute what he can to the social whole as civilization should offer barbarianism its qualities without destroying the barbarian.

Tommo comments that he cannot verbally describe the "wretchedness" that he feels as a result of the "perfidious" actions of Toby, who abandons Tommo "to destruction" (120). Joseph A Ward, Jr., "Melville and Failure," *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 33 (1963): 43-8, argues from a metaphysical standpoint that man’s "prosperity" and "hopefulness" are "mere evasions"; however, he later concludes that Tommo’s evasion is a freedom from civilization, p. 46. This freedom is from Western civilization and allows Tommo’s acclimation to the barbarian ways and his improved health. Tommo also demonstrates F. O. Mathiessen’s, *American Renaissance*, declaration that "Ourselves are Fate" because Tommo must decide to abandon his idea of escape or rescue and turn to the Typeans for help. He alone can make this decision, which allows his partial freedom from Western civilization and his partial acclimation to the Typean life.

I maintain, with Samson, that Tommo does see the native "realistically." T. Walter Herbert correctly asserts that Tommo is beachcomber-gentleman, but Tommo begins to probe the Typeans before he becomes a gentleman-beachcomber. As Tommo and Toby are above the vale, Tommo superficially and, possibly, stereotypically, examines the dangers that await below. But once Tommo evolves into the beachcomber-gentleman (when he disregards civilization’s aid and, instead, turns to the barbarians), he becomes a critic of civilization and barbarianism as well as a participant in his new found freedom from Western civilization (154).

Herbert’s assertion that Tommo "falls" into the vale reiterates that Tommo and Toby abandon their moral condescension (162). However, Toby cannot adjust to the Typean
life and quickly departs; Tommo is not in a position to do the same, although he fears the natives once he is in their presence as when he looks down upon them.

24 Gorman Beauchamp, "Montaigne, Melville, and the Cannibals," notes that the Noble Savage theme "is obviously simplistic," but it can lead us to seriously contemplate civilization and better worlds (308). A. N. Kaul, The American Vision, also believes that "the exaltation of the Noble Savage [is] at the expense of his civilized opposite (224). Joseph A. Ward, Jr., "Failure," argues that because Tommo is able to acclimate to barbarianism, he "stand[s] apart" from the rest of Western civilization, 44. From these studies I infer support for my assertion that Tommo is a "reliable" narrator and critic of barbarianism and civilization.


26 The more Tommo acclimates to barbarianism, the more valuable his insights because he is able to understand more about Typean life. Tommo's participation in native culture makes him familiar with his surroundings. As a result, he is no longer disturbed by the constant, native hollering and vale noise, and the "farthest" he conforms is "to regale [himself] with raw fish" (T'135, 209 respectively). Without adapting to Typean life, Tommo would remain a Western, civilized man who believes that the natives have nothing to offer him which is his condition before his leg heals and he realizes that the Typeans can aid him.


28 T. Walter Herbert, Marquesan Encounters, 167. And though Herbert notes that Tommo learns from the Typeans once he detaches himself, Herbert asserts this point too early in his account of the novel—after Tommo's leg has healed—because Tommo still thinks about a possible rescue or escape from Typee. However, once Tommo fully dresses natively (T'161), he learns more; he does not simply enjoy his freedom from Western
civilization. Although Tommo participates in Typean life before his full immersion into barbarian life, he does not learn.  


John Samson argues that Tommo never abandons his accustomed civilization (29, 41). Tommo relates his Typean detention to an Indian captivity, and because Tommo can make his situation familiar, he recovers. John Samson maintains that because Tommo describes the Typeans in Western terms, which John Samson deems ridiculous, Tommo remains a civilized man and never acclimates to barbarianism. Although Samson advances a convincing argument about perceptions and preconceptions in *Typee*, I do not agree with him about Tommo's acclimation. Tommo partially acclimates, and as a result he is critical of civilization. Because Tommo is critical of Western norms, we are able to discern Melville's concept of society and learn about the attributes of barbarianism and civilization. Tommo's acclimation or non-acclimation is less important than what is learned from his critique of civilization and exaltation of Typean life.

Both James Duban and T. Walter Herbert similarly note that Tommo never becomes a barbarian. James Duban, *Melville's Major Fiction*, declares that Tommo "never affirms or denies any one impression of the natives but rather participates in the full range of stereotypes" (5). Similarly, T. Walter Herbert notes that the "narrative voice" of *Typee* contains a "subtle ambivalent balancing" between "a cultured gentleman and a beachcomber" (155). While I agree that Tommo never adopts, and possibly cannot, adopt barbarianism, he does, by his participation, allow us to reconstruct part of Melville's societal concept. Tommo illustrates the limitations of civilization and the attributes of barbarianism.

This example of Tommo's political courtship of Mehevi demonstrates that Tommo does not "protest against every type of authority that seeks to constrain [him]" as Nicholas Canaday, Jr. asserts in "The Theme of Authority in Melville's *Typee* and *Omoo*," 41.
Tommo's actions do confirm that although he participates in Typean life, he is continually looking towards the Western horizon of civilization.


34 While T. Walter Herbert focuses upon Tommo's fear of the islanders' cannibalism (165), I assert that the islanders' desire to brand Tommo as one of them begins Tommo's fixation upon escape and cannibalism—both Western ideas. I do agree with T. Walter Herbert that Tommo is influenced by the islanders' peculiar culinary practice; still, I maintain that while Tommo acclimates to the Typean life, cannibalism does not engross him. After he believes that the Typees have something to offer him and before they intrude upon his freedom, Tommo participates in barbarianism without preoccupation with cannibalism. After the tattoo intrusion, he begins to think of escape due to the Typees' missionary-like intrusion.

35 While Tommo's conclusion about cannibal banquets is based upon information gained in Nukuheva (*T* 237), his discovery of human remains lends credence to his belief that Typean cannibalism is real. His belief is possibly influenced by Kory-Kory's insistence that the remains Tommo sees are really pig remains. Here, Melville is demonstrating that, like individualism, barbarianism should only be accepted if qualified—no cannibalism allowed.


38 For references to "mindless" and "soulless," see James E. Miller, Jr., "Complex Figure of Melville's Carpet," *Arizona Quarterly* 15 (1959): 197-210, in which he discusses the accompanying evil to Typean happiness, especially 201. Cannibalism's confirmation is discussed by Charles Roberts Anderson, *Melville in the South Seas*, who concludes that "Melville ... was convinced that he was being held by a tribe of irredeemable cannibals, and ... his ultimate fate was certain" (109-10). Similarly, A. Robert Lee, *Herman Melville: Reassessments*, asserts that for Tommo cannibalism becomes real when it becomes "something heart stoppingly near[sic]" (23). T. Walter Herbert similarly concludes that
Tommo's reversal is complete when "he finds evidence of an actual cannibal feast had followed upon a successful skirmish with the Happahs" (170).


40 For a progressive account of Tommo and Melville see D. H. Lawrence's "Herman Melville's Typee and Omoo," 15 and Gorman Beauchamp's "Melville and the Tradition of the Primitive Utopia," who reiterates Lawrence's assertion that "one cannot go back." For commentary about Tommo's contrasting vision of Typee see *Marquesan Encounters* 166-69.


42 For a further discussion on the ideal community and the actual community, see A. N. Kaul's *The American Vision: Actual and Ideal Society in Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, especially 222-38, which examine the Typean world from a dialectic of the "'community lost'—lost for good reasons—and not the image of [the] 'community to be regained'" (235).

43 Marnoo's actions before Tommo's intercession demonstrate all the elements of Melvillean society, except evil and corruption. However, his future action will quickly change this and demonstrate how evil and corruption need to be paradoxically opposed by innocence and goodness in order to limit their overall presence in society.

44 R. E. Watters, "Melville's Sociality," 42.

45 James E. Miller, Jr., "Complex Figures in Melville's Carpet," 200.

46 A. Robert Lee, *Herman Melville: Reassessments*, 19. If Melvillean society is considered barbarian, I would believe that it should be able to withstand intrusion or, at least, acclimate to them. However, this is not the case.

47 See William A. Hefferman, "Melville's Primitivism: Queequeg and Fedallah," *Lock Haven Review* Ser. 1 No. 6 (1964): 45-52, who discusses the Monkey-Rope chapter of *Moby-Dick* and concludes that this chapter posits "the positive quality of love of mankind"
to "the virtues of tolerance," 48. This is equally applicable to *Typee* because missionaries' love of mankind should be linked together with the barbarian virtue of tolerance to produce the tension of the monkey-ropes and allow society to function.
CHAPTER II

THE DYSFUNCTIONING OF MELVILLEAN SOCIETY: ALTERING THE PARADOX

Although Herman Melville gained a reputation from the publications of *Typee* and *Omoo*, he did not "enjoy" his status. His "gingerbread" fame was transparent, and Melville would rather have been "infamous" than receive *en masse* approval for mere travel books. He wanted to write books with more meaning, substance, and content. Melville wanted to seek truth; but he understood that "truth is ever incoherent," and "the silliest thing under the sun" and would lead any man who attempted a living by it to poverty and to the gutter. During 1851 Melville was grappling with the truth; and although it was incoherent, Melville had reached for himself a sense of security achieved by writing a "wicked book."

*Moby-Dick* is Melville's literature, the type of literature Melville wanted to write. It develops and questions philosophies and is pertinent to society, which it warns against the corrupting dangers of rampant individualism. Previously, *Mardi* had demonstrated the results of an unsubmitting individual's quest for the absolute (Yillah) and his (Taji's) subsequent alienation from the rest of his traveling group. In *Redburn*, Melville illustrates the corrupting effects of money upon men. In these novels, Melville details the ruinous consequences to "paradoxical society" of rampant individualism and of laissez-faire economics.  

*Redburn* has been dissected by scholars who treat its autobiographical elements and the limitations of a "democratic self-reliant[1]" society. *Mardi*, its critics contend,
demonstrates the dangers of pursuing an absolute, especially as that pertains to matters of the soul. Scholarship on *Moby-Dick* primarily examines the "wickedness" of the novel, one scholar to declaring that "all interpretations which fail to show that Moby Dick is, in some sense, wicked have missed the author's avowed intention." Other studies have concentrated upon Ahab as dominating and self-destroying, as representing the "millennial assumptions" of the American renaissance, as demonstrating Melville's relation to his age, as depicting "the most dangerous and destructive social type that has ever appeared in Western Civilization." Further scholarship reveals the social implications of *Moby-Dick*. C. L. R. James goes so far as to state that "Melville worked out an entirely new conception of society, not dealing with profits and the rights of man" but with the interrelation of man, technology, and Nature. Other "social critics" have concentrated upon the theme of the alienation of man in *Moby-Dick*, especially the conflicts that arise when man quests for "ultimate values" "that exceed human understanding." Ahab's quest for the unknowable leads the scholarly trail to examine the white whale as the embodiment of the destruction of human will and intellect and as a symbol of the divine power for whom Ahab's feud is solely intended.2

I differ from these previous approaches to *Moby-Dick* and *Redburn* by explicating the corrupt influences of rampant individualism and money upon the paradoxical Melvillean society. Building upon the previous chapter, I argue that when the paradoxical relationships necessary for society are altered, society is corrupted to a point but not totally dissolved: certain aspects dominate the societal paradoxes, instead of actively participating with and preserving the community of paradoxes. *Redburn* will be studied to demonstrate money's influence upon Melvillean society, while *Moby-Dick* will be extensively examined to detail how money, to an extent, and rampant individualism more generally, corrupt society. *Mardi*, which I treat tangentially, illustrates the dangers of the absolute quest, Taji's journey being a precursor to Melville's Ahab, who also seeks a
symbol of an absolute. However, money and rampant individualism are the focus of this study, which will reveal how a functioning society can be transformed into a dysfunctioning, non-paradoxical social paradigm. An examination of Ahab and Wellingborough Redburn and Harry Bolton will illustrate how a corrupted society becomes "(de)constructed." In Redburn, money produces both evil and happiness and leads to the collective dominating the individual and to the corruption of the innocent.

Life aboard the Highlander and in Liverpool details how civilization eclipses barbarianism, how "society" masters primitivism, and how evil taints goodness. In Moby-Dick, advancement alters primitivism; corruption, innocence, barbarianism, civilization, individualism, the collective; and evil, good. As a result, society's precarious nature will become evident, as will the need for paradoxical interrelations.

As both Redburn and Moby-Dick begin with monetary concerns, both Ishmael and Redburn are led to the sea. In this respect, Melville is aware that man's pursuit of money has the potential to poison his intentions which, in turn, affect the Melvillean society of paradoxes; for when men pursue money as a justifiable end, in itself, they consequently alter the community of paradoxes of society, like Ahab, through singular and selfish preoccupation. On the surface, however, Melville's attitude towards money appears positive. Redburn contemplates that if he "had a little money to enjoy" the world, everything would be fine. Redburn notices the beauty of the "promenading ladies and gentlemen ... so fresh and bright" (R 310). As Joseph A. Ward, Jr. asserts, a reader "cannot avoid the impression that, for Melville, money buys happiness." Still, beyond the green pastoral facade of money exists Melville's characterization of it in an entirely different vein. As Redburn steps into the Lyceum, and the old, judgmental gentleman peers over his London Times, the "gutter-escaped" Redburn is returned to the street without apology (R 208). Money is here presented as a barrier--a controlling device. Just as the doors are closed upon Redburn to prevent his return, he is outraged by the
"artificial" barrier between himself and his wealthier contemporaries. Further, Redburn also observes the people of Liverpool not assisting those in need. The barrier that money creates is one of mass isolation between the wealthy and the poor. Taken a step further, this barricade is used as a controlling device. As Redburn sails for America, he notices that the "detachment of geniality" aboard ship insists that the lower classes remain separated from them. Monetary control is twofold: first, it restricts the poorer passengers' movement; second, it defines the classes of people on board—to distinguish themselves as better, because of wealth, than the others. However, the wealthy are also limited by their own boundaries, but their limits are self-imposed and demonstrate the power that they and their money hold and can influence. Their boundaries are more to keep others out than themselves in, while they intend to keep the poor in their place—a dissociated locale.

In *Moby-Dick*, money is used as a subtler means of control. Ahab baits the crew of the *Pequod* with an ounce of gold for whoever raises the white-headed whale (*M-D* 162). In this situation, Ahab is aware of the power or influence of money. Ahab, as he thinks, "cash—aye cash," reiterates his belief that money does influence the behavior of men because if the men are to aid him in his revenge and stray from the owners' expectations, the crew's reward would have to compensate them for lost potential income. Income is the reason that Ishmael ships, and a reason why most of the crew go to sea. Ahab knows the power of money when, after he spots Moby Dick and claims the doubloon for himself, he further entices the crew with the division of ten times its sum when the white whale is raised the same day (*M-D* 553-54). To a large extent, therefore, money or the reward of money leads the *Pequod*'s crew into following Ahab on his monomaniacal quest for revenge. Ishmael echoes the assertion when he asserts "how cheerfully we consign ourselves to *perdition*" when entered into activity with money as an end (*M-D* 6 emphasis mine) and when he declares that "no ... monied man enter[s]"
heaven" (M-D 6). Money is presented as being evil and inimical to man's moral end and as having a destructive potential.

Because money is used to control man's actions, the paradoxical tension between the individual and the collective erodes and is replaced with the dominance of the rich over the poor. Here, the force of the paradoxical society is lessened due to the lack of active tension necessary for a functioning society. In Redburn, as a result, money separates the collective rich from the collective poor. The individual is not presented or perceived as an individual—merely a non-distinct part of a larger whole. With this dissolution of the person, the necessary tension between the collective and the individual is similarly lessened. Also, the non-individual person has no collective whole to which to contribute, and the monitoring knot between the individual and the collective is also relaxed. Instead of a paradoxical society existing between the individuals and the collective, the collective rich maintain their identity to the exclusion of others. In contrast, Ahab, the ultimate individualist, manipulates the collective crew of the Pequod into self-traitorous actions with the doubloon. Consequently, the crew feels as if Ahab's quest is theirs. This mentality is evident when Ishmael declares that "Ahab's quenchless feud seemed mine" (M-D 179). Similarly, in Redburn the individual is submitted to the collective and in the process loses personal identity. By so doing, the individual no longer monitors the collective; his identity is the collective identity, and whatever it does is justifiable in their collective eyes. The people of Liverpool, for example, do not readily aid those in desperate straits—the woman at Lancelot Hey dies; when Redburn returns, the sight has been "cleansed" of its destitute reminders. As a result, the tension necessary to maintain the paradoxical relations of society are lessened or disregarded.

As money can lead a man to alter or lose his identity, money potentially corrupts the innocent aspect of society and continues to alter the paradoxes of Melvillean society. In Melvillean terms, society's innocence should be protected from corruption by the
monitoring of the individual upon the collective and--the reverse. However, since this relationship is diminished in Redburn and Moby-Dick, the "checking" paradigm is equally lessened between the rich and the poor. For those with money, it is equated with happiness and well-being. In contrast, those without monetary pleasure seek to emerge out of poverty but not necessarily into happiness. In the process, the money-seekers alter their youthful impressions or beliefs about money--they corrupt their innocence by becoming involved in events they normally would not. As mentioned above, Ahab likewise realizes the power of money to provoke men to perdition, although this economic impetus is overshadowed by Ahab's intense revenge. Redburn affirms money's corruptibility when he says that it was "hard times that had made [him] so" (R 10). To a lesser extent, Ishmael also goes to sea because he has little of no money of his own and nothing to interest him on shore (M-D 3). For similar reasons, Redburn comments about how easily money-less youth are "induced" to enter a military life due to their lack of money and the possible related adventures (R 194). If these young people had money, the provocation to leave home would not be so persistently present: the want of money alters their youthful innocence about life.

However, while money is potentially accountable for corruption, others have asserted that the injustices in Liverpool are more appropriately attributable to Original Sin. I maintain that Melville's position towards ruinous money is evident in his setting of the novel and the preponderance of examples in which money is used to corrupt or control others. However, because of the events of the Lyceum, Captain Riga's withholding Redburn's pay, and the extent to which the poor endeavor to make money--returning bodies from the waters, dead or alive--Melville is more overtly concerned with money's effect upon man. Redburn is similarly interested in redeeming his family's wealth and not their spirituality (R 86). Melville further demonstrates money's corruption of past innocence as he discusses the poisoning of the sailors at Canton "for the sake of money"
Redburn witnesses how the "land-sharks" and "land-rats" prey upon the sailors and constantly nibble at their purses (R 138). Melville's most egregious example in Redburn of money's tainting effect upon man occurs as the taverns and the pawn-brokers share a common wall which allows easy access to man's perdition and the owner's profits. This situation enables and even encourages the tavern patrons as their money is spent to enter the pawn shop and sell whatever they have. Conversely, if a person wants a potent refreshment and does not have the requisite money, the proximity of the businesses promotes his pawning a possession and then quenching his thirst. If the circumstances of pawn-to-drink or drink-and-pawn-and-drink is encouraged by the owners, man's corruption is accomplished at a faster pace.

However, like Melville's other abstract concepts, his position on money must be qualified. Melville does not necessarily equate people who strive for money or the bettering of their lot with corruption. The symbol of the carriage carrying passengers (R 139) presents Melville's qualification of money: workers, like wheels, are necessary. However, these workers should not be controlled or corrupted because they are workers. Like Redburn, people must work for a living (R 36), and it is when people are poisoned by money or by the pursuit of money that Melville objects. And when people are corrupted, the Melvillean paradoxical society is similarly corrupted since money possibly can taint men because their innocence is befouled by those who seek to take advantage of them due to the extremes to which some endeavor to acquire more money. Captain Riga's actions towards Redburn are easily applicable.

The dysfunctioning societal paradox results to this standard from the corruption of the innocent under the auspices of civilized constraints, while barbarianism is suppressed by civilization and its commercial expectations: the barbaric freedom to act is hindered by civilized mores of conduct which are vehemently implemented by those with money—the corrupted. This occurrence is antithetical to the conditions of Moby-Dick: Ahab acts
outside of the bounds of civilized expectations. In comparison, Redburn's charitable act to aid the destitute family at Lancelot-Hey is hindered by the tavern keeper who refuses to help Redburn because he lacks the funds to pay for a pitcher (R 183). The barkeep refuses to act because the civilized need to pay for goods or services is not fulfilled. The owner is a part of civilization and demonstrates that he is not free to act until he receives the civilized norm of payment. Similarly, Redburn, earlier in the novel, is made aware of the business relationship between owners and consumers. As Redburn goes to the captain's office to pay for his ticket, he becomes aware that he does not have enough money; the fare had been raised because the other normally scheduled ships were not in service (R 12). Redburn's situation demonstrates the restrictions of civilization and the resulting corruption of himself. Because Redburn does not have the required fare, his subsequent actions are restricted by civilized norms dominating the civilized/barbaric paradox. Instead of having the barbaric freedom to act, Redburn determines he "will say nothing to any body until called upon for [his fare]" (R 12); as a result, Redburn compromises himself because he knows his actions are deceitful. In this incident, money's effect is to restrict action and to corrupt the limited action which is taken.

However, the dominating, collective rich are not entirely at fault for altering the paradoxes of society, although they receive much blame from Melville. Just as the wealthy remain separate from the indigent, so the impoverished, when allowed the opportunity to gain some subsistence, conflate their plight because they fight amongst themselves for what is thrown their way. However, Melville's commentary is directed more to the "social superiors" who constrain the poor to their social underclass (R 264). Here, Melville indicts the wealthy for their restricting passivity toward mankind. Melville, while a qualified believer in democracy, believed in the "unique value of the human being which ... was manifested by men in bonds of love, sympathy, and charity," however, little charity exists in Redburn. The rights of property have become more important than the
rights of people, and even more important than people themselves. In comparison to
Tommo, whose survival is dependent upon his acceptance that people must receive
precedence over ideologies, Redburn also encounters the dominance of money and power
over humanitarianism. Melvillean society, therefore, loses its tension between and among
the societal components. And unlike the barbaric Typeans with whom Tommo interacts,
learns from, and appreciates, Redburn confronts self-serving profit-seekers.

In bold contrast to Redburn's constrained, corrupted actions is Harry Bolton who
symbolizes the possible freedom to act as a result of his money and, later, when aboard the
Highlander, represents the deprecation of the human personality to the statutes of
constricting civilization. Harry's actions, to a lesser extent, foretell the disintegration of
Melvillean society in his later novels. In effect, Harry comes to illustrate the effects of a
"loose" paradox, one that is no longer actively tense. As Redburn remarks, "... what
rights has a poor Yankee, like me, to insinuate the slightest suspicion .... What little
money he [Harry] has, he spends freely" (R 223 emphasis mine). Redburn's commentary is
doubly revealing: first, it illustrates that the poor have their place in a dysfunctioning
society, and that place is not influential or in the mainstream. Second, the barbaric
freedom to act is well-enveloped within the civilized criterion of money: those who have it
can and do control those who are without. For example, during the Highlander's stay in
Liverpool, the ship's discipline is relaxed and the men are allowed to roam freely (R 238);
however, while the restrictions are loosened, they are only relaxed because the men are of
little economic value to Captain Riga. Although the severity of the rules are somewhat
relieved, the men are still economically accountable for their actions.

When Redburn attempts to comfort himself outside the constraints of civilization
and to exhibit a barbaric freedom to act, he is further made aware that his actions are
inimical to an altered Melvillean society, a society where certain elements attempt to
dominate other societal components due to man's pursuit of wealth and power. And
although Redburn has little means to aid others, he helps the woman and her three
cchildren--the most pitiful example of destitution and the most alarming example of the
wealthy not helping others. Redburn does what he can, even though he is hindered by the
tavern keeper who will not give him a pitcher (R 183). Redburn's example of charity
reveals Melville's belief that man must rely upon his fellow man for charity, if a christian
democracy is to exist. Without some assistance, the poor are left to fight amongst
themselves for sustenance or, in this example, die.

The necessary tension between the advanced and the primitive and the civilized
and the barbaric is lessened because of the latent economic factor in Redburn. As
Redburn demonstrates, without continual remembrance of where people start, their
present situation is not fully known or appreciated because they know what they seek,
improvement from their impoverished condition. Like Tommo and Redburn who both
know their beginnings (civilization, wealth respectively), people, if they are unsatisfied
with their present situation, should know their starting place and what they want to
improve. These circumstances create the tension necessary for the advanced/primitive
paradox of Melvillean society because as the person advances, he must evaluate his
actions in accordance to what is gained from his beginning and the price of his
advancement. Is the advancement worth the price of forgetting his beginning? Is the end,
like money, an end in itself and all means justifying the end, no matter the costs?
However, in Redburn the advancement of people dominates the advanced/primitive
paradox because those on the primitive side of the paradoxical society remain in squalor
after persons who have advanced refuse to aid others. Harry Bolton's experience aboard
the Highlander reiterates how advancement dominates primitivism. As Harry is pre-
judged by the crew, his worth to the crew is perceived in terms of what he can contribute-
how much he can advance the efficiency of the ship. After Harry plummets to the ship's
deck and refuses any duties which mandate his climbing the sails, his fate is sealed, for he
offers little to the ship's society (R 253-57). As a result, with the ship as a symbol of the mechanization of Melville's time, Harry is reduced to an almost non-person for his refusal to be a part of the advancement of civilization's expectations and commercial concerns.

The ultimate example of Melville's contempt for unqualified use of money, which corrupts the interacting paradoxes of his social paradigm, is "under the beneficent sway of the Genius of Commerce" (R 165) that connects nations. According to this outlook, "all climes and countries embrace, and yard-arm touches yard-arm in brotherly love" (R 165 emphasis mine). It is necessary to note that only the yard-arms embrace in "brotherly love"; Melville does not mention the individual. Melville's contempt for this lack of respect for the individual is further expressed in that "climes" and "countries" embrace; the individual is subordinated to the collective, commercial want. Man's mechanization, while it can bring together different peoples, leads to the devaluation of the individual's wants and needs. In contrast, one of the reasons Queequeg is respected, and arguably free to act, is that he "never had [sic] a creditor" (M-D 50)--no one who could possibly sway or taint him or "persuade" him to act contrary to his principles. In contrast, Redburn demonstrates that civilization limits the "barbarian's" freedom to act individually because the Invisible Hand of civilization inhibits individuals for the sake of acquiring wealth. As individuals seek wealth as an end, like the ship owners, the collective society appreciates these members mainly for advancing the mercantile machine. This limiting of the barbarian also leads to the dominance of the collective over the individual, as well as to the supremacy of advancement over the primitivism. For example, the collective Liverpool does not aid the destitute lady, and as a part of the collective commercial enterprise, Captain Riga "manipulates" the rules towards his own personal advancement.

In Redburn, Melville details Redburn's journey to re-establish wealth, but Redburn also delineates how this pursuit subordinates the individual to the collective, thereby threatening Melville's paradoxical society. Consequently, Redburn must decide if the price
of personal advancement is worth it. In other words, Redburn is presented with a choice of remaining poor or acquiring wealth. Redburn is determined to improve his situation, and he believes that he "must not turn pauper" (R 212). Clearly, Redburn precludes primitivism and chooses advancement. By so doing, he taints the Melvillean society: he does not allow the paradox to remain active and tense. Instead, Redburn becomes a part of the advancing, mercantile concern of his time. In comparison, Harry Bolton, while not as concerned with wealth, illustrates the result of an advancing civilization upon members who cannot effectively contribute to it. Because Harry does not have any "regular profession or business" and because he has demonstrated how inept he is as a sailor (R 253-57), he appears to have little to offer. In contrast, one scholar asserts that "in the end, the individual need is a function of the public framework." However, the "public framework" is concerned with commercial interests which Harry cannot advance. A better understanding of Melville's thoughts towards "non-contributing people" is evidenced at the end of Redburn: Harry just fades into obscurity—no one knows his whereabouts. In stark contrast to Harry stands Captain Riga, who represents the dangers of personal advancement at the expense of Redburn. As Redburn requests his wages, Captain Riga informs him that Redburn owes him money. Here, Captain Riga represents the civilized, advanced, and corrupted individual; he garnishes Redburn wages due to civilized statutes; and he realizes that because of Redburn's circumstances, Captain Riga can advance his own monetary condition. After all, Captain Riga needs money to cover his own expenses (R 307), and however he acquires his funds, it matters little to him that another man's income pays his bill.

In comparison to Captain Riga, the competition for emigrant passengers also leads to the corruption of Melvillean society at the expense of the individual. While competition is not essentially evil, when it leads to sub-human treatment of people for greater profits of the ship owners, competition for revenue alters people. The ship owners are concerned
with advancing their wealth, and people are merely seen as commodities and implements to be used or transported for profit. As a result, personal advancement has its ruinous side. The "nefarious commercial speculations [selling tobacco] of theirs reduced them to sad extremities in the end" (R 270): Melville indicates that corrupting others for the sake of advancement will eventually lead to ruin for those who seek corrupting, individual advancement. When the primitive (where one begins) is disregarded, the price for advancement cannot be weighed against any relativistic point. However, if the primitive and advanced actively and paradoxically interact, society profits. For example, if the sailors would have realized their "ruinous" end, they may have been disinclined to sell all of their tobacco. Similarly, if Redburn had chosen to follow the rules of the ship, he should have received his wages uncontested by Captain Riga. The paradoxical tension between advanced and primitive is necessary to check the advancement of Melvillean society in order to control or preclude its corruption of the innocent and the individual.

As in Redburn, Moby-Dick also explores societal ramifications that are manifested when advancement inhibits primitivism from paradoxically functioning within the Melvillean social paradigm. Ahab’s quenchless need for revenge, the Pequod’s journey to corner Moby Dick, and Ahab’s disregard for his earthbound social interrelations demonstrate how advancement dominates the advanced/primitive paradox and leads to an impaired Melvillean society. Although Ahab has a "sweet girl" and a child (M-D 79) for whom he should be responsible and who should serve as a point of reference for the advanced/primitive paradox, his rampant individualism leads him to neglect his family. When Ahab informs his crew about their actual reason for sailing (M-D 163), he does not mention any landlocked responsibilities for him or the other men. Ahab's purpose if "to chase that white whale on both sides of the earth", however, Ahab's words suggest that the Pequod's ever-advancing voyage inhibits a return or, at the least, a very conditional return because they will not return until Moby Dick "spots black blood and rolls fin out"
Early in the novel, therefore, Melville intimates the destructive possibility of continuing forward without a primitive point of reference. For example, had Ahab realized that he and the other sailors had familial responsibilities (primitive point of reference), he probably would not have pursued Moby Dick with such fervor. He should have weighed the consequences of a singular quest with respect to his family and those of the other men. The primitive here acts to monitor the advancing. Without primitivism checking advancement (the reverse is also possible and necessary), Ahab has little to constrain his revenge.

Melville's rhetoric in *Moby-Dick* details how destructive Ahab's unending revenge is to the fragile balance of society's paradoxes. Ahab's preoccupation with the white whale is an "unsleeping, ever-pacing thought" (*M-D* 160) which leads Ahab to seek Moby Dick "unerringly"; "[n]aughts is an obstacle" (*M-D* 186) to his "audacious, immitigable, and supernatural revenge" (*M-D* 186). As the voyage progresses, Ahab's "unfaltering hunt" and "all intervening quest" (*M-D* 200-01) "intensifie[s] itself" (*M-D* 483) to the point that Ahab is prepared to "girdle the unmeasured globe; yea and dive straight through it" (*M-D* 561). However, Ahab, because he continues forward, is doomed to self-destruction because he does not actively engage the advanced/primitive paradox. As Ahab advances, he comes closer to destruction and further from his primitive, familial responsibilities. In contrast to Redburn, Ahab's unending advancement leads to his own destruction, while in Redburn the mercantile progress leads to other individuals being "destroyed"--the poor passengers and the destitute.

As a consequence of the pursuit of revenge, Ahab only perceives objects with respect if they will aid in him in accomplishing his revenge; in so doing, Ahab affects the tension of the advanced/primitive paradox because he intensely pursues Moby Dick without regard for others. Ahab discards his razors because he no longer needs them (*M-D* 487); he questions the quadrant's use; he refuses social gams with any other ship (*M-D* 487).
238) because, unless objects or people can assist his quest, they are meaningless and useless. These actions demonstrate the danger of blind fanaticism; Melville's warning in *Moby-Dick* is similar to the cautionary ending of *Mardi* which demonstrates the dangers of the unsubmitting individualist. Ahab takes Taji to a further extreme because, unlike Taji, Ahab destroys himself and his crew due to his continually advancing revenge, while Taji abandons his traveling companions to pursue his quest by himself, leading to his own possible destruction. Without the paradoxical tension between advancement and primitivism, society is partially ruined because, in this example, Ahab puts his concept of revenge before his fellow man. In contrast, Tommo insures his survival by acclimating to the primitivism of Typee, while he devalues his idea that, by advancing to civilization, he will be saved. Ahab does the opposite: his absolute vision is placed before people (his crew). Therefore, a dominating adherence to advancement taints Melville's paradoxical society.

If, on the other hand, advancement is in itself beneficial to society, Ahab should have changed or, at least, been improved in some manner. However, no change is apparent: even as he strikes out at Moby Dick and perceives that his own end may be near, he does not change. Nearing death, Ahab continues his advancing revenge. "Ahab is forever Ahab" (*M-D* 561): he has no catharsis or purgation. Melville demonstrates that by continually advancing without an "eye" on the past, man is on a course towards destruction. Unlike Tommo, Ahab does not realize the need to incorporate some part of primitivism into his life and actions. Ahab's adherence to advancement also leads to the corruption of the crew. However, this corruption is necessary for Ahab to proceed with his revenge.

Because of the dominance of the advancing over primitivism, Ahab corrupts the innocence of the crew because of his power over the *Pequod*, because of his unaccosted reign of martial law, because of his barbaric freedom to act, and because of his rampant
individualism; the crew's corruption enables Ahab to act and to advance his rampantly individualistic quest. The crew is corrupted because of Ahab's "absolute dictatorship" (M-D 97) and his "irresistible dictatorship" (M-D 147). While one scholar maintains that "democratic consent" prevails on the Pequod which is led by a "democratic leader who persuades his crew voluntarily to assist in the pursuit of the white whale," the activities on the Pequod inform readers otherwise. However, as noted above, Ahab is fully aware of the corrupting influence of money which he offers as an enticing reward. The crew also painfully realizes that if they do not submit to Ahab's fiat, their fate is sealed. Stubb remarks that he can perceive Ahab's plan because "the chick that's in him pecks the shell[, and] [t]will soon be out" (M-D 160). Ishmael comments that only a fool would attempt "to wrest this old man's living power from his own living hands" (M-D 515). What is apparent is that the crew believes that their collective whole is "outmanned" by one man—Ahab. The crew does not believe they can confront and conquer Ahab and his unyielding quest. A possible explanation for the crew's consensual corruption is that because Ahab presents himself as the highest authority, the crew does not have a higher entity against which to question Ahab's actions. Thereby, the crew's collective power to usurp the individual evil is not possible; they answer to Ahab, and Ahab commands them to obey. Thus Ishmael's comment about God--"he oftener commands us than persuades us. And if we obey God, we must disobey ourselves" (M-D 43)—is applicable to the crew's relationship with Ahab. If God commands, there truly is no choice; however, Melville's "if" in the above statement recognizes that obeyance is not mandatory and that man consciously decides to act against his will and be corrupted. Because the crew is corrupt, Melvillean society is altered, and the paradoxical tension is lessened.

While Ahab taints the social paradox through tyranny, the crew's lack of monitoring the corruption enables their perdition. The Pequod's crew, like the crew of Ahab's whale-boat, must have been chosen by Ahab to guarantee Ahab's visceral and
unfaltering revenge. Starbuck, the first mate, while he also has a "young Cape wife and child" (M-D 116), is not able to monitor Ahab's actions because he "cannot withstand those more terrific, because more spiritual terrors, which sometimes menace you from the concentrating brow of an enraged and mighty man" (M-D 117). Stubb, the second mate, is a "calm and collected" man who does not possess the requisite passion to counterbalance Ahab. Flask, the third mate, is a lesser version of Ahab. Flask believes that "the great leviathan ha[s] personally and hereditarily affronted him, and therefore it was a sort of point of honor with him, to destroy them whenever encountered" (M-D 119). Instead of Flask counterpoising Ahab's corruption, Flask is eager to slay the white whale. Ahab corrupts his crew by unbalancing the tension necessary to keep societal corruption to a minimum. The crew—unlike the Typeans' sinister actions against Marnoo—does not actively monitor Ahab's actions and is instead led to corruption by a tyrant. As a result, the corrupted crew no longer operates within the confines of civilized mores and statutes; they do, however, with Ahab as a prime example, exhibit the barbaric freedom to act unhindered because they do not regard their primitive points of reference and instead follow Ahab.

Since the crew is corrupted, and no one rigorously opposes Ahab's tyranny, Ahab further has the barbaric freedom to act, while unhindered by civilized constraints from the crew of the Pequod. His revelry reflects the impairment of the paradoxical tension between crew and captain—the collective and the individual, the primitive and advanced, the corrupt and innocent. The owners of the Pequod think that the objective of the ship's journey is to kill whales, process them, and return to port with a full cargo-load of sperm oil. Ahab is fully aware of this intended and expected function, but he decides to disregard the civilized expectations with which Peleg and Bildad have entrusted him. Starbuck admonishes Ahab about the leaking oil which needs to be saved because it "is worth saving." To that Ahab replies, "Let it leak" (M-D 474). Consequently, since Ahab does
not consider the origins (primitivism) of his journey, he does not have the constraints of
civilization, while he does demonstrate the barbaric freedom to act. The extreme to which
Ahab displays his barbarianism is affirmed when he declares that there is "one Captain
over the Pequod," while there is one "Lord over the earth" (M-I 474). As a result, Ahab
perceives that he alone is above the others and this allows him to attempt and to pursue his
revenge fully. In contrast to Ishmael, who attempts much and accomplishes what he can
(M-I 345), Ahab, because he is unencumbered by civilized constraints, seeks and achieves
his goal to a greater extent. Because Ishmael is influenced by the impassioned Ahab,
Ishmael is profoundly limited in his actions. Ishmael, while he asserts that he tries all, is
too influenced by Ahab to accomplish his own pursuits. Instead, he becomes a part of
Ahab's quest, a pursuit that is possible because all of Ahab's energies are focused intensely
upon Moby Dick.  

Ishmael notes that "the perils of whaling" breed a "free and easy sort of genial,
desperado philosophy" (M-I 226), and this condition promotes Ahab's barbarianism to
command the civil expectations of him. Since Ahab is removed from any landlocked
civilization, he is more able to enact his revenge freely. In comparison, the sailors in
Omoo on the island of Papeete are less affected by civil statutes; theirs is a carefree
lifestyle because, like the Pequod's crew, the sailors are similarly removed from civil
statutes. As an example, when Ahab is faced with a hindrance, he is not stopped or
influenced by civil expectations, and were the crew to confront him, he might be possibly
constrained. However, Ishmael maintains that even though Ahab seemed to have a nail
driving into Ahab's heart, Ahab continues to rally (M-I 568). Ahab may be so removed
from civilization that he cannot be stopped: he is a non-restrained barbarian who freely
acts without contemplating the consequences to others of his actions.

Nor does the possibility of death deter his revenge.  Melville also illustrates that
"the drawing near of death ... impresses all with a last revelation" (M-I 480). Queequeg's
words are applicable to Ahab: "if a man [makes] his mind to live, mere sickness could not kill him" (*M-D* 480). Only some "unintelligent destroyer" could kill the committed man (*M-D* 480). Ahab is determined to enact his revenge upon the white whale, but he does not realize that Moby Dick is an "unintelligent destroyer" who should, like civilization, deter Ahab, while the limitation of Ahab promotes his well-being. Ahab as "lord" of the *Pequod* is not a member of civilization; therefore, he perceives that the civil man has little to offer him. His harpooneer Fedallah demonstrates this. Ahab turns to a barbarian because, like Ahab, Fedallah would not be hindered by expectations or statutes of the Western man. And unlike Queequeg, who is a transitional man (*M-D* 27), Ahab usurps the civil norms; in so doing he retrogresses to a barbarian who freely acts without regard to constraints. As a result of being a barbarian lord above the crew, Ahab similarly controls the collective with his rampant individualism.

That same rampant individualism allows Ahab to corrupt the innocent, to advance his revenge, and to act freely. In doing so, Ahab lessens the paradoxical tension necessary for Melvillean society to function. Because Ahab's actions remain unmonitored, his internal drive for revenge remains unchecked. Melville declares, through Ishmael, that "[f]or with little external to constrain us, the innermost necessities in our being still drive us on" (*M-D* 165 emphasis added). Here, Melville maintains that only a "little" constraint would possibly limit Ahab's actions; however, this is not the situation. Another explanation for Ahab's rampant individualism exists: as Ishmael notes that he is aware of absolute dictatorship, he realizes that "when a man suspects any wrong, it sometimes happens that if he be already involved in the matter, he insensibly strives to cover up his suspicions, even from him self" (*M-D* 97). This mentality allows for two serious consequences: first, since a man continues doing a wrongful deed, he loses his own individuality; second, because a man keeps his nefariousness "even from him self," he also loses a distinct individuality as a part of the collective. Therefore, Ahab's individuality
reigns supreme because there is no identifiable collective whole to counteract him—the crew is a mere extension of Ahab and an implement to insure the fruition of his revenge. In order for Ahab to continue his revenge, he needs a crew whose identity is outside of themselves and who can be considered an extension of himself. Starbuck, a prime example, even though he does not agree with Ahab, does not obtrude upon Ahab's quest. Ahab is aware of this condition, and he commands Starbuck to stand watch and instruct Ahab of any changes in the weather. Without a sense of identity, Starbuck blindly aids Ahab. In so doing, Starbuck confirms Ahab's words that "[y]e are not other men, but my arms and my legs; and so obey me" (M-D 568). Ahab's rampant individualism controls the collective who, as a result, perfidiously act against themselves. The crew has, in effect, ceased being human to Ahab; they are instead implementations (tools) for his personal use. And at a further extreme, the crew, as Ahab remarks, is no longer a contrast to Ahab but a part of him.

Because Ahab removes himself from societal relations and does not operate within the Melvillean paradoxical society, he contemptuously regards his social interrelationships. Ahab, "proud as a Greek god," "stand[s] debtor to this blockhead (the carpenter) for a bone to stand on" (M-D 471). Because he is inimical towards the collective society, Ahab is more prone "to drag a whole ship's company down to doom with him" (M-D 514-15). Ahab, who neither fears death nor values his crew, believes that death should not deter him from using his crew: they exist for his use. In contrast to Ishmael, who understands the social connections in terms of the monkey-rope situation with Queequeg, Ahab perceives no societal responsibilities between himself and the crew. Like the helmsman on the Highlander who could provide "a vast deal of work to surrogates and lawyers," the fate of the crew—the submissive collective—is similarly in the hands of Ahab. Starbuck, the person who is the logical choice to start a mutiny, "feels that [he] must help [Ahab] to it (revenge)" (M-D 169). Similarly, Ishmael also believes that "Ahab's quenchless feud
seemed [his]" (M-D 179). Continuing throughout the novel, Stubb "did but speak for well nigh all that crew. The frenzies of the chase by this time worked them blindly up, like old wine worked anew" (M-D 556). Ahab's intoxicating effect upon the crew is evidenced as Ishmael asserts that the crew's "fear of Ahab was greater than their fear of Fate" (M-D 517). What underlies Ahab's control of the collective is that the crew values the person of Ahab over the precedence of abstract ideologies. However, unlike Tommo, who valued humanity over "civilized" abstractions for his own survival, the Pequod's crew seals their own fate in Ahab who is fate's lieutenant.

As Ahab unfalteringly pursues his revenge, he only appreciates the Pequod's technology in as far as it can assist him: like the crew, he only uses the technology that he can manipulate to his end. Ahab curses the quadrant and smashes it against the deck (M-D 501). And after the compass become useless and the lag-line is destroyed by the sea, Ahab declares that he "can mend all" (M-D 521). Ahab is, in effect, elevating himself above the crew, above technology, and above God—he believes he is an omnipotent individual. He "curses" technology, and when nature turns the compass needles, Ahab maintains that he can fix what nature destroys. Ahab's attitude towards his fellow man is similar to his scorn for technology because he is removed from civilization. He scorns man and, because Ahab is not "involved" in technology—or only to the extent to which it helps him—he is contemptuous of failed technology. Like Taji at the end of Mardi, Ahab rejects all in life by not being satisfied with the society around him. Rather than strive to improve it, he continues his unfaltering quest. Taji, a lesser individualist, abandons society when he is not content with Serenia; similarly, Ahab abandons all except his maniacal revenge which is only achievable if the rampant individualist usurps the collective individuals of the Pequod and puissanty imposes his "unerring" revenge. Because Ahab controls the Pequod by corrupting the innocent and by inveterately advancing his revenge without regard to what possibly could be lost, and by diminishing the collective identity
and power, Ahab correspondingly subverts the paradoxical society. He has distorted the necessary tension required for the collective to monitor the individual, for the individual to contribute his talents to the collective; for the civilized to restrict the barbaric freedom to act; for the barbarian to strive to a more constructive civilization; and for the barbarian to progress. Because Ahab corrupts Melvillean society, evil dominates the possible good of the paradoxical society.

Ahab describes his action as hateful and compares his "fair play" revenge to the power of the sun which he could equal because of his jealousy (M-D 164). An effect of Ahab's evil, as Ishmael comments, is "the complete debasement of poor Starbuck's fortitude" (M-D 117). An explanation of the evil effects is that Ahab "pile[s] upon the whale's white hump the sum of all the general rage and hate felt by his whole race" (M-D 184). Because Ahab is only able to see the "dark side of the earth" (M-D 528), he can only promote evil; and because, like Taji, whose pursuit of Yillah is hindered by its murderous beginning, Ahab's revenge is similarly unattainable because of its evil origin. Because Ahab does not "prometheusly" aid mankind, the pursuit of Moby Dick, a symbol of good, is evil and alters the Melvillean society.

Nor has Ahab's soul kept pace with his mind. Ishmael observes that Ahab, "yielding up all his thought and fancies to his one supreme purpose ..., forced itself against gods into a kind of self-assumed independent being of its own" (M-D 202). As a result, Ahab does not have an internal monitoring system, like Marnoo, to inhibit actions which corrupt society. Even Ahab realizes that his soul is lacking when he comments that his soul is not nourished (M-D 544). While Ahab is advancing his individual revenge upon Moby Dick, he, concurrently, enables his own self-destruction--evil begetting evil. Starbuck warns Ahab to "beware of Ahab" (M-D 474-75). As a result, Ahab is likened to the Missourian Grisly whose own hibernating actions lead to his self-destruction--he feeds upon himself. Similarly, because Ahab's uses nefarious means to accomplish his revenge
that is based upon corruption, his actions are self-destroying. The closer Ahab gets to his revenge the more Ahab is ruined; he is like the Prometheus whose self-created vulture feeds upon him (M-D 202).

While Ahab progresses to his own self-annihilation, the whale-line symbolizes Ahab's plight. The whale-line is a necessity for capturing a whale, and if the crew heeds the potential danger of it, the whale-line facilitates their purpose (M-D 280-81). However, when the "graceful repose of the line" turns to "true horror" (M-D 281), the consequence is the hempfill end of Ahab who attempts to clear the "flying" line, but in so doing, only puts himself in a situation for his final breath (M-D 578). In contrast to the whale-line, the monkey-rope which suspends Queequeg, while attached to Ishmael, symbolizes the necessary social cooperation among men. However, Ahab excludes himself from society and provokes his own punishment—death. While Ahab pursues Moby Dick, his path is evil, and this is allowed because the crew does not monitor the actions of a rampant individual. Consequently, Ahab usurps society's potential good and destroys most of his surrounding society.

To conclude, Melville's literary warnings in Redburn and Moby-Dick illuminate the resulting decay of a paradoxical society due to the lack of human, interrelating associations; to the self-imposed elevation of an individual above others; to the non-constrained actions of a "barbarian," civilized Ahab acting outside of civilized expectations; to the control of the individual by the collective; and to the preclusion of good and innocence because of evil and corruption. A paradoxical society is weakened to a dominating paradigm where certain aspects dictate the consequences of other "societal" features, elements which corrupt Melvillean society. Consequently, in Moby-Dick Melville admonishes humankind to guard against the insurgence of a rampant individualist seeking his unaltering, unerring pursuit of an absolute revenge, while he disregards civil constraints and acts barbarically. In Redburn, Melville remonstrates against the
controlling boundaries between the rich and poor, which devalue individual identity, the confining civil restrictions upon the barbaric freedom to act, the end-in-itself pursuit of money, and the consequences of advancing without a primitive point of reference. In these two novels Melville warns man not to pursue an absolute end but to "operate" between extremes. Because the constructing paradoxes of Melvillean society do not actively interact, the innocence and goodness of its members are befouled. In Moby-Dick, the corrupt, barbaric, advancing individual dominates the innocent, civilized collective; while in Redburn, the advancing, civilized, corrupt collective regulates the actions of the barbaric, innocent individual. What underlies "society's" tainting is that the necessary paradoxes which construct Melvillean society are replaced with non-interacting relations between the individual and the collective, the civilized and the barbaric, and the primitive and the advanced. What follows is the dominating of "society's" features by other aspects. The societal symbol of Marnoo grows more than "a hair's breadth" taller and results in the decay of Melvillean society into a controlling, corrupting, evil paradigm of "society."
NOTES

1For Melville's thoughts about fame, see [1 June] 1851 letter to Nathaniel Hawthorne in *The Writings of Herman Melville: vol. fourteen, Correspondence*, Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. Thomas Tanselle eds. (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press & Newberry Library 1993), p. 193. Melville further illustrates his contempt for fame in the same letter: "Let me be infamous" (193). While Melville asserted in the [1 June] 1851 letter to Nathaniel Hawthorne that earning a living "by the Truth" would only lead "to the Soup Societies" and death "in the gutter," he was aware that truth "is ever incoherent," as stated in a [17] November 1851 letter to Nathaniel Hawthorne (191, 192, 213). Although Melville needed to write about the truth, the result was a "wicked book," as he described *Moby-Dick* to Hawthorne in a [17] November 1851 letter (212). By writing *Moby-Dick*, Melville experienced a catharsis, a personal cleansing, which he described as his "profoudest sense of being" (212). For Melville's comments on unconditional democracy and his "dislike to all mankind," see [1 June] 1851 letter to Hawthorne. Similarly, Melville warns his delicate friend, Sarah Huyler Morewood, not to buy *Moby-Dick* because of its wickedness and "horrible texture" in a [19 or 20] September 1851 letter (206). As Melville asserts "some certain significance lurks in all things" *The Writings of Herman Melville: Vol. Six, Moby-Dick or The Whale*, Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. Thomas Tanselle eds. (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press and The Newberry Library, 1988), p. 430, henceforth cited as *M-D*.

2Frederic I. Carpenter, *American Literature and the Dream* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1955), asserts that Melville believed "that martial law should prevail" because war is inevitable (76). However, I believe that Carpenter has made a broad-sweeping statement that is not applicable. In *White-Jacket*, Melville is highly critical of flogging--an
ultimate example, besides death, of authoritarian, martial discipline. In the same novel, Jack Chase is praised because of his talents and their contributions to a better republican government. In *Billy Budd*, Melville's last literary critique, the insanity of martial law is illuminated as Billy Budd is sacrificed in the name of order. James Duban, *Melville's Major Fiction* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1983), maintains that *Redburn* "examines the isolationist and charitable tendencies of democratic self-reliance" (71). For an accomplished study of Melville's religious contemplations, see William Braswell, *Melville's Religious Thought: An Essay in Interpretation* (New York: Octagon Books, 1977). Braswell interprets *Mardi* as symbolizing the soul: each character representing a different aspect of Burton's vegetal soul, sensible soul, and rational soul (86-102 passim).

Henry A Murray, "In Nomine Diaboli," in *Moby-Dick: Centennial Essays* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1953) boldly asserts that *Moby-Dick* must be interpreted with some sense of wickedness, or Melville's intent is discounted (9). F. O. Mathiessen's seminal *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), asserts that the tragedy of *Moby-Dick* is that the "self-enclosed" Ahab, taken to the extreme, destroys himself (459).

Milton R. Stern, "Moby-Dick: Millennial Attitudes and Politics," *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 54 (1969): 51-60, compares Moby Dick to the American Renaissance's "millennial attitudes" and how they were challenged by Melville (53). In a significant—if often overlooked—book, C. L. R. James, *Mariners, Renegades, and Castaways: The Story of Herman Melville and the World We Live In* (New York: CLR James, 1953), demonstrates how Melville was a social critic of his time with applications to James' contemporary era. James holds that Ahab is "the most dangerous and destructive social type that has ever appeared in Western Civilization" (5). This destructive behavior leads to isolation, a theme in which James concentrates along with Melville's new concept of society and its interrelations of man and man, man and
technology, and man and Nature (3, 104-5). Henry Nash Smith, "The Image of Society in Moby-Dick," in Moby-Dick Centennial Essays, proclaims that because Melville chose the name Ishmael, the primary theme of the novel is "the problem of alienation, of disturbance between the individual and the community (63). Although John B. Williams, White Fire: The Influences of Emerson on Melville (Long Beach: California State University Press, 1991), concentrates upon the Emersonian influence and strands in Melville's fiction, he accurately portrays the "central dramatic conflict between Ahab and the white whale" as the danger of "questing for ultimate value and primal powers of creation that exceed human understanding (141). Floyd Stoval, American Idealism (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1943), similarly examines the white whale as "embod[y]ing all that opposes, baffles, and finally defeats the human will and human intellect" (71). William Braswell, Melville's Religious Thought, demonstrates how Ahab "openly pits himself against a symbol of the divine power" and that his conflict is with God alone because Ahab baptizes his harpoon in the name of the Father alone. Melville knowingly omits the Son and the Holy Ghost (60, 69).


4Joseph A. Ward, Jr., "Melville and Failure," ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance 33 (1963): 43-8. However, Ward does not make the same conclusion; he later remarks that man's natural state is a suffering existence, and money cannot elevate this pain (46).

5F. O. Mathiessen, American Renaissance, notes that Redburn is incensed by the artificial barrier between the rich and poor. Henry W. Wells, "Unobtrusive Democrat," South Atlantic Quarterly 43 (1944): 46-51, agrees.

7. Joseph A. Ward, Jr., "Melville and Failure," asserts that "Melville ascribes the cruelties in *Redburn* not so much to the economic system as to Original Sin (45).


9. Henry W. Wells, "Unobtrusive Democrat," states that on Melville's trip to Liverpool he learned the importance of property rights (48).


13. Ernest E. Leisy, "Fatalism in Moby-Dick," asserts that "in death only can man be in complete accord with his environment" (84).

14. While William Braswell, *Melville's Religious Thought*, contends that Ahab is motivated by "his pity for mankind," and his revenge enacted in behalf of mankind (64-65), I disagree because of the rhetoric Ahab uses to describe his crew (mankind). The crew is Ahab's arms and legs and, to Ahab, their only use is to complete his hunt. Ahab even threatens to harpoon any man who jumps from his boat, which action would interrupt his quest. And unlike a Christ-figure or a Prometheus-figure who both benefit mankind by sacrificing themselves, Ahab does not seek to only "sacrifice" himself: if he does not conquer his enemy, his crew (his people) will also perish.
CHAPTER III

COLLAPSE OF SOCIAL PARADOXES: DESTRUCTION
OF MELVILLEAN SOCIETY

With the publication and "failure" of *Moby-Dick*, Herman Melville abandoned his philosophical queries of the "ever incoherent" truth and instead produced the "calculated ... popularity" of *Pierre*. Melville's impetus for writing shifted from his heart to his pocket; he redirected his literary quest towards "unquestionable novelty, ... new scenes and characters ..., [and] ... regular romance." ¹ As an extension of Melville's "literary re-direction," his themes, characters, and plots, I maintain, reflect his return from philosophical questor to a pecuniary writer: he questions "truth" less and writes more overtly popular books that detail perceived reality. For example, characters like Ahab and Taji, who conspicuously seeks an absolute or symbol of an absolute, are replaced by Potters and confidence men who seek a "pragmatic reality," characters attempting to live through another tomorrow. However, Pierre stands alone as Melville's continuation of an Ahab-like, rampant questor of an absolute. In contrast with *Israel Potter*, Melville assured his publisher George P. Putnam that his latest manuscript "contain[s] nothing of any sort to shock the fastidious. There shall be very little reflective writing in it; nothing weighty." ²

However, some scholars examine *Pierre* for its underlying sexual innuendos; other assert that Pierre's relationship with Mary demonstrates all humanity's "blindness to time and mortality," which is tolerated as long as the relationship is pleasant. Peter J. Bellis textually approaches *Pierre* to reveal that the novel which Pierre writes, equally as the one
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Melville wrote, remains outside of himself because Pierre's text and his "life story" remain distinct entities. Some historical critics maintain that Israel Potter is a "response" to the "concerted effort in the early 1850's to preserve and promote" the myth of the American Revolution, and in Israel Potter Melville underscores the epic qualities that historians Bancroft and Sparks attempted to construct. Israel Potter reveals that not all Revolutionary soldiers received a hero's welcome upon return and that some experienced dire consequences because of the Revolution. Melville's The Confidence-Man, according to some critics, reveals a vision of reality which results from a carefully planned novel, demonstrates the theme of friendship and betrayal, and explains, for one unique scholarly approach, that the self is not accountable for his actions because the self is ontologically what he is and cannot "escape" that self. Therefore, the Indian-hater's actions are not "accountable" because there is not a correlation "between what was done to the Indian-hater and what he does in return." 3

This portion of the study illustrates the destruction of Melvillean society because social paradoxes are altered destructively by the characters in Pierre, The Confidence-Man, and Israel Potter. In contrast to the actively interacting paradoxes in Typee and White-Jacket, the social paradoxes collapse and result in a stagnant society void of promise. In comparison to Moby-Dick, Redburn, and Mardi--which illustrate the control of certain social elements upon others as society "advances" at the expense of the suppressed--Pierre, The Confidence-Man, and Israel Potter reveal that while characters advance towards goals, genealogical restoration, confidence, and recognition, the end result is a society replete with hopelessness. Pierre serves as the main vehicle for this study with The Confidence-Man riding alongside and Israel Potter a passenger to this social emptiness. Pierre, which Melville contends was written for commercial interest, demonstrates that the necessary, tense, paradoxical interrelations of Melville's society no longer function because one antipode of the paradox nullifies the other. In other words, as
Pierre seeks to establish his genealogical restoration, the constructs of society disintegrate, leaving a social paradigm which cannot function. As a result, the characters lose themselves: in Pierre, Pierre Glendinning loses his family identity and in the end his existence; in Israel Potter, Potter's identity is lost to the collective Revolutionary identity and ultimately forgotten upon his return; and in The Confidence-Man, the confidence man wears many hats, coats, and conditions which entail a loss of self and reality. Because Melvillean society shifts from an active, tense paradoxical paradigm to a hopeless disintegration of society, mankind's progress stagnates into a chaotic collection of individualism, primitivism, advancement, evil, good, innocence, corruption, barbarianism and civility, which terminates in a suffocating, counter-social paradigm. Distinctions between the different social elements become blurred and lead to the disintegration of Melvillean society: Pierre's pursuit of good becomes evil, and his protection of Isabel's innocence requires deceitful corruption of the Glendinning family. Rather than have the opposite poles of the social paradoxes—in this instance, the good and evil—monitoring one another, one pole usurps the other's balancing capacity and nullifies its social usefulness.

In Pierre, Isabel declares that the imperative "impulse" within herself mandates that she inform Pierre of her secret, familial relation. Isabel also asserts that "good" is a reason why she reveals herself to Pierre, but without regarding the possible evil which might accompany her good, Isabel lays the foundation for Pierre's singular quest that ignores the necessity of the paradoxical interrelationship between evil and good. Pierre, however, does not originally speculate whether his father had had a daughter, but whether Isabel is that daughter and his sister (P 353). Pierre quests after the truth of Isabel's identity—a truth with which, like the assertion about fiction in The Confidence-Man, one should "feel the tie." Yet, Pierre by-steps the first principal question of whether his father had had a daughter, and by so doing, his "tie" with this daughter is one he perceives
as a possibility. After all, the reality of Isabel's sisterhood is an unproven reality "in the unscrupulous light of real naked reason" (*P* 353), a possible fiction. To the dictum posed in *The Confidence-Man*, "[D]espond or have confidence" (*C-M* 65), Pierre demonstrates that he has complete confidence in Isabel's assertion; Pierre's subsequent actions verify dangers associated with an unquestioning belief. Conversely, though, instead of becoming an optimistic confidence man, Pierre evolves into a dark character who, alienating himself from his ideal quest of recognizing Isabel, engenders the destruction of self and his surrounding world. Unfortunately for Pierre, he does not regard or recognize the potential danger that underlies his quest for "good." That oversight aids in the disintegration of Melvillean society because Pierre does not allow the necessary evil/good paradox to function actively.

From the beginning, Pierre ignores the evil which is represented in his father's portrait: Pierre prefers to cherish his father's "untouched" "beatification" (*P* 85). In so doing, Pierre also disregards a possible social check or monitor of his actions: the possible resulting evil of "good" actions should be weighed in comparison to their end result(s), and if the evil dominates the end, the "good" actions should be tempered. Likewise, Marnoo's interceding actions are monitored by the Typeans because they do not appreciate his intrusion and demonstrate collective monitoring of evil actions with their collective power. While Marnoo fully acknowledges his surroundings and their importance, Isabel asserts that love should not know everything (*I* 357); similarly, as Pierre pursues his quest for the truth, he needs to acquire sufficient information about his father and should not ignore details contrary to Isabel's possible sisterhood. For example, Pierre disregards the advice given to Israel Potter: "one remedy for mistake is honesty." But Pierre does not "honestly" approach his quest since his surroundings, Lucy, Mrs. Glendinning, and Saddle Meadows, preclude him from fully exploring the truthfulness of Isabel's identity, the appearance of reality interferes with reality. Pierre's conversation
with his mother reveals that he communicates with Mrs. Glendinning in terms of appearances because, as his actions illustrate, the subject of Isabel is not to be discussed since it will unbalance the appearances of Glendinning nobility.

While Pierre does not examine all possibilities about Isabel, he is aware that he leads a "hidden life" (P 66), and this acknowledgment leads Pierre to his personal destruction and contributes to the surrounding destruction of Melvillean paradoxical society. Pierre declares that only truth could move him to act so—to own and love Isabel "through all" (P 66). However in Pierre's quest of the Truth and his attempt to affirm the good that surrounds Isabel's possible illegitimacy, he leads an impractical life: he lives on chronometric time in a horological world (P 211). Perhaps, here, Melville asserts a criticism of transcendentalism, which can lead a man to folly, if adhered to fully, since the heavenly wisdom is not practical to man, and earthly wisdom, to God (P 212). Pierre does not recognize the need to temper chronometric beliefs and absolute pursuits with horological application for Melvillean society to operate. Here, paradoxical society is illustrated in that man should not implement either chronometrical or horological time completely or singularly. Instead, the two should actively interact to produce the excellence of chronometricism in a useful horological application. This interaction produces an advancing, improving world. In contrast to Redburn, which illustrates how certain elements of society control other social constructs, resulting in an altering of the paradoxes of society, Pierre completely discards good's paradoxical pole (evil) in order to validate Isabel's relation to him. By so doing, Pierre destroys the social paradox and likewise Melvillean society. In contrast, Benjamin Franklin, as depicted in Israel Potter, is "famous" because he exhibits "politic[al] grace of mind" and "pastoral simplicity" (IP 46). As these two characteristics interact, they enhance Franklin's political effectiveness because he does not approach a situation with only one possible solution: he can rely upon simplicity and political necessity to resolve situations and conflicts. In contrast, a
result of Pierre's singular approach to good is that the pursuit of establishing Isabel's family identity (his action which begins from goodness) produces evil consequences. Likewise, the other societal elements will also be altered as Pierre quests for goodness and Truth.

Because Pierre one-sidedly pursues good, a hollow good is exhibited since in the course of his actions evil replaces the initial good. Consequently, Melvillean social paradoxes do not interact; one social element replaces another. As an example, the reflecting lake duplicates the stirless heaven, but the reflected image is not substantial; it merely captures a hollow representation of chronometricism (P 109). Similarly, as Pierre replaces his father by acknowledging Isabel, Pierre becomes a transparent father because he is powerless to correct possible, past transgressions. By replacing his father, he corrupts and destroys the relations between father and son. He therefore does not realize the procreative potential of maintaining familial relations. Since Pierre replaces his father and singularly acts for "goodness," pursued good turns into evil, and Melvillean society disintegrates because the distinction between evil and good is not maintained but obliterated into the same entity.

As Pierre pursues truthful good towards evil, a contributing factor of his malicious end is that he attempts to capture past innocence (his fated sister) by corrupting his idyllic surroundings at Saddle Meadows. In the process, instead of evil and corruption being a minimal, monitoring element of Melvillean society, they conjoin to squelch goodness and innocence, which destroys the interacting relationships of these two social paradoxes. When Pierre leaves Saddle Meadows and after he reads Plinlimmon's pamphlet, Pierre enters a world "saturated and soaking with lies" (P 208). However, because Pierre wants to recognize his sister, he merely contributes to "the world's downright positive falsity" (P 208) because he knowingly does not pursue all possible avenues. He prefers to incorporate information that does not confound or irritate his quest, instead of using it to
make his situation more pellucid. Unlike Ahab, who challenges everything in his quest and obliterates anything (compass, quadrant) that will not aid him, Pierre only partially pursues his absolute. Because Pierre does not "answer" all possibilities, he is prepared obtusely to engage his Isabelean quest. Pierre does not realize that because he deceptively acknowledges Isabel as his "wife," he contributes to the world's wickedness. As explained in *The Confidence-Man*, "though the sorrows of the world are great, its wickedness—-that is, its ugliness—is small" (*C-M* 26). Isabel's illegitimacy is a sorrowful situation, but as Pierre endeavors to "correct" the past, he greatly increases the world's maliciousness and society's destruction. Pierre, "by secret rites," is doomed from the incipiency of his plan because he wrongly assumes that his actions "would entirely warrant his dwelling in [Isabel's] continual company, and upon equal terms ..." (*P* 173). Milton R. Stern, while asserting that Lucy "rejects the comfortable, lifelong haphazard ride," accurately notes that the evil one half of Lucy's life is rejected but necessary, "though evil in its historical forms and circumstances." Pierre similarly attempts to circumvent his familial evil; but in so doing, he merely compounds the evil, which illustrates how evil must remain in-check for Melvillean society is to function paradoxically.

While Pierre attempts to disregard the consequences of his secret rites and hidden life, Mrs. Glendinning questions Pierre about his marriage; she concludes that since Pierre remains mute, this is "good proof" that his wife is "something vile" (*P* 185). Mrs. Glendinning illustrates—as did the shipowners in *Redburn*—how the civil controls the barbaric element of society. Mrs. Glendinning does not believe that Pierre can freely (barbarically) choose a wife outside of the (her) civil expectations. Conversely, however, Pierre demonstrates that by attempting to correct past familial faults (to transcend history), he asserts himself as superior to others and subjectively strives to resolve the events around him. In other words, he barbarically acts obdurately to change what is expected of him without regarding these expectations. Pierre wants barbarianism to
dominate, whereas Mrs. Glendinning desires civility. However, a lesson is to be learned from the wood pile at the end of *Israel Potter*: by "oversight" it is "abandoned to oblivious decay" (*IP* 168). Similarly, as Pierre ignores his Glendinning identity (civility) and barbarically enters into secret rites and a hidden life, his family decays to ruin because he does not heed his familial arrears (civility). In order for Pierre to acknowledge Isabel fully, he must incorporate his past with his present. However, Pierre's singular quest ignores his present for his past. His present is symbolized by Lucy, "the highest heaven of uncorrupted Love" (*P* 142), who is unabashedly forsaken for the recognition of a possible sister. However, in order to reach an "uncorrupted Love," Pierre must corrupt his life, his family, and his past. Pierre does not realize that as a son he can not reverse history and gain recognition of his sister; this is his father's responsibility. Pierre can accomplish the corruption of his family's past and an evil end to his "good" quest because he does not actively engage the good/evil paradox of Melvillean society.

As Pierre erroneously pursues his quest and complicates his life, he removes himself from his former carefree life and comes closer to his life of gloom, and as he distances himself from others and his former surroundings, he likewise disjoins the paradoxical nature of Melvillean society. Thus, a "man oppressed with cares ... cannot love; the man of gloom find[s] not the god" (*P* 33). Because Pierre attempts to re-create an Edenic situation from a "post-lapsarian" condition, his end quest for love is doomed to failure. Pierre does not understand the need to temper his corruption with innocence and evil with good. For Pierre,

> the before undistrusted moral beauty of the world is forever fled; for thee, thy sacred father is no more a saint; all brightness hath gone from thy hills, and all peace from thy plains; and now, now, for the first time, Pierre, Truth rolls a black billow through thy soul! (*P* 65).
From the beginning, Pierre's quest is unattainable, and by the end of the novel, "the beautiful illusions of youth" are picked off by the world's "sharp-shooter's ambush" (P 218). Although Charles N. Watson, Jr., maintains that Melville's post-Moby-Dick works contain "a metaphor for [Melville's] disillusionment in the theme of Timonism," he inaccurately blankets these works. While this theme is probably more applicable to Israel Potter, Pierre knowingly removes himself to a position of betrayal by his family and even knows that his mother will not accept Isabel as Pierre's sister, her "half-sister" or step-daughter.

The main contributing factor towards Pierre's destruction is that he declares he has no father as he looks at the reverse side of his father's portrait (P 87). This action, of course, ultimately leads Pierre to "some additional and not-to-be-thought-of-woe" because he obeys the loftiest behest of his soul, which leads to the loss of "his worldly felicity" (P 209). With the elimination of paternal authority, Pierre must obtain Isabel's legitimacy from himself only because he has destroyed his outside legitimizing force, his father. As Pierre demonstrates, the man who attempts to be omnipotent (chronometric) in a horological world is doomed from the beginning since "after 1800 years' inculcation from tens of thousands of pulpits, it has proved entirely impracticable" (P 215). Melville reiterates this dictum as the narrator declares "that he who finding in himself a chronometrical soul, seeks practically to force that heavenly time upon the earth; in such an attempt he can never succeed, with absolute and essential success" (P 212). While Pierre endeavors a heavenly, chronometrical recognition of Isabel, he does not realize that his absolute end is surrounded by the corruption of his secret rites. Pierre does, however, later learn that actions are brass and philosophizing is air; he curses himself as a "heartless villain," as the murderer of his mother, and as an "idiot fool" because he threw away all his worldly happiness (P 289). Pierre's evil-good quest surrounded by corrupted innocence produces an alienation from his family. This situation constrains Pierre's attempt of
recognizing Isabel because, since he is no longer a part of his family, Isabel's
"Glendinning" acknowledgment is improbable. In essence, Pierre prevaricates the
paradoxical interrelation of evil and good and innocence and corruption when he abandons
his family but still seeks to have Isabel recognized as a part of an entity he himself leaves.

Pierre sinks below the depths of Israel Potter's despair (IP 165) because of his
singular and absolute adherence to chronometricism, which authorizes Pierre to corrupt
his present in lieu of an "innocent past" and construct a good familial relation with Isabel
from an evil beginning. However, in the process, Pierre disregards the possible
consequences of his actions which would normally temper, monitor, or gauge one's
actions. By so doing, the paradoxes of Melvillean society would operate appropriately
and remain actively tense. Conversely, Pierre does not temper his actions or allow the
societal paradoxes to remain tense and monitor one another but seeks his absolute, a
certain destruction of Melville's paradoxical society.

As Pierre continues his destructive quest, his "counter-social" actions are possible
because he usurps the civilized norms and expectations and with barbaric freedom
"incestuously" destroys the family he yearns to have recognized. In so doing, Pierre
demonstrates that if barbarianism is not balanced with or monitored by civilization,
Melvillean society disintegrates into a barbaric free-for-all of chaos: non-interacting,
individual concerns replace paradoxical society. As evidenced by Mrs. Glendinning's
remarks, civilized norms of respectable actions are expected from those around her. Mrs.
Glendinning verbally abuses Ned for his licentious behavior with Delly and declares that he
is worse than a murderer (P 100). Mrs. Glendinning's remarks have a two-fold
importance: first, Pierre knows that he can not openly acknowledge Isabel's sisterhood
without tarnishing his father's reputation and destroying the noble reputation of Saddle
Meadows because his sister corrupts Mrs. Glendinning's civility; second, Pierre realizes
that he must establish a relationship with Isabel covertly because she is not a member of
accepted society. Consequently, Pierre usurps civilized expectations of marrying Lucy Tartan and with barbaric freedom of action "marries" Isabel. Pierre realizes that his plan is counter-civil when he affirms that he, "like a skulking coward" and "a thief," steals into the night to get Isabel, and after forty-eight hours, their relationship is not yet publicly acknowledged (P 170). Again, Pierre's actions result in a singular adherence to one element of the societal paradox between the civil and the barbaric, which leads to the disintegration of Melvillean society. Pierre's nocturnal actions symbolize that he cannot proceed with his plan in the light of civil expectations.

Pierre does not allow the paradoxes of society to interrelate actively, and this results in his mother's remarking that her "only son [is] married to an unknown ... thing" (P 193) and ultimately declaring that "cast-out Pierre hath no paternity" (P 199). As Milton R. Stern notes, Pierre, when he burns the portrait and rejects his history, similarly rejects the present and human potentialities. Likewise, Pierre also rejects his history when he "marries" Isabel because he knows that his actions will result in his mother's disowning him. (Pierre refers to himself as a "heartless villain," his mother's murderer.) Pierre also forfeits his future because his father's will leaves everything to Pierre's mother who, in turn, since Pierre gives umbrage to his mother, leaves the estate to Glen Stanly. Pierre's future is his present, a dismal situation, a failed plan of happiness. In Wai-Chee Dimock's words, "the self is free not only to underwrite but also to nullify." Pierre destroys his future and present because he barbarically acts to destroy the civil expectations of him and replaces these with his own reality with Isabel as he returns to his past and assumes his father's position through the recognition of Isabel. Pierre should have yielded to the advice in Israel Potter that "too much suspicions is as bad as too little sense" (IP 91). However, Pierre is not suspicious of Isabel's sisterly assertion; nor does he approach his problem with much sense. This double-disregard leads Pierre barbarically to
ignore civilization and pursue his quest and the subsequent destruction of Melville's paradoxical society.

In order to obtain Isabel's recognition, Pierre still needs to rely upon his familial fealty, Glen Stanly, who represents civilization; but Pierre manipulates civilization instead of paradoxically approaching the relationship between civilization and barbarianism. It is necessary to note that, when requesting help from Glen, Pierre deliberately does not inform him "of his already consummated marriage with a poor and friendless orphan [or] of his mother's disowning him" (P 227), for Pierre knows that such information will taint Glen's receiving him and Isabel. It also demonstrates Pierre's reluctance publicly to acknowledge Isabel, which reduces her to a "public nothing," a non-existent relation. While Pierre demonstrates a blatant disregard for the civilized pole of the civilized/barbaric paradox, he also, by not informing Glen and the world about Isabel, discloses that he "refuse[s] to solve any present problem, for fear of making still more work for [himself]" (P 205). In contrast to the Plinlimmon pamphlet, which espouses a comfortably expedient life, Pierre, a chronometrical man, affirms by his actions that his quest is not always absolute. This is important because it illustrates what Pierre does not realize: life within a society needs to be balanced and monitored between and among the poles of the actively tense paradoxes and not pursued in an absolute manner. Because Pierre does not operate within a paradoxical paradigm, he barbarically usurps and destroys the civilized element of the social paradox, which leads to societal destruction.

Pierre, symbolizing the barbaric, and Glen, the civilized, show the resulting destruction of non-paradoxical antipodes of Melvillean society. "Spatterings of his own kindred blood were upon the pavement, his own hand had extinguished the only unoutlawed human being by the name of Glendinning" (P 360). Pierre's barbaric actions in his quest of Isabel's recognition ultimately conclude in the death of civil society symbolized by Glen Stanly, who outright denies relation to Pierre when Pierre interrupts
his party (P 239). As these entities conflict with one another, it illustrates the non-interaction of the primarily civilized pole of the paradox alienating its opposite and further leading to social chaos. As Pierre journeys his miasmal path, he shows how "it is not for man to follow that trail of truth too far, since by so doing he entirely loses the directing compass of his mind ... " (P 165). Had Pierre tempered his Isabelean quest by regarding the possible evil it could produce and the civil innocence it could destroy, the outcome of his quest might not have been a bloody failure. However, Pierre singularly acts barbarically, not allowing the paradoxes to function, which leads to the destruction of Melvillean society. Pierre's quest leads to failure because he corrupts the barbaric/civilized paradox by the lack of action at "the earliest instant of conviction" by his disregarding civilized norms and expectations and by his ultimate act of barbarianism, murdering Glen Stanly (P 360).

In the end, Pierre is "seized by a hundred contending hands" which forcefully inflict their civilized constraint upon a man operating too barbarically without civilized temper--Melvillean society acts to check the "off-balanced" actions of its members who refuse to control their own actions. Similar to how the Typeans monitor Marnoo's efforts on behalf of Tommo, they inform him that his "taboo" status will be revoked if he does not discontinue his counter-civil actions. If members of Melvillean society refuse to supervise their own actions, the collective members enforce control and maintain the actively, tense civilized/barbaric paradox.

While Pierre pursues society's acknowledgment of Isabel with barbaric disregard for maintaining the civil good, he demonstrates a retrogressive advancement to the primitive. Pierre, instead of moving towards the future with Lucy Tartan, decides that Isabel's questionable family identity is more important. Therefore, Pierre attempts the absolute reconstruction of the past at the deconstruction of Glendinning present and future. By so doing, Pierre illustrates that if the primitive/advance paradox does not
remain actively tense, society disintegrates into a "retrogressive future," a future that is an attempted corrected past. Because Pierre endeavors to reconstruct the "pre-lapsarian" Glendinning family without regarding the future of its present members, he dooms his and his family's (including Isabel's) future, since he does not paradoxically approach the situation. Were a paradoxical solution imagined, Pierre's primitive need to have Isabel recognized would be monitored by the advancing antipode of the paradox. Conversely, Pierre's quest is singularly primitive because he leverages his future in order to procure his heavenly invocation for a sister (P 7).

Pierre's desire to return to the past (Isabel) is made easier possibly because he is continuously enveloped by Glendinning's reminders, Saddle Meadows, the surrounding landscape, and the old phaeton. Pierre remarks that he "shall take the best care of the old phaeton" because it persistently reminds him of riders past (P 19). For Pierre, the past needs to live on in the present energetically, as Isabel symbolizes. Pierre believes "that his virtuous father, so beautiful on earth, [is] now incorruptibly sainted in heaven" (P 69); here, Pierre discloses his adherence to times past because he reveres things and people in the past, Saddle Meadows and his father, respectively, unlike his future with Isabel. What underlies Pierre's belief is that past and present actions can advance man to a better state, but Pierre does not recognize that the past can be improved upon by advancing nascent beliefs and actions into the future. Pierre declares that "he shall not live" in the "monuments of the past" and that the past "is forever over now" (P 97). By so doing, Pierre unerringly destroys part of his past and any chance of recapturing his remaining past. In this case, a total collapse of the paradoxical antipodes occurs because, when Pierre throws out his past, he does not realize that he himself is a representation of the past and that, similarly, Isabel is too. But Pierre does not want to reconstruct a Glendinning past that does not include Isabel; therefore, he must construct a "pre-lapsarian" past, a time before his father's possible procreative tryst. But Isabel is not a part
of the pre-lapsarian past because she is the possible product of a licentious affair: she is the product of the fall, *per se*. Therefore, because Pierre disregards the advance/primitive paradox and instead attempts to construct a primitive past which never existed, his singular quest for Isabel's acknowledgment is doomed. And in the process, Pierre's absolute actions demonstrate the destruction of Melvillean society due to the non-paradoxical solution he endeavors. Pierre should have realized that the haunting face—"as vaguely historic and prophetic; backward hinting of some irrevocable sin; forward pointing to some inevitable ill" (*P* 43)—is applicable to himself since Isabel's possible illegitimacy cannot be reversed; by pursuing her recognition, Pierre dooms his future because he ignores the advancement of the advance/primitive paradox. However, Pierre, as he replaces his father, pursues Isabel and in the process nullifies society and himself because he destroys the possibility of advancing when he attempts to re-construct a primitive which never did exist.

Perhaps a reason why Pierre foregoes his future advancement is that he perceives that it is unequipped to handle revelations from the past. As Mrs. Glendinnings's actions demonstrate, Glendinning nobility will not recognize the possibility of unacceptable behavior by one of its members. Pierre perceives that he must recognize the past solely, which results in a destruction of the social paradoxes. Pierre's unerring disregard for advancing the Glendinning past is provoked by Mrs. Glendinning's intolerance for Isabel's marriage to Pierre (*P* 89). Pierre knows that his mother will not tolerate a questionable relation because it will "attack ... her citadel of pride, ... as torturing her in her recollections, and desecrating the whitest altar in her sanctuary" (*P* 91). Consequently, Pierre singularly picks one or the other, Lucy or Isabel (future or past, advancement or primitivism), without realizing that were he to allow the primitive/advance paradox to remain actively tense, he might maintain his present and future happiness with Lucy and incorporate the "primitive" happiness of Isabel's sisterhood into his present and future.
However, as Pierre chooses to endeavor the reconstruction of innocence through corruption (recognition of Isabel by marrying her, his sister), the correction of evil with "good," and the usurpation of civility with barbarianism, he similarly decides to advance retrogressively to his primitive past. He thereby disregards the advice in *The Confidence-Man* that the "appeal of confidence is the appeal of something as yet unrealized, something all the more alluring for being offered strictly as a projected difference from things as they are" (*C-M* 191). However, Pierre realizes that by pursuing Isabel, his future will be dark not "more alluring." Pierre, as he rejects his future happiness, also rejects his past history in his quest. Taken a step further, Pierre must also reconstruct another history (the primitive), which he does when he replaces his father, who should be responsible for Isabel's acknowledged family relation. Pierre attempts the unobtainable because he does not paradoxically approach the advancement of the Glendinning primitive.

Pierre's "past" contains "intuitively certain, however literally unproven facts of Isabel's sisterhood to him [but] was a link that he now felt binding [to] him ..." (*P* 139). The portrait of Pierre's father also serves to "convince" Pierre of Isabel's relation to him. "Its prophetic finger" connects Pierre's past and present. However, because Pierre re-establishes his past, he destroys his existing past as he burns his father's portrait which "tormentedly stared at him in beseeching horror" (*P* 198), which like his past torments him and causes him to forego his advancing future. Because Pierre destroys his past, he and his actions have no point of reference from which to gauge his quest. The monitoring necessary for the primitive/advanced paradox is consequently destroyed. Since Pierre's past no longer exists for him, like Ahab who disregards his family and civil expectations, Pierre's quest is not monitored from without and is doomed. In contrast to Israel Potter, who builds upon his past for his future, Pierre discards his. For example, twice Potter distinguishes himself: first, he is promoted to quarter master (*IP* 94), second, he proves himself an excellent seaman and befriends those who were once suspicious of him (*IP*
Pierre, however, does not advance over his past in order to improve his situation; rather, he abandons both past and future for a manufactured past having little interrelation with society. Consequently, he is doomed to fail. Similarly, as Pierre rejects his past, his past rejects him. Saddle meadows, "his ancestral roof," "trips" Pierre as he departs for the last time (P 185). Mrs. Glendinning more intensely "would have the world know that [she] disowns and scorn[s]" Pierre (P 193) because he no longer adheres to the Glendinning appearance of nobility, and Mrs. Glendinning in her Hautia-like vanity casts out Pierre.

While neither Pierre nor society is able to monitor Pierre's actions, he knowingly chooses to perpetuate "his sacred problem" by "interrogating his remaining relatives on his father's side" (P 141). Pierre's isolation precludes paradoxical interrelations between the advanced and the primitive and the individual and the collective since there is no opposing pole with which to interact. Pierre's decision demonstrates that he refuses to determine Isabel's identity and that an "overwhelming event, as well as the minutest, is but the product of an infinite series of infinitely involved and traceable foregoing occurrences" (P 67). While Pierre desires to unify the Glendinning family, his "marriage," his disregard for the existing past, and his rejection of progressing the present Glendinning family illustrate that because Pierre re-establishes his past he dooms himself and his family, without a past to monitor his action, and lacking advancement to temper him, Pierre is left to his singular quest for Isabel's recognition and his failure. Since Pierre does not maintain the primitive/advanced paradox and instead replaces Glendinning past with his own manufactured past (Isabel as wife and not as a sister), he does not have a monitoring paradigm for his actions to be compared with and tempered by. Consequently, Pierre destroys his family and world, and his actions symbolize the effects upon the paradoxes that construct Melvilean society.
While Pierre continues his quest with barbaric corruption of civil innocence, he isolates himself from the collective society in order to gain a relationship with Isabel. By so doing, Pierre eliminates the controlling capacity of the collective upon the individual and the individual upon the collective. The collective can not guide Pierre because he withdraws himself from its company, and Pierre removes himself from society to pursue his absolute. Thus, neither the individual nor the collective can supervise and paradoxically interact with one another in order to maintain the actively tense balance of Melvillean society.

Pierre believes that his reclusion from society is necessary for his singular quest: Early in the novel, Pierre remarks that he realizes why the "old men of Truth" remained separate from "the gild, diamonds," and "the chains of Lies": because in order to pursue the Truth, the old men had to remove themselves from the wealth and delight of mankind in pursuit of Truth (P 91). Pierre, to his absolute extreme, further removes himself from all possible obstacles; similarly, as he would not interview his father's surviving relations, Pierre also distances himself from the aid of reading because "reading is apt to prove but an obstacle hard to overcome" (P 283). Comparatively, information from Pierre's father's relatives could have been an obstacle, but the gained information also could have proven, if not enlightening, helpful. Similarly, Melville asserts "that [the] ultimate once fairly gained, then books no more are needed for buoys to our souls; our own strong limbs support us ... " (P 283). However, like Ahab's isolation from crew and technology, which accompany his destructive quest, Pierre does not heed this advice and prefers to isolate himself in his individualness prior to achieving his ultimate. Advice contained in Israel Potter also applies to Pierre's situation: "[w]e may make these times better, if we bestir ourselves. Industry need not wish, and that lives upon hopes will die fasting ... " (IP 53-4). Melville, here, advocates, as St. Paul does, that hopes (prayers) are useless unless coupled with appropriate actions. Otherwise, as Pierre's non-actions and refusal fully to
pursue his quest demonstrate, one's hopes or prayers are doomed to failure without complete, accompanying actions.

Instead of Pierre actively contributing to the surrounding collective and thereby providing the paradoxical interrelationship necessary between the individual and the collective, Pierre withdraws from "the common world, however base and dastardly, [that] surrounds [him] for [his] worldly good" (P 176). In this statement, Melville again demonstrates the evil/good paradox of his social paradigm. Although the world is possibly "base and dastardly," its individual collectiveness promotes the good of its members. But this occurrence is only possible when paradoxical interrelations are actively maintained. Pierre's actions, conversely, illustrate how Melvillean society disintegrates when the social paradoxes collapse. Pierre does not realize that he is a brick in the community wall (IP 156); by removing himself, he creates an Usherian fissure which brings down the House of Glendinning, a symbol of society. Pierre becomes an unflattering, self-reliant individualist who does not recognize that a collection of individuals is necessary to make society function (IP 9). In terms of confidence, Pierre lacks the confidence needed to sustain a relationship with the collective, subsequently, his lack of confidence illustrates the "vain [sic] short-sighted care" with which he approaches his quest (C-M 128, 250). By removing himself from the collective, "a committee of Safety" can not invisibly patrol Pierre nor can Pierre be party to the Committee of Safety (C-M 250). His actions doubly negate himself because he can not monitor or be supervised because a fanatically self-reliant individual has no collective society to become a part of. Pierre, a drowning soul, a single individual surrounded by the "sea" of mankind, drowns amid the collective which could aid him. Yet he knows "the causes of [his] peril, [although] the sea is the sea, and these drowning men do drown" (P 303). Surrounded by a collective from which he isolates himself, Pierre disregards the necessity of the

Within Pierre, "two antagonistic agencies," a possible paradox (the good angel and the bad angel), internally battle for "mastery," and Pierre perceives himself as "the only umpire" for his actions (P 63). This demonstrates that Pierre believes his extreme isolation is justified. He does not perceive the need for paradoxical interrelations between the individual and the collective and good and evil, and he thereby destroys a possible avenue of help for himself. Pierre's withdrawal even from his inward intuition demonstrates his solitary individuality: "one in a city of thousands of human beings, Pierre was solitary as at the Pole" (P 338). The Pole being a lifeless place, Pierre's isolation can only lead to the destruction of his surrounding collective because his barbaric actions result in murder and bloodshed. As a result of such an individual doctrine, Pierre becomes antinomian and society disintegrates into atomistic anarchy because individuals fail to interact paradoxically. Pierre illustrates how the ultimate, non-monitoring individual destroys Melville's social paradigm. Because Pierre continually looks to himself for validation of his actions, he further isolates himself from the collective, and he is "forced now to stand and toddle alone" (P 337, 305). Pierre illustrates the negative side of "Ourselves are Fate" in White-Jacket and demonstrated best by Tommo in Typee. Pierre realizes that all man "are .. [their] own factors" (P 51) in life, but he does not recognize the need for men to incorporate the assistance of the surrounding collective. Tommo, on the other hand, realizes that in order for him to survive his stay among the Typeans, he must incorporate the assistance of the natives who can clothe, feed, and promote his survival. Without Tommo deciding the most practical (horological) plan for his survival, his Fate—if he decides to remain separate from the Typeans--is uncertain. Pierre, on the other hand, determines that he and he alone is his Fate, and he suffers the consequences (death, destruction) of an ultimate, non-monitoring and non-interacting, self-reliant
individual. In order for Pierre to have Isabel recognized fully, the collective is necessary because without the collective there is no one to acknowledge Isabel. Also, the collective, while recognizing Pierre's new-found sister, oversees Pierre's action in order to maintain the paradoxical balance of society.

Pierre's isolation leads to his own demise because the collective does not restrict the barbaric individual who has removed himself from the paradoxical, Melvillean society. Pierre declares that he "no longer .. holds term with aught. World's bread of life, and world's wealth of honor, both are snatched from [Pierre], but [he] def[ies] all world's bread and breath. Here [Pierre] step[s] out before the drawn-up worlds in widest space, and challenges one and all of them to battle!" (P 357). For Pierre, it is him against the world with him as self-monitor of his destructive actions, just as Ahab is forever Ahab and must pursue the White Whale. And like the confidence man who structures his own reality of human experience, Pierre creates his own reality based upon his individual perceptions of his family, Isabel, and society's reception and lack of recognition of Isabel. The reality Pierre weakly attempts to create is a chronometrical, heavenly one, where all can turn the left cheek and give everything freely to the poor—a heaven on earth (P 214). Pierre wants a pre-lapsarian Saddle Meadows, one before the possible licentious corruption. However, he does not realize that Isabel is not a part of such a world because she is the product of Pierre's father's "fall." Pierre individually quests after a reality that will and can never exist. Pierre is confronted with an external impetus (Isabel) and one from within himself that contains an "interior, responding wonder" to effect a change (P 51), but Pierre does not realize that inherent in his change is the recognizing body of the collective, and to have Isabel fully sistered, the collective society is a necessary element of his quest. Pierre, unfortunately, isolates himself from the collective and from his quest by not incorporating all possible elements, which determines his path to destruction.
Pierre's individual isolation culminates in a Shakespearean ending replete with the necessary blood and death. Consequently, instead of the individual and the collective working together to create a functioning society, the antipodes struggle with one another for mastery over the other. By so doing, the individuals involved are destroyed and the collective which they, except Pierre, are members of is likewise destroyed. Pierre declares that Fred and Glen "may never stir alive" again (P 358) due to their meddling, and Pierre kills them both, a barbaric destruction of the civil sanctity of life which in a paradoxically maintained society is monitored by the collective upon the individuals. Similarly, Isabel and Lucy die and are followed in death by Pierre after he ingests the vial's contents. For Pierre, his individual quest leads to his loss of self because he attempts to replace his father in order to have Isabel recognized. Similarly, because he no longer has an independent identity of his own, Pierre entangles himself into his perception of reality which in the end is sharply monitored by one hundred contending hands (P 360) after he kills Glen and Fred. The monitoring hands of civilization seize Pierre after he slays the only "unoutlawed" Glendinning, and Pierre is forcibly made aware of what he has attempted to isolate himself from in order to pursue his doomed quest--the monitoring collective of the innocent and the good of an advancing civilized society.

The consequence of Pierre's isolation from the collective and his withdrawal from the light of its monitoring capacity is that Pierre becomes a dark character damned to his "utter-night desolation" where he is left to roam the streets in a city of thousands until his retreat from Melville's paradoxical society leaves him with an "all-pervading sensation" that he does not know its location and has no "ordinary life-feeling at all" (P 341). Pierre is marooned by choice amidst a city which could have saved him from his self-annihilation. Pierre does not realize that "security" without society is "a bore," but society is worth being a member of (C-M 162). In antipodal contrast to Tommo and Marnoo, who both quickly learn to adapt to their surroundings, Pierre, instead of incorporating the
information that Isabel "is" his sister into his Saddle Meadows world, abandons his life of comfort for a known miserable life. Pierre singularly quits one life to start another without realizing that his new life is dependent upon his former life. In the end, Pierre demonstrates the extreme destitution of a person who does not respond paradoxically to society: Pierre is an all-destroying Ahab.
1 Herman Melville, *The Writings of Herman Melville, vol. fourteen, Correspondence* (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press and The Newberry Library, 1993), asserts in a [17?] November 1851 letter to Nathaniel Hawthorne that the truth is "ever incoherent" (213) and leads Melville to the "popular" fiction of Pierre as he remarks to Richard Bentley in a 16 April 1852 letter (226). In a letter to his father-in-law Lemuel Shaw dated 6 October 1849, Melville is already sensing that his literature is doomed to "fail" because what he writes from his heart will not be rewarded in his pocket (139). Melville knowingly attempts "fiduciarily rewarding" writing and describes Pierre as "possessing unquestionable novelty" (226).

2 Herman Melville, *Correspondence*, p. 265.

Empire for Liberty: Melville and the Poetics of Individualism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989) observes that the characters in The Confidence-Man cannot be held "accountable" for their actions because they are merely acting-out their ontological selves (183). In contrast, Joyce Sparer Alder's chapter on the Indian-hater in War in Melville's Imagination (New York: New York University Press, 1981) illustrates that Melville's handling of the Indian-hater is Swiftian because it illustrates "the real history of a conquering people" as a result of "a masterpiece of grotesque art, p. 115. Because society "masks" its history, it falsifies its connection between the past, the present, and the future, which leads to "the lack of morality in the Fidele society" and which is "one of the main reasons why society becomes what it is"--hypocritical and corrupt, pp. 130-31.

4Herman Melville, The Writings of Herman Melville, vol. seven, Pierre or The Ambiguities (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press and The Newberry Library, 1968) p. 159; henceforth cited as P.


6Herman Melville, The Writings of Herman Melville, vol. eight, Israel Potter: His Fifty Years of Exile (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press and The Newberry Library, 1968), p. 41; henceforth cited as IP.

7Milton R. Stern, Fine Hammered Steel, p. 76.


11 Wai-Chee Dimock, Empire for Liberty, p. 187.

CHAPTER IV

THE NECESSITY OF PARADOX: SYNTHESIZING MELVILLE’S VISIONS AND HYPOTHEORIZING FUTURE STUDIES

Melville's major novels present varying perspectives on society: in *Typee* Melville warns against unrestrained civilization corrupting idyllic culture; in *Omoo* he demonstrates a crew's retaliation against civilized constraints; in *White-Jacket* Melville details the dangers of martial law; in *Moby-Dick* he illustrates the dire consequences of a "society" (crew) led by an absolute questor; and in *The Confidence-Man* Melville admonishes self-centered visions of society and reality. In his progression of social thought, Melville begins his literary journey in the primitive, tropical valley of Typee, where the natives live simple "happy" lives; he ends his quest by illustrating the difficulty of knowing. The recurring concept, however, is that elements of the examined societies are not useful without qualification: the primitive Typeans must abolish cannibalism; the civilized West must stop proselytizing; the individual can not be an absolute, self-reliant individual; and advancing or seeking one's "absolute" must be tempered by the collective. While Melville seeks to qualify the elements of society, these continual qualifications construct a paradoxical paradigm of society because "qualification" is inherent within a paradox. This study has argued that all aspects of society must be monitored by their opposing societal element: civilization monitors barbarianism and *vice versa*, primitive, the advancing, innocence, corruption; good, evil; and the individual, the collective. Without the monitoring capacity of antipodal elements, society, in Melvillean terms, disintegrates into conflict. However, when the elements of society monitor one another, a functioning.
Melvillean society results. For example, Tommo, unlike Toby, incorporates the barbaric into his civilized ways and becomes more of a part of the collective than he does an advancing, civilized individual.

In contrast to previous scholarship which examines limited social elements (primitivism, civility, evil, utopianism, or individualness),¹ this study constructs a holistic approach to Melville's society that incorporates the antipodal elements, demonstrating that opposing elements are necessary to maintain the paradoxical interrelations in Melville's functioning societal paradigm. Yet, future scholarship should detail the paradoxical nature of Melville's novels in relation to society and its construction, corruption, and disintegration. Even Melville's shorter fiction contains these paradoxes. For instance, without the societal elements paradoxically interrelating, society decays into the individuality of "Bartleby," the barbarianism of "Benito Cereno," and the individual's action being monitored from without by society; Melvillean society collapses into the conflicting social elements apparent in *Moby-Dick* or *Pierre*.

While *Moby-Dick*, on one level, illustrates Melvillean society, the novel also details the collapse of paradoxical society because the monitoring capacity of the paradoxes is suppressed by one pole of the antipodes. Starbuck, the chief mate, is a logical choice to monitor Ahab's monomaniacal actions, but his hollow words and lack of action limit his challenge to Ahab's control.² The remaining chain of command, Stubb and Flask, are similarly ineffective in confronting and monitoring Ahab, the collective crew is also unable to temper the actions of Ahab, a rampant individualist (*M-D* 186-87), but their competency is suspect, according to Ishmael (*M-D* 213). Non-monitored, extreme individualism allows Starbuck, for example, freely to give his life to "an otherwise distrusted person[sic]" (*M-D* 539). This leads that society down the path of social destruction.
The complex and interconnecting levels of *Moby-Dick* testify to the intricacies of Melvillean society that precariously need to interrelate to construct and maintain the paradoxes of society. Queequeg demonstrates a possibility of the barbarian, if properly "vitiated" by civilization, becoming paradoxically a civil barbarian, a contributing member of Melville's society. While civility and barbarianism actively monitor one another in order for both to be simultaneously present in a qualified manner (barbaric civility and/or civil barbarianism), the good of society monitors the necessary but limited evil of society, demonstrated by the sharks in *Moby-Dick* and more poignantly by the Typeans' actions towards Marnoo. Some evil is necessary: without some evil, the idyll of primitivism would be incomprehensible. The interrelationships of evil and good, primitive and advancing, civil and barbaric, the individual and the collective, and the corrupt and the innocent, like "free will and necessity," are not incompatible, they "all interweavingly work [sic] together" (*M-D* 215) paradoxically to construct Melvillean society.

While Ahab and Pierre both pursue an absolute end, Bartleby illustrates the dangers of an individual who is content to remain in a "forever present" without advancing or improving society. The narrator of "Bartleby the Scrivener" maintains that he is quite delighted with Bartleby's work, but the narrator is disquieted by Bartleby's reluctance to communicate with others because Bartleby prefers to remain silent. 3 The narrator declares that while Bartleby is separated from the encompassing office by a green folding screen, "privacy and society [are] conjoined" (*B* 46), which illustrates that the individual and the collective interact with one another to produce society. For Bartleby, however, the screen represents a "hermitage" which allows him to direct his attention to "his own peculiar business" (*B* 50). In contrast to Tommo, who realizes that his survival is directly related to incorporating his surroundings, Bartleby does not acknowledge a social link between him, the law office, his work, or his fellow clerks: he remains the consummate, non-advancing individual. Because of Bartleby's extreme individualism, little information
is available about him, except from first-hand sources. This situation exemplifies Bartleby's isolation from the collective society and the dangers of remaining entirely separate.

Nor is society able to monitor Bartleby. In contrast to Bartleby, the narrator's actions are monitored doubly: first, the narrator himself invokes charity "a vastly wise and prudent principle--a great safeguard to its possessor" (B 64); second, the collective monitors the narrator's actions through "relentless remarks" about Bartleby's intrusive presence (B 64). While Bartleby's fanatical individualness leads to his isolation from society, his non-paradoxical nature presents an enigma for Melvillean society because, although Bartleby is a primitive, corrupting individual, a paradoxical society exists around him. Bartleby's actions are a detriment to society, while the narrator's actions more constructively detail how social poles monitor their opposites. Understandably, the "collective" narrator wishes to rid himself of Bartleby.

While the activities in the Typean valley illustrate Melville's paradoxical society, other Western elements in Typee equally demonstrate the evils of Western civilization. Melville's commentary about capitalism and its effects upon the Typeans details a negative, corrupting influence because the natives become absorbed in the Western, mercantile machine which is similarly present in Redburn. The "greatest commotion" prevails throughout the valley as the natives learn that visitors have arrived who will want fruit. Although future commerce corrupts the Typeans, the natives do not fabricate this mercantile fabrication; rather, this corruption of primitivism occurs after "recent commerce with [the] Europeans" (T 11). Tommo reiterates the Western perspective about advancing the mercantile machine as he asserts that he should patent his pop-gun invention (T 145). Typee, if the Western perspective that collapses the necessary social paradoxes is investigated primarily, will detail the corruption of Melvillean society since advancement, individualness, evil, and civility intrude and dominate the innocent, primitive barbarians.
Analysis of Typean culture similarly demonstrates the restriction of the monitoring, paradoxical antipodes necessary for Melvillean society to operate. With regard to the civil/barbaric paradox, the men of Typee isolate themselves collectively from the women. This situation, enabled by the taboo system, disintegrates the monitoring of "civil" actions into free indulgence of mirth (barbarianism by the men) (T 152). This non-monitoring of men's actions results in men controlling women, which is similar to the control the shipowners exert upon Redburn and the other sailors. The paradoxes of Melvillean society cannot interrelate with one another because they are limited and controlled by one social element; instead the paradox collapses into polar domination of its opposite: men dominate women. However, these two control paradigms differ because the Typean men control in the name of power, while the shipowners pursue profit. Women's actions, no canoeing and restriction from the Ti (T 14, 92), are limited because men control and overpower women but do not improve their culture to its fullest because social paradoxes do not actively interrelate. In contrast to Tommo, who is a Westerner attempting to survive in a barbaric, primitive environment and who must interrelate with the Typean world to survive, an exclusive Western or Typean perspective in Typee results in an incomplete social paradigm. Typee should be studied with close attention to the social paradoxes in order to demonstrate how Melvillean society is constructed and also to illustrate how the social paradoxes can be influenced by dominating elements that corrupt the paradoxical, social paradigm. When both cultures interact with one another paradoxically, Melvillean society is achieved because Melville's society requires the active interrelation of paradoxical antipodes, civil/barbaric, innocent/corrupt, good/evil, collective/individual, and primitive/advanced. Hence, Tommo exemplifies Melvillean society because he incorporates both the civil and barbaric, the primitive and advanced, and the individual and collective into his survival. Further criticism needs to similarly
examine the Typean men and other Melville works with reference to Western mores to determine how the social paradoxes can be corrupted into a dominating social paradigm.

While Tommo recognizes the need to free himself from Western civilization's grasp, Captain Delano in "Benito Cereno" is less astute. Delano's actions demonstrate the dangers and ramifications of those who cannot paradoxically interrelate between the antipodes of Melvillean society. Delano's lack of insight leads to his inability to discern the barbaric actions of the slaves on board the San Dominick. Thus, Benito's irreverent mannerisms are attributed to sickness, "innocent lunacy, or wicked imposture." Captain Delano cannot escape the presentiment that a dictatorship, of sorts, exists while at sea, for "which ... there [is] no earthly appeal" (BC 246), even though the limited authority of Benito is evident. Because Captain Delano cannot "objectively" evaluate, he does not comprehend the dire situation on the San Dominick and instead believes that civil control and restraint pervade the ship. He cannot fully judge the situation since he never considers the opposite of what he perceives. In other words, Delano demonstrates that when a person adheres to one pole of a social paradox, his comprehension and knowledge of a situation is limited by his narrowed perspective. In contrast, if a person approaches the same situation with attention to the social paradoxes of Melvillean society, a more complete understanding results because, instead of continually questioning why the authority of the captain is weak, as Captain Delano does, a person can approach the same dreadful situation from a barbaric perspective and discern that Benito's authority has been usurped. This "two-pronged" approach to the San Dominick's mutiny allows an observer to deduce that the primitive, barbaric actions of the slaves dominate the civilized order which Captain Delano perceives as weak. Consequently, because Captain Delano does not accept the possibility that civil norms of authority have been destroyed, he is ignorant of the brutality on board, which results because of the non-interrelation between the civil
and the barbaric (The barbaric controls the civil.), the corrupt and the innocent, the advanced and the primitive.

One reason paradoxical monitoring does not occur is that civil command is usurped by the slaves' barbaric mutiny. "[N]ot so much as a fourth mate" is seen on deck, and Benito's command is in name only (BC 247, 253). As in Pierre, because the paradoxical opposites do not monitor one another and instead singularly act against each other, the distinction between the antipodes is blurred. Benito's command, as noted by Delano, is nullified, and Benito is perceived as "an invalid courtier tottering about London streets in the time of the plague" (BC 251). Benito is no longer actively participating in civil control but is reduced to being acted upon, as Bartleby is, to a lesser extent, which results in the disintegration of Melvillean society at the cost of antipodal nullification.

Like Tommo, Melvillean society needs to be studied with full attention to paradoxical interrelationships of civility and barbarianism, good and evil, innocence and corruption, collectivism and individualism, and advancing and primitivism. If Melville's society is not studied holistically, the paradoxical nature is reduced to conflicting, non-interrelating social elements, which lead scholars to label Melville's vision of humanity inappropriately. But when Melville's works are analyzed with regard to social paradoxes, his vision of society is holistically constructed of interrelating, antipodal elements within social paradoxes.

Ah, Melville! Ah, Paradox! Ah, Society!
NOTES

1See note three in chapter one and note two in chapter two for a summary of previous scholarship.
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