

## Writers of the American Renaissance and Shakespeare

—A Note on American Literary Independence<sup>1</sup>—

Nobunao Matsuyama

### I

When F. O. Matthiessen published his monumental critical study in 1941 he gave it the title of *American Renaissance*.<sup>2)</sup> The book is not a descriptive narrative of literary history, but it actually covers the period of literary flowering and flourishing in America between the 1830's and 1880's when Melville's and Whitman's later works were published. By the title of American Renaissance Matthiessen high-lighted the half-decade of 1850-55 when people saw the appearance of Emerson's *Representative Men* (1850), Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) and *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851), Melville's *Moby-Dick* (1851) and *Pierre* (1852), Thoreau's *Walden* (1854) and Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* (1855). When I say "Writers of the American Renaissance" I am thinking of these five and a few others whose major literary activities were done between the late 1820's and 1850's.

Nobody would doubt their brilliant achievements as the realization of the American independence in literature. It was a long-sought-for literary identity. After political independence, despite the earlier claims and disputes concerning the national literary identity, the first really significant literary achievements were made by these writers.

It is true, there appeared during and after the Revolutionary War a certain number of

writers whom we cannot dismiss from the point of view of literary history. Some of them still retain relevancy to us; for example, Trumble's *The Progress of Duleness* (1772), which causes embarrassed giggle among the students; or Freneau's "The Wild Honey Suckle" whose "hid," "untouched," and "unseen" figure appeals to us, not simply because it is beautiful, but because of "the frail duration of a flower."<sup>3)</sup> Some of them were to set a pattern or an archetype of a tradition: C. B. Brown's gothic novels, for example, are at the fountain-head of the tradition of the gothic and the grotesque in American literature, and Clara in his *Wieland* is probably at the head of the long line of American intellectual women. Again, Irving's "Rip Van Winkle" has outlived its author, contributing to the generations that followed the "Rip archetype" of "the man on the run from his wife,"<sup>4)</sup> or from his mother-in-law who, as a shrew, is identical with his wife. Or, his "Legend of Sleepy Hollow" presents in its basic narrative structure the contrast between urban sophistication and rustic barbarism and simplicity.

It is also true that some writers who came to the front after them and were the contemporaries of those writers of the American Renaissance had their own worthiness. There were Boston intellectuals known as "Brahmins." As the leading figure of the age

Longfellow brought the European reader and audience closer to the literature produced in America, although his poetry was more in accord with the European popular taste, rather than the expressions of American identity. James R. Lowell created Hosea Biglow whose vernacular is as memorable as Huck's. And Holmes's wit at the breakfast table is also worthy of attention.

However, whatever significance we might give to their achievements, they are far surpassed by those of the writers of the American Renaissance; such as Cooper's Natty Bumppo, Bryant's poems of American natural scenery, Poe's attempt at *poesie pure* and grotesque and ratiocinative short stories, Emerson's proclamation of self-reliance and Nature symbolism, Thoreau's individualistic experiment in solitude, Hawthorne's ambivalence and symbolism in stories and novels of sin, Melville's epic and tragic sublimity of whaling, Whitman's identification of "Myself" and people "en-mass." I think I am fully aware of the magnitude of their achievements which cannot be couched in these simple terms. But they all constitute the American literary identity.

However, during the early decades of the nineteenth century Americans could not expect favorable responses to their literature from Europe. In 1818 a British writer asked, "Why should Americans write books?"<sup>5)</sup> And in 1820 Sydney Smith observed in the *Edinburgh Review*, "In the four quarters of the globe, who reads an American book?"<sup>6)</sup> In 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville observed in a more moderate tone, "The inhabitants of the United States have . . . at present, properly speaking, no literature,"<sup>7)</sup> although he later predicted the birth of a literature "peculiarly its own."<sup>8)</sup>

Most American writers of this period were "not only aware of but discomfited by local and European challenges"<sup>9)</sup> of this kind to American literature. But their responses to these challenges and their attitude toward literary independence were various: some were extremely nationalistic and impatiently patriotic, but there were others who were wary enough to notice the ineffectiveness of extreme literary nationalism. One of them was Margaret Fuller. In one of her essays she wrote:

We have no sympathy with natinal vanity. We are not anxious to prove that there is as yet much American literature. Of those who think and write among us in the method and of the thoughts of Europe, we are not impatient.<sup>10)</sup>

She was patient simply because she believed they were still in a transition state, and because she firmly believed in a genius in America yet to come, who is, as she described him, "wide and full as our rivers, flowery, luxuriant, and impassioned as our vast prairies, rooted in strength as the rocks on which the Puritan fathers landed." She had no doubt about such a genius yet "to rise and work in this hemisphere."<sup>11)</sup> This was 1846, but unfortunately she did not live long enough to see some gifted American writers actually bring forth their brilliant achievements a few years later.

In 1847 another warning was raised in the *North American Review* against intense and impatient patriotism: "an intense national self-consciousness . . . is the worst foe to the true and generous unfolding of national genius."<sup>12)</sup> And in line with this warning classical British authors were considered to be the common source of literature in America. The following words of James Russell Lowell

made in 1849 seem to show representative attitude of the mature American authors toward Shakespeare.

After the United States had achieved their independence, it was forthwith decided that they could not properly be a nation without a literature of their own—As if Shakespeare, sprung from the race and the class which colonized New England, had not been also ours!<sup>13)</sup>

“Shakespeare is also ours” is the basic attitude of the writers of the American Renaissance. In fact on the basis of his observations made in early 1830's Tocqueville recorded in his *Democracy in America*: “There is hardly a pioneer's hut which does not contain a few odd volumes of Shakespeare. I remember that I read the feudal drama of Henry V for the first time in a log-house.”<sup>14)</sup> And by the middle of the nineteenth century some of Shakespeare's plays had become very popular on American stages by the performances of American and British actors including Edmund and Charles Kean. But it was mainly the Shakespeare “as a mere man of Richard-the-Third humps and Macbeth daggers,”<sup>15)</sup> as Melville once said, that appealed most to the American audience. Even Whitman loved “the more bombastic tragedies, such as *Richard III*.”<sup>16)</sup> But most writers of the American Renaissance responded quite seriously. Not that their responses were unanimous. What each one separately learned from Shakespeare was also different. But all in all, Shakespeare helped American writers achieve what they could, and their approach and indebtedness to Shakespeare reveal some of the characteristics of the literature of the American Renaissance.

## II

Of all the writers of this period the one who referred to and talked about Shakespeare most often was perhaps Emerson. He made innumerable references to Shakespeare in his lectures as well as in his journals and letters. Also he made three public lectures on Shakespeare each different from the others. First, in a series of lectures on English literature made in 1835-36, he devoted two consecutive lectures on Shakespeare on Dec. 10 and 17. Then, over the period of 1845 and 1847 he made a series of lectures on representative men, in which was included a lecture on Shakespeare the poet. In 1850 these lectures on the representative men were published in book form. And finally, in 1864 he talked on Shakespeare again at the Revere House, Boston. This is not exactly a lecture but some remarks made at “The Celebration of the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Shakespeare by the Saturday Club.”

Perhaps throughout his whole life Emerson gave the highest praise to Shakespeare as “the first poet of the world.”<sup>17)</sup> In his 1864 speech he found Shakespeare to “dwarf all writers without a solitary exception.”<sup>18)</sup>

To Emerson the imaginative power is the primary talent of the poet, and because of his high estimate for Shakespeare's imaginative power he thought of Shakespeare first of all as a poet.<sup>19)</sup> Particularly he loved the sonnets, because Shakespeare's imaginative power “was never so purely manifested as in his sonnets.”<sup>20)</sup>

At the same time, however, trying to distinguish the leading elements of Shakespeare's genius, Emerson praised Shakespeare's faculty “to introvert his eye, to explore the grounds of his own being, to

compare his own faculties."<sup>21)</sup> Imagination, if "untempered by other elements,"<sup>22)</sup> would be a disease, thought Emerson. But Shakespeare had "the natural check of a clear Reason,"<sup>23)</sup> and "the extraordinary activity of . . . reflective powers."<sup>24)</sup> Hence Shakespeare was to Emerson the philosopher, too.

Furthermore, Shakespeare possessed the faculty of perceiving accurately things as they are in the world around us. "He soars indeed," Emerson said, "to [a] heaven of thought and there poises himself as if it were his natural element but he returns instantly to the ground and walks and plays and rolls himself in hearty frolic with his humble mates."<sup>25)</sup> And he went on to add: "it was this fitness for and pleasure in the common social world in business and society and amusement that drew Shakspear to the drama."<sup>26)</sup>

Emerson concluded his first lecture by saying that "he was by these three rarely united gifts, the imaginative, the spiritual, and the practical faculties, at once a poet, a philosopher, and a man."<sup>27)</sup>

Elsewhere he praised Shakespeare for his "magic of the story,"<sup>28)</sup> "the authority and permanence of the language"<sup>29)</sup>, and "the sweetness of his numbers."<sup>30)</sup> He admired the fact that Shakespeare was "so perfect in his melody"<sup>31)</sup> and that his words were "so exactly proper that it would be difficult to express the sense in a simpler or shorter form."<sup>32)</sup> Or, "for executive faculty, for creation, Shakspear is unique."<sup>33)</sup> Shakespeare seemed to him to be "inconceivably wise,"<sup>34)</sup> too. Emerson then praised Shakespeare's genius in its receptiveness, "in letting the world do all, and suffering the spirit of the hour to pass unobstructed through the mind."<sup>35)</sup> In short, Emerson gave Shakespeare the highest appraisal as a poetic artist.

However, we must note the fact that, though Emerson thought highly of Shakespeare's "dramatic merit,"<sup>36)</sup> he thought it still to be "secondary."<sup>37)</sup> This leads to his rather famous objection against Shakespeare:

He converted the elements which waited on his command, into entertainments. He was master of revels to mankind.<sup>38)</sup>

Behind these words it is not difficult to suspect Emerson the Moralist with the Puritan legacy still alive in him. We hear him express again the following dissatisfaction with Shakespeare:

I can marry this fact [that he was a jovial actor and manager] to his verse. . . . [It] must even go into the world's history that the best poet led an obscure and profane life, using his genius for the public amusement.<sup>39)</sup>

These words reveal Emerson's severely moralistic turn of mind toward drama as the public entertainment and toward Shakespeare the Man of the World and the Dramatist. Even if Shakespeare was a genuine, life-long favorite of Emerson, Emerson's objection to Shakespeare for not "explor(ing) the virtue which resides in . . . symbols"<sup>40)</sup> does not seem just. The only justification would be that Shakespeare was so perfect a poet and so long a favorite of his that he wanted Shakespeare "to share the halfness and imperfection of humanity."<sup>41)</sup> This would be a point only the man of Self-Reliance could raise.

It is rather well known that Emerson set forth the theory of symbolism in a distinct formula in *Nature* (1836):

Nature is the vehicle of thought, and in a simple, double, and three-fold degree.

1. Words are signs of natural facts.
2. Particular natural facts are symbols of particular spritual facts.

### 3. Nature is the symbol of spirit.<sup>42)</sup>

This is too famous and I do not see any necessity of examining his theory in detail. But what is important is that Nature as symbol is related to the perception of the poet. "Shakespeare, Homer, Dante, Chaucer," said Emerson, "saw the splendor of meaning that plays over the visible world; knew that . . . these things [of the visible world] bore a second and the finer harvest to the mind, being emblems of its thoughts, and conveying in all their natural history a certain mute commentary on human life."<sup>43)</sup>

This symbolic perception was shared by the major writers of this period and the search for the symbolic meaning became their major common preoccupation. Ishmael observed in *Moby-Dick* :

One morning, turning to pass the double-bloom, he [Ahab] seemed to be newly attracted by the strange figures and inscriptions stamped on it, as though now for the first time beginning to interpret for himself in some monomaniac way whatever significance might lurk in them. And some certain significance lurks in all things, else all things are little worth.<sup>44)</sup>

Hawthorne said of the "rag of scarlet cloth"<sup>45)</sup> which he insisted to have discovered in the attic: "Certainly, there was some deep meaning in it, most worthy of interpretation, and which, as it were, streamed forth from the mystic symbol, subtly communicating itself to my sensibilities, but evading the analysis of my mind."<sup>46)</sup> Poe's narrator in "The Fall of the House of Usher" also perceived a power subtly communicating itself to his sensibilities, but evading the analysis of his mind.<sup>47)</sup> All of these were the assertion of the symbolic mode of perception, through which they could grapple with anything that would elude in-

tellectual analysis or would be hidden behind the paste-board masks. As Charles Feidelson said emphatically in *Symbolism and American Literature* (1953) "their symbolistic method is their title to literary independence."<sup>48)</sup>

However, Nature as symbol and faculty of imagination, as Emerson understood, were two sides of the same thing. He thought that the faculty of perceiving the splendor of meaning that plays over the visible world is what makes a poet a poet. In his lecture on "The Uses of Natural History," made on Nov. 5, 1833, he referred for the first time to the correspondence of the outward world to the inward world of thoughts and emotions," and said that "the whole of Nature is a metaphor or image of the human Mind."<sup>49)</sup> This is the germinal idea of Nature as symbol which he later elaborated and incorporated in his *Nature*. And important is the fact that on Dec. 10, 1835, when Emerson gave his first lecture on Shakespeare he contended for the first time that perceiving the correspondence between Nature and the mind is the faculty of imagination and that Shakespeare possessed above all men this imaginative power.<sup>50)</sup>

In the early part of this 1835 lecture Emerson said:

The power of the Poet depends on the fact that the material world is a symbol or expression of the human mind and part for part.<sup>51)</sup>

He said of the office of the Poet that it is "to perceive and use these analogies"<sup>52)</sup> of the visible to the invisible, of the outward world to the inward world of thoughts and emotions. And,

[The Poet] converts the solid globe, the land, the sea, the air, the sun, the animals into symbols of thought. He makes the outward creation subordinate and merely

a convenient alphabet to express thoughts and emotions. And this act or vision of the mind is called Imagination.<sup>53)</sup>

Then, he said that Shakespeare possessed the power of subordinating nature for the purpose of expressing thoughts and emotion "beyond all poets."<sup>54)</sup>

These early lectures reveal that Emerson's understanding of Shakespeare's imaginative power helped him fortify his theory of symbolism which underlies his theory of Imagination. There is every reason to believe that Emerson tested the validity of his theory of Nature as symbol in the light of Shakespeare's imaginative power. For in other lectures of the series in which he discussed English literature and English men of letters he did not touch upon this subject.

### III

One of the appraisals Emerson made of Shakespeare was his "magic of the story."<sup>55)</sup> It was J. F. Cooper who received the greatest impact from Shakespeare's plot and characters and stories. Emerson said of Shakespeare's story:

No art is omitted to carry to its height the interest of the tale and our imaginations are carried captive by the distress or adventure of his kings and queens, his lovers and knights.<sup>56)</sup>

There are no kings and queens in Cooper's novels, but he is better remembered as "the golden-storyteller"<sup>57)</sup> of "the optimism and fatalism of the frontier, the growth of class-consciousness, the beginnings of imperialism, the stubborn resistance of property-ownership, and a hundred other battles of a century ago."<sup>58)</sup> And as such a golden-storyteller he was often compared to Walter Scott. According to W. M. Thackeray, a 19th century

English novelist who knew the novels of Scott very well, "Leatherstocking, Uncas, Hardheart, Tom Coffin, are quite the equals of Scott's men; perhaps Leatherstocking is better than anyone in 'Scott's lost'."<sup>59)</sup> Honoré de Balzac, a French novelist, believed that Cooper is "the only author worthy of being compared with Walter Scott"<sup>60)</sup> and said that Natty Bumppo the hero of the plains and forests cannot be surpassed by Scott's male characters.

Though Cooper wrote *The Pilot* (1823) because of the nautical inadequacy he suspected in Scott's *The Pirate* (1822), he was, it seems, well aware of Scott's capability as a romance-novelist and learned much, as it seems most likely, from Scott in the situation of the chaser being chased, or in the triumphant suspense as in *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826), or in the contrast of the Fair and the Dark ladies. But it is to Shakespeare that Cooper was more greatly indebted.

Shakespeare was again Cooper's life-long favorite. His daughter, Susan, said that he was "always ready"<sup>61)</sup> to read Shakespeare aloud to the family. While traveling in Europe "the small volumes of the 32° edition of Shakespeare" were "his constant traveling companion."<sup>62)</sup> He must have learned many passages of Shakespeare by heart. W. B. Gates studied Cooper's indebtedness to Shakespeare in some detail and published an article, considering "only the most important and most representative Shakespearean elements, with particular emphasis upon incident, character, and plot."<sup>63)</sup> His conclusion is:

The novelist sometimes lifted an incident from Shakespeare almost bodily; at other times he combined incidents or expanded one episode into two; in the creation of some characters he leaned heavily upon their Shakespearean prototypes. In several of the novels the framework of the

plot is apparently from Shakespeare.<sup>64)</sup> Beginning with *The Spy* (1821), Gates pointed out the Shakespearean elements in about one third of Cooper's novels which embody some plot element apparently derived from Shakespeare's plays, and analysed many incidents vivified by Shakespearean reminiscence. He also directed our attention to the adaptations of character and said "about the parentage of such characters as Burroughcliffe, Polworth, Job Pray, and Hector Homespun, there can be no shadow of a doubt."<sup>65)</sup> They all reveal some traits of Falstaff.

Another Shakespearean indebtedness of Cooper's is the use of Shakespeare in the quoted chapter mottoes. According to E. P. Vandiver more than 1100 lines are quoted from Shakespeare chiefly for chapter mottoes as compared with Scott's quotation of slightly more than six hundred.<sup>66)</sup> The following list shows the number of chapter mottoes quoted from Shakespeare in his most famous Leatherstocking Tales and the Littlepage Trilogy:

Leatherstocking Tales		
<i>The Pioneers</i>	(41 chapters)	11
<i>The Last of the Mohicans</i>	(33 chapters)	19
<i>The Prairie</i>	(34 chapters)	33
<i>The Pathfinder</i>	(30 chapters)	3
<i>The Deerslayer</i>	(32 chapters)	5
Littlepage Trilogy		
<i>Satanstoe</i>	(30 chapters)	8
<i>The Chainbearer</i>	(30 chapters)	5
<i>The Redskins</i>	(30 chapters)	8

The extreme case is *The Prairie*. Of the 34 chapters only one is given a motto from Montgomery and the rest are from Shakespeare.

The quoted chapter mottoes from Shakespeare deal with the similar psychological or outward situation of certain characters or the similar event that is to be described in the chapter. Let me take Chapter II of *The Pio-*

*neers* as an example. This chapter gives a brief explanation of the history and character of the major figures of this novel, and tells the relationship between Edward Effingham and Marmaduke Temple; how Edward left America when the colony rebelled against England, putting the cares of almost all of his commercial and private properties in the hands of his friend and partner Temple; how he then came back to New York and fought for England; how Temple, on the other hand, stood for the colonies but succeeded not only in keeping the properties safe but in purchasing the estates of the adherents of the crown. The following lines from *Richard II* are used as the chapter motto:

All places that the eye of Heaven visits,  
Are to a wise man ports and happy  
havens:—  
Think not the king did banish thee :  
But thou the king.— (I, iii)

These are the words of the Duke of Lancaster to his son Bolingbroke (who later became Henry IV) when the son was to be banished from England by Richard II. Obviously the last two lines express the father's sympathy for Bolingbroke who, for the sake of defending the honor of Richard II, accused the Duke of Norfolk of his unmannerly comments on the King and yet was to be banished from England by the King. By these two lines Cooper seems to suggest the feeling of the people in the colonies towards the King, but he discarded the very delicate situation of Bolingbroke. The quotation is used simply for what it says on the surface, and this can be applied to almost all the chapter mottoes.

There is also an interesting thing to be observed about the Shakespearean chapter mottoes, and this is in accord with the findings

which Gates made with regard to incident, character and plot. Cooper relied more heavily on comedies and histories rather than tragedies. Of the 92 chapter mottoes from Shakespeare in the *Leatherstocking Tales* and the *Littlepage Trilogy*, 49 are from comedies, 26 from histories and 17 from tragedies. As for individual works, 11 mottoes are from *The Merchant of Venice*, 8 from *Henry IV*, 6 each from *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *Henry VI*, 4 each from *Much Ado About Nothing*, and *King Lear*, 3 each from *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Henry V*, *Richard III* and *Hamlet*. That Cooper was more indebted to Shakespeare's comedies and histories rather than to tragedies makes a distinguishing contrast with Herman Melville, who received a greater impact from Shakespeare's tragedies and dark characters—a fact which tells emphatically the difference of the turn of the mind of these two writers. Cooper was more interested in the picture (ideal or factual) of the lives people lived in America, while Melville in the metaphysical problems of the darker aspect of human being and the universe.

An avid reader of Shakespeare Cooper made extensive and, to a large degree, surface, if not superficial, use of plot, character and passages to suit his own purposes as the "golden-storyteller." Without Shakespeare's impact Cooper might have been a very different writer from what he was. It was his belief that he was fully entitled to follow Shakespeare and other literary masters of England simply because they are common property and

it is quite idle to say that the American has not just as good a right to claim Milton, and Shakespeare, and all the old masters of the language, for his country men, as an Englishman.<sup>67)</sup>

#### IV

Melville's indebtedness to Shakespeare was so extensive and far reaching that it seems almost impossible to give an appropriate account in a few pages. Besides, much has already been said and written about it. Charles Olson and Matthiessen are among the earliest critics who paid particular attention to Shakespearean influence on Melville.<sup>68)</sup> *The Melville Log* by Jay Leyda and Hendricks House's edition of *Moby-Dick*, edited by L. S. Mansfield and H. P. Vincent, provide us with various materials.<sup>69)</sup> Therefore, my observation will be limited to a particular aspect of Shakespearean impetus to Melville.

It is not known when Melville first became acquainted with Shakespeare, but it was 1849 when Melville made "close acquaintance with the divine William"<sup>70)</sup>—a phraseology expressive of Melville's worshipful fascination with Shakespeare. He said in a letter to Evert Duyckinck:

Dolt & ass that I am I have lived more than 29 years, & until a few days ago, never made close acquaintance with the divine William. Ah, he's full of sermons-on-the-mount, and gentle, aye, almost as Jesus. I take such men to be inspired. I fancy that this moment Shakespeare in heaven ranks with Gabriel Raphael and Michael. And if another Messiah ever comes twill be in Shakesper's person.—I am mad to think how minute a cause has prevented me hitherto from reading Shakspeare. But until now, every copy that was come-atable to me, happened to be in a vile small print unendurable to my eyes which are tender as young sparrows. But chancing to fall in with this glorious edition, I now exult over it, page after page.—<sup>71)</sup>

How he was fascinated by Shakespeare is shown by his underlining, various marks and

marginal notes made in his seven-volume Shakespeare which he bought in 1848. They are heaviest in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *King Lear*.<sup>72)</sup>

On the last fly-leaf of the last volume of Melville's Shakespeare, the one containing *King Lear*, *Othello* and *Hamlet*, is written in Melville's hand a note which suggests a secret motto of *Moby-Dick* and is a record of his fragmentary idea, obviously inspired by Shakespeare:

Ego non baptizo te in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti—sed in nomine Diaboli.—madness is undefinable—It & right reason extremes of one,—not the (black art) Goetic but Theurgic magic—seeks converse with the Intelligence, Power, the Angel.<sup>73)</sup>

We find the latin motto incorporated in Chapter 113 of *Moby-Dick* where Ahab uses the blood of the pagan harpooners to batize the harpoon with which he plans to kill Moby Dick:

Ego non batizo te in nomine patris, sed in nomine diaboli!<sup>74)</sup>

The Latin motto shows, as is "deliriously" uttered by Captain Ahab in the novel, the seeking of illicit power or the perverted worship of the devil in defiance to God. It suggests more of Hawthorne, especially in "Young Goodman Brown." While still working on *Moby-Dick*, Melville wrote to Hawthorne and said: "This is the book's motto (the secret one),—Ego non baptiso [*sic*] te in nomine—but make out the rest yourself."<sup>75)</sup> In Melville's belief Hawthorne could easily make out the rest because of his knowledge of the black mass and of his understanding of the darkness in the world.

More interesting, however, is the second half of the note. It tells of a paradoxical

truth suggested obviously to Melville by his reading Shakespeare, especially *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, in which madness plays an important function. According to Charles Olson's interpretation,

"madness" and its apparent opposite "right reason" are the two extremes of one way or attempt or urge to reach "the Intelligence, Power, the Angel" or, quite simply, God."<sup>76)</sup>

Elsewhere Melville wrote that "tormented into desperation, Lear, the frantic king, tears off the mask, and speaks the sane madness of vital truth."<sup>77)</sup> And in *Moby-Dick* when Pip, a black boy, lost his sanity Ishmael said:

He saw God's foot upon the treadle of the loom, and spoke it, and therefore his shipmates called him mad. So man's insanity is heaven's sense; and wandering from all mortal reason, man comes at last to that celestial thought, which, to reason, is absurd and frantic.<sup>78)</sup>

Nor is this understanding limited only to Ishmael. Starbuck also said: "poor Pip, in this strange sweetness of his lunacy, brings heavenly vouchers of all our heavenly homes."<sup>79)</sup> The importance of all of these is Melville's discovery in Shakespeare of the paradox of the vital truth which can be revealed or find expression in madness.

It is hardly possible to account for the greatness of *Moby-Dick* in the light of his earlier novels. It is true that *Mardi* partially reveals Melville's metaphysical quest for the absolute, and that *Redburn* and *White-Jacket* show an insight into the darkness of this world, and a kind of infernal character is introduced in *Redburn* in the figure of Jackson. But the grandeur of *Moby-Dick* and tragic sublimity of Captain Ahab can only be explained by Melville's almost sudden awakening to maturity which caused the retardation of the pob-

lication of *Moby-Dick*. For on May 1, 1850, we hear Melville's first mention of *Moby-Dick*: "I am half way in the work." And on August 7 we hear Evert Duyckinck's report of "a new book mostly done."<sup>81</sup> But *Moby-Dick* was not published until October, 1851.

We do not know exactly what happened with the whaling story during this period of a year and two months. There is a hypothesis of an important revision which is due to the revolution within Melville's mind. And there were many events which can be considered to be the causes of this revolution. First, there was the "close acquaintance" with Shakespeare as seen above. (It must be noted that while he was in London in the winter of 1849 he bought a "pocket Shakespeare.")<sup>82</sup> Secondly, Melville bought another Bible in March, 1850, and then and later marked numerous passages of the Old Testament with checks and scores, and for the whaling book in progress Melville marked "Job 41 (*Leviathan*), Isaiah 38 : 8 (*the sundial of Ahaz*) & I Maccabees 6 : 34 (*the fighting elephants*)"<sup>83</sup> and so on. And finally, Hawthorne. In July, 1850, Melville read Hawthorne's *Mosses from an Old Manse*, a collection of short stories published in 1846, and wrote a review article which was published on Aug. 17. On Aug. 5 he was made acquainted with Hawthorne in person and a close friendship began between them.

These things explain many of the external facts of *Moby-Dick*, such as the introduction of characters with Biblical names, dramatic forms, allusions and references to the Bible and Shakespeare. Emphasizing the impact from Shakespeare and Hawthorne, H. P. Vincent explained Melville's revolution in these words:

That revolution may be seen in two parts: first as the result of forces long gathering within Melville as he brooded on life and read Shakespeare; second, as the sudden and magnificent release of those Shakespearean forces when Melville met Nathaniel Hawthorne.<sup>84</sup>

These two points are clearly observed in Melville's own words in his "Hawthorne and His Mosses."<sup>85</sup>

To Melville Hawthorne and Shakespeare seemed to share the same "blackness."<sup>86</sup> In fact Melville perceived and enjoyed the bright side of Hawthorne but he was more fascinated by the other side of Hawthorne which "is shrouded in a blackness, ten times black." And he ascribed this blackness to "that Calvinistic sense of Innate Depravity and Original Sin."<sup>88</sup> But he was not saying that this is because Hawthorne is the descendant of the Puritan. In Melville's mind "no deeply thinking mind is always and wholly free from the "visitations, in some shape or other,"<sup>89</sup> of this sense of man's essential depravity. It is in this blackness that Melville found homogeneity between Hawthorne and Shakespeare (and himself, too). And he said:

But it is those deep far-away things in him; those occasional flashings-forth of the intuitive Truth in him; those short, quick probings at the very axis of reality;—these are the things that make Shakespeare, Shakspeare. Through the mouths of the dark characters of Hamlet, Timon, Lear, and Iago, he craftily says, or sometimes insinuates the things which we feel to be so terrifically true, that it were all madness for any good man, in his own proper character, to utter, or even hint of them.<sup>90</sup>

In short, Melville found in Shakespeare, as well as in Hawthorne, the truth sayer—the

truth which is vital and terrifically true but is revealed only by cunning glimpses, or "covertly and by snatches,"<sup>91)</sup> or in madness. "Man's insanity is heaven's sense,"<sup>92)</sup> is precisely one of those truths. And many of the passages of Shakespeare which Melville scored and marked are of the same nature. For example, in *King Lear* Melville scored the following words of treacherous Edmund:

What in the world he is  
That names me traitor, villain-like he lies.  
Call by thy trumpet; he that dares approach,  
On him, on you, (who not?) I will maintain  
My truth and honour firmly. (V, iii)

and Melville's comments are: "The infernal nature has a valor often denied to innocence."<sup>93)</sup>

As for the direct allusions and references to Shakespeare they are too many to be cited here. In matters such as dramatic form, vocabulary, partial scenes, characterizations, Melville was so indebted to Shakespeare that, again examples are too numerous to be cited. But Melville was not imitating Shakespeare. Shakespeare permeated, as it were, into Melville's mind and when an utterance was made it was not Melville speaking through the mouth of Shakespeare, but Melville confluent with Shakespeare who was speaking. This can be illustrated in a passage based upon Shakespeare:

Moby Dick had reaped away Ahab's leg,  
as a mower a blade of grass in the field.  
No turbaned Turk, no hired Venetian or  
Malay, could have smote him with more  
seeming malice.<sup>94)</sup>

The original Shakespearean passage is:

Where a malignant and a turban'd Turk  
Beat a Venetian and traduced the state.  
(*Othello*, V, ii, 353-4)

To Melville whether the Venetian was a victim or an assailant did not matter. What mattered was to elevate Moby Dick's seeming malice to Ahab and thus imply the greatness and depth of Ahab's "wild vindictiveness against the whale."<sup>95)</sup> This is no imitation at all. Melville fused himself together with Shakespeare and magnified the malignancy of what might have been an accident caused by an impersonal mower or cutting machine, thus emphasizing "Ahab's quenchless feud"<sup>96)</sup> against the whale.

By reading Shakespeare he was awakened to a hidden greatness in Shakespeare which could not be seen "on the tricky stage."<sup>97)</sup> By that awakening everything in him was given a sharp focus and development as well. His metaphysics deepened. His sense of tragic grandeur was elevated. His use of language, his style, and literary form attained maturity and variety. If Melville is the first great American writer who became aware of the tragic grandeur of humanity on the one hand, and who recognized the tragic darkness of the universe on the other, and if he succeeded, and I think he did, in giving literary expression to this awareness and recognition in *Moby-Dick*, then it was above all Shakespeare who helped Melville with the awareness and the recognition and the literary expression.<sup>98)</sup>

## V

Like his contemporary writers Hawthorne was also closely acquainted with Shakespeare. As a boy he liked to quote with mock heroic effect a line from *Richard III*, "My Lord, stand back, and let the coffin pass."<sup>99)</sup> While in England Hawthorne had several occasions when he was reminded of Shakespeare. After seeing the deer in the Charlecote Park he

recorded in his notebook: "I think it was this partially domesticated state of the Charle-cote deer that may have suggested to Shakespeare the tender and pitiful description of a wounded deer in *As You Like It*."<sup>100)</sup> Or, when he referred to his orchard at the Old Manse he compared it to Shallow's orchard in *2 Henry IV* (V, iii).<sup>101)</sup>

Twice in his short stories he referred to Shakespeare. In "A Virtuoso's Collection," there are two items of Shakespearean collection. One is "the horns of the stag that Shakspeare shot"<sup>102)</sup> and the other is "Prospero's magic wand, broken into three fragments by the hand of its mighty master."<sup>103)</sup> And in "Earth's Holocaust" when Shakespeare's works were thrown into the bonfire, with which people burned the world's entire mass of printed paper,

there gushed a flame of such marvellous splendor that men shaded their eyes as against the sun's meridian glory; nor even when the works of his own elucidators were flung upon him did he cease to flash forth a dazzling radiance from beneath the ponderous heap. It is my belief that he is blazing as fervidly as ever.<sup>104)</sup>

On the other hand, the books of several writers, "native as well as foreign," "suddenly melted away in a manner that proved them to be ice."<sup>105)</sup>

Hawthorne's novels do not have quoted chapter mottoes except for *Fanshawe* published privately in 1828. *Fanshawe* has, just like Cooper's novels, ten quoted chapter mottoes and three of them are from Shakespeare.<sup>106)</sup> And in other novels there are also a few expressions which are reminiscent of Shakespeare. For example, the following passage of *The Marble Faun* reminds us of the "dusty death" of *Macbeth* (V, v, 23):

But the cemetery of the Capuchins is no place to nourish celestial hopes: the soul sinks forlorn and wretched under all this burden of dusty death.<sup>107)</sup>

These examples show how closely was Hawthorne acquainted with Shakespeare and that he paid a very high respect to Shakespeare. He explicitly declared to Ticknor, his publisher and literary advisor as well, that he "dislike[s] poetry," but exceptions were Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton and Longfellow.<sup>108)</sup>

However, compared to Melville Hawthorne's indebtedness to Shakespeare is less conspicuous. Hawthorne was the last writer, it seems, to reveal the traces of direct indebtedness. He heavily relied upon his own imaginative creation even when he used historical materials or his own personal experience. Typical would be *The Blithedale Romance*, which is obviously based upon his own experience at the Brook Farm. Except for a few incidents and the setting, it is very difficult to find traces of direct indebtedness even to his own experience at the Brook Farm.

His response to Shakespeare as in "he had left mankind so much to muse upon that was imperishable and divine"<sup>109)</sup> is very close to Melville's. As seen above, Melville called Shakespeare "divine William." And Hawthorne also discovered in Shakespeare the proclaimer of vital truth. But he was far more reserved in his appraisal of Shakespeare. In him there was none of Melville's extreme enthusiasm. And Hawthorne stared at the dark cavern of the human heart more placidly and kept reticent except in his works about the blackness.

However, most interesting is Hawthorne's discovery of "surface beneath surface" in Shakespeare. In *Our Old Home* Hawthorne spoke of many phases of truth to be discov-

ered in Shakespeare and said:

Shakspeare has surface beneath surface, to an immeasurable depth, adapted to the plummet-line of every reader; his works present many phases of truth, each with scope large enough to fill a contemplative mind. Whatever you seek in him you will surely discover, provided you seek truth. There is no exhausting the various interpretation of his symbols, and a thousand years hence, a world of new readers will possess a whole library of new books, as we ourselves do, in these volumes old already.<sup>110)</sup>

What he said in the first five lines can be applied to a certain extent to every great work of art. But the presentation of "many phases of truth" was what Hawthorne sometimes tried to do in his own works, especially in a scene of *The Scarlet Letter* in which Dimmesdale revealed his scarlet letter on his breast and Hawthorne let the reader choose the interpretation of its appearance from the various responses of the witnesses, saying, "The reader may choose among these theories."<sup>111)</sup> This is Hawthorne's "device of multiple choice,"<sup>112)</sup> as Matthiessen called it. But apart from the device of multiple choice, "there is no exhausting the various interpretation of his symbols" is applicable again to several of his own works such as *The Scarlet Letter*, "Young Goodman Brown," "The Minister's Black Veil," "My Kinsman, Major Molineux," and so on. Therefore, Hawthorne's discovery of "surface beneath surface" in Shakespeare is the recognition of homogeneity in Shakespeare.

When he visited Stratford-on-Avon and saw Shakespeare's house he felt no emotion at all, "nor any quickening of the imagination." "It is agreeable enough," he recorded in his *English Notebooks*, "to reflect that I have

seen it; and I think I can form, now, a more sensible and vivid idea of him as a flesh-and-blood man." But to this he added immediately, "I am not quite sure that this latter effect is altogether desirable."<sup>113)</sup> Much of the materials he recorded in his notebooks went into *Our Old Home* and there this last sentence was a little amplified:

I am not quite certain that this power of realization is altogether desirable in reference to a great poet. The Shakespeare whom I met there took various guises, but had not his laurel on.<sup>114)</sup>

And he drew a moral, as he did in many of his short stories and novels, from these "unworthy reminiscences and this embodiment of the poet":<sup>115)</sup>

It is for the high interests of the world not to insist upon finding out that its greatest men are, in a certain lower sense, very much the same kind of men as the rest of us, and often a little worse.<sup>116)</sup>

This is very close to Emerson when he objected against Shakespeare. But Hawthorne's attitude was to save the genius from moral scrutiny so that he can be enshrined in the sanctuary of people's adoration without causing "moral bewilderment" and "even intellectual loss in regard to what is best of him."<sup>117)</sup> However, his words seem to have a personal implication which he might not have been aware of: that is, Shakespeare's greatness lies in his works, in what he left to mankind that was "imperishable,"<sup>118)</sup> and not in his person; the Shakespeare with his laurel on lives in his works and not in his house at Stratford-on-Avon. If this is what Hawthorne actually implied, then it will make a remarkable contrast with Thoreau, who said:

The real facts of a poet's life would be of more value to us than any work of his

art.<sup>119)</sup>

Thoreau also had an early acquaintance with Shakespeare but he was not so enthusiastic about him as his contemporaries. Of Thoreau's preference H. S. Canby said:

This Puritan in morals was most strongly moved . . . by the churchmen, the lovers of the beautiful in religion, and most of all the Platonists, whose poetry was almost as good Greek as good Christian. They meant much more to him than Shakespeare, who was too unspiritual, perhaps too direct, for a mind always seeking the shadow of reality behind outward appearance.<sup>120)</sup>

If this is true Thoreau failed to perceive the "surface beneath surface" which Hawthorne observed in Shakespeare. The most characteristic attitude of Thoreau toward Shakespeare that distinguished him from his contemporaries is in that he wanted to know and understand more of Shakespeare "the speaker" or "the worker."

In one of the passages of his journal Thoreau wrote:

The peculiarity of a work of genius is the absence of the speaker from his speech. He is but the medium. You behold a perfect work, but you do not behold the worker.<sup>121)</sup>

To Thoreau Shakespeare's greatness was self-evident. But it was the achievement of "unconsciousness."<sup>122)</sup> So Thoreau wanted to know more of the "speaker," the "worker," the conscious self rather than the work of unconscious achievement or the work in which the author is completely hidden.

In the cult of genius of this age Thoreau shared the sense of romantic idolatry towards Shakespeare but he was quite dissatisfied with Shakespeare without real facts of his actual life, which to him seemed more valu-

able than any work of his art. And he wrote again in his journal after his visit to Shakespeare's house:

Shakespeare has left us his fancies and imaginings, but the truth of his life, with its becoming circumstances, we know nothing about. The writer reported, the liver not at all. Shakespeare's house! how hollow it is! No man can conceive of Shakespeare in that house. But we want the basis of fact, of an actual life, to complete our Shakespeare, as much as a statue wants its pedestal. A poet's life with this broad actual basis would be as superior to Shakespeare's as a lichen, with its base or thallus, is superior in the order of being to fungus.<sup>123)</sup>

Like Hawthorne he did not particularly love the Shakespeare on the stage, but unlike Hawthorne he was not satisfied in seeing the literary genius only within his works, in the "surface beneath surface" of his works. And he fell, it seems to me, into the error of a biologist classifying the plant mechanically according to the category. What value would he find in a work that is classified as "anonymous"?

Whitman was perhaps the one who saw Shakespeare more often on the stage than anyone else among the writers of the American Renaissance. Obviously he loved the oratory of Shakespeare's blank verse in its more rhetorical passages and enjoyed hearing the best actors of his day declaim the scenes of Shakespeare. He loved to declaim himself many scenes from Shakespeare. It is naturally presumed that one of the sources of his poetic style is this Shakespearean oratory and there he learned "his elaborate sentence structure."<sup>124)</sup> As none of the writers of this period had ever done, Whitman seems to have learned much from Shakespeare's "melody"

which Emerson appraised as "so perfect."<sup>125)</sup> A detailed analysis in this line is necessary, which, however, is beyond the capacity of the present writer.

However, different from any other writers again, Whitman approached Shakespeare as the poet of feudalism. He said in *Democratic Vistas* that at all times the central point in any nation is national literature and contended that

Above all previous lands, a great original literature is surely to become the justification and reliance, (in some prospects the sole reliance,) of American democracy.<sup>126)</sup>

And in order to prove how "the great literature penetrates all, gives hue to all, shapes aggregates and individuals, and after subtle ways, with irresistible power, constructs, sustains, demolishes at will,"<sup>127)</sup> he referred to the European past:

what was afterwards the main support of European chivalry, the feudal, ecclesiastical, dynastic world over there . . . was its literature, permeating to the very marrow, especially that major part, its enchanting songs, ballads, and poems.<sup>128)</sup>

And in a footnote given to this passage Whitman enumerated various examples of "hereditaments, specimens" and referred to Shakespeare:

the Shakesperean drama, in the attitudes, dialogue, characters, &c., of the princes, lords and gentlemen, the pervading atmosphere, the implied and express'd standard of manners, the high port and proud stomach, the regal embroidery of style, &c.<sup>129)</sup>

In a later passage, again, Whitman made reference to Shakespeare as one of the "forms of majesty and beauty" which stands "along the great highways of time" and said:

rich Shakespeare, luxuriant as the sun, artist and singer of feudalism in its sunset, with all the gorgeous colors, owner thereof, and using them at will.<sup>130)</sup>

He was well aware of the fact that he himself had been fascinated by the stage performances of Shakespeare's plays and how some of them such as *King John* and *Richard III* were popular among the American audience. So much so he was worried about the effect of the feudal temper of the Shakespearean heroes to the American audience. As Melville made a warning against Shakespeare "as a mere man of Richard-the-Third humps and Macbeth daggers"<sup>131)</sup> Whitman warned people against the fad of the feudal Kings and Queens.

T. S. Eliot once said about the "several levels of significance" in Shakespeare.

In a play of Shakespeare you get several levels of significance. For the simplest auditors there is the plot, for the more thoughtful the character and conflict of character, for the more literary the words and phrasing, for the more musically sensitive the rhythm, and for auditors of greater sensitiveness and understanding a meaning which reveals itself gradually. And I do not believe that the classification of audience is so clear-cut as this; but rather that the sensitiveness of every auditor is acted upon by all these elements at once, though in different degrees of consciousness.<sup>132)</sup>

Eliot's words indicate the comprehensive greatness of Shakespeare. But in our context what is significant is not in the fact that the various responses of the writers of the American Renaissance to Shakespeare corroborate Eliot's observation, nor in the fact that a certain writer falls into one of the classified reactions and another into another category of

reactions. The significance lies in the American writers' various approaches and responses to Shakespeare in "different degrees of consciousness." Thanks to the freedom of the individual and to their own confidence in themselves as writers, these writers of the American Renaissance reacted to Shakespeare according to the kind of writers they were. The significant fact was that they saw Shakespeare face to face with their own eyes and, while recognizing almost unanimously a supreme example of possibility of literature in Shakespeare, they reacted to him rather squarely, not confining themselves to simple adorations nor joining in the popular favor of Shakespeare. Poe's cynical words may be pertinent here, although it is not clear whether Poe was conscious of these writers' reactions to Shakespeare at the time of his writing:

A fool . . . thinks Shakspeare a great poet—yet the fool has never read Shakespeare. But the fool's neighbor [who is only a little wiser than him] . . . asserts that Shakespeare is a great poet—the fool believes him, and it is henceforward his *opinion*. This neighbor's own opinion has, in like manner, been adopted from one above *him*, and so, ascendingly, to a few gifted individuals who kneel around the summit, beholding, face to face, the master spirit who stands upon the pinnacle.<sup>113)</sup>

Different from the people who were carried along by the Shakespearean fad, these writers of the American Renaissance were indeed "a few gifted individuals" who beheld Shakespeare "face to face." They could see Shakespeare squarely because they were confident in themselves, in their sensitiveness and sensibility as writers. What they did was not mere borrowing or plagiarism even when in-

detedness was as great as in Cooper or Melville. The impact they received from Shakespeare was incorporated into their capability as creative artists. And in that sense Shakespeare helped American writers of this period achieve what we now call the American Renaissance.

### Notes

- 1) From Jan. 21 through 23, 1977, an international and interdisciplinary seminar was held in Hyderabad, India, on "Formative Periods in American History." In the Seminar three topics were discussed and this paper was presented in a slightly different form to the Topic I, "The Emergence of an American Identity, 1820s-1850s."
- 2) F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance/ Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (New York: Oxford University Press, c1941).
- 3) Philip Freneau, "The Wild Honey Suckle," ll. 2, 3, 4 and 25.
- 4) Leslie A. Fiedler, *Love and Death in the American Novel* (Meridian Books; Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., c1960), p. 333.
- 5) Quoted in Kay S. House (ed.), *Reality and Myth in American Literature* (Fawcett Premier Book; Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Pub., c1966), p. 100.
- 6) *Loc. cit.*
- 7) Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. Phillips Bradley (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 56.
- 8) *Loc. cit.*
- 9) Kay S. House, p. 100.
- 10) Margaret Fuller, *Papers on Literature and Art* (1846), in Perry Miller (ed.), *Margaret Fuller/American Romantic: A Selection from Her Writings and Correspondence* (Anchor Books; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1963), p. 230.
- 11) *Ibid.*, p. 231.
- 12) Quoted in E. A. Duyckinck, "Nationality in

- Literature" (1847), in Philip Rahv (ed.), *Literature in America* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 76.
- 13) Philip Rahv, p. 78.
  - 14) Alexis de Tocqueville, p. 55.
  - 15) Herman Melville, "Hawthorne and His Mosses," in Jay Leyda (ed.), *The Portable Melville* (New York: The Viking Press, 1952), p. 407.
  - 16) G. W. Allen, *The Solitary Singer: A Critical Biography of Walt Whitman* (New York: New York University Press, 1955), p. 476.
  - 17) R. W. Emerson, *Works of Emerson* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1904), Vol. XI, p. 448.
  - 18) *Ibid.*, p. 451.
  - 19) Cf. "Shakespeare; or, The Poet," in *Representative Men* (1850).
  - 20) S. E. Whiche and R. E. Spiller (ed.), *The Early Lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), Vol. I (1833-36), p. 293.
  - 21) *Ibid.*, p. 297.
  - 22) *Ibid.*, p. 296.
  - 23) *Ibid.*, p. 305.
  - 24) *Loc. cit.*
  - 25) *Ibid.*, p. 300.
  - 26) *Ibid.*, p. 301.
  - 27) *Ibid.*, p. 305.
  - 28) *Ibid.*, p. 307.
  - 29) *Loc. cit.*
  - 30) *Ibid.*, p. 308.
  - 31) *Ibid.*, p. 309.
  - 32) *Ibid.*, p. 310.
  - 33) R. W. Emerson, "Shakespeare; or, The Poet," *Representative Men, The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* ("Concord Edition"; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, c1903), Vol. IV, p. 212.
  - 34) *Ibid.*, p. 211.
  - 35) *Ibid.*, p. 191.
  - 36) *Ibid.*, p. 210.
  - 37) *Loc. cit.*
  - 38) *Ibid.*, p. 217.
  - 39) *Ibid.*, p. 218.
  - 40) *Ibid.*, p. 217.
  - 41) *Ibid.*, p. 216.
  - 42) *Ralph Waldo Emerson, Representative Selection*, ed. F. I. Carpenter (New York: American Book Co., c1934), p. 21.
  - 43) "Shakespeare; or, The Poet," pp. 216-7.
  - 44) Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick, or The Whale*, ed. L. S. Mansfield and H. P. Vincent (New York: Hendricks House, 1952), p. 427.
  - 45) Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter, The Centenary Edition of The Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1962), p. 31.
  - 46) *Loc. cit.*
  - 47) E. A. Poe, "The Fall of the House of Usher," *Edgar Allan Poe: Selected Prose, Poetry, and Eureka*, ed. W. H. Auden (Rinehart Editions; San Francisco: Rinehart Press, n. d.), p. 2.
  - 48) Charles Feidelson, Jr., *Symbolism and American Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c1953), p. 4.
  - 49) *The Early Lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Vol. I, p. 24.
  - 50) "Shakspear [first lecture]" (Dec. 10, 1935), "Shakspear [second lecture]" (Dec. 17, 1835), *ibid.*, pp. 287-319.
  - 51) *Ibid.*, p. 289.
  - 52) *Ibid.*, p. 291.
  - 53) *Loc. cit.*
  - 54) *Ibid.*, p. 292.
  - 55) Cf. note 28 above.
  - 56) *The Early Lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Vol. I, p. 307.
  - 57) S. T. Williams, "James Fenimore Cooper," in Robert E. Spiller, et al. (ed.), *Literary History of The United States: History* (Fourth Ed.: Revised; New York: Macmillan, c1974), p. 253.
  - 58) *Ibid.*, p. 255.
  - 59) Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 255.
  - 60) Honoré de Balzac, "Notes on Literature," in Warren S. Walker ed., *Leatherstocking and the Critics* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, c1965), p. 2.
  - 61) Quoted in W. B. Gates, "Cooper's Indebtedness to Shakespeare," *PLMA* (Sept. 1952), Vol. 67, p. 716.

- 62) Quoted in *loc. cit.*
- 63) Gates, p. 717.
- 64) *Ibid.*, p. 716.
- 65) *Ibid.*, p. 731.
- 66) E. P. Vandiver, "James Fenimore Cooper and Shakespeare," *SAB*, XV (1940), quoted in *ibid.*, p. 716.
- 67) *Notions of the Americans*, Letter #23, in R. E. Spiller, ed., *The American Literary Revolution, 1783-1837* (Anchor Books; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1967), p. 313.
- 68) F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance*. Charles Olson, *Call Me Ishmael; A Study of Melville* (Evergreen; New York: Grove Press, c1947).
- 69) Jay Leyda, *The Melville Log* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, c1951). L. S. Mansfield and H. P. Vincent (ed.), *Moby-Dick or, The Whale*.
- 70) Melville bought a seven-volume edition of Shakespeare (see note 72 below) on Jan. 18, 1848.
- 71) *The Letters of Herman Melville*, ed. M. R. Davis and W. H. Gilman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 77.
- 72) *The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare . . .* (7 vols.; Boston: Hillard, Gray, 1837).
- 73) I adopted the transcription done by Charles Olson (*Call Me Ishmael*, p. 52).
- 74) *Moby-Dick*, ed. L. S. Mansfield and H. P. Vincent, p. 484.
- 75) *The Letters of Herman Melville*, p. 133.
- 76) Olson, p. 55.
- 77) Herman Melville, "Hawthorne and His Mosses," *The Portable Melville*, p. 407.
- 78) *Moby-Dick*, p. 413.
- 79) *Ibid.*, p. 476.
- 80) *The Letters of Herman Melville*, p. 105.
- 81) Eleanor Melville Metcalf, *Herman Melville: Cycle and Epicycle* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 84.
- 82) *The Melville Log*, Vol. I, p. 349.
- 83) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 370.
- 84) H. P. Vincent, *The Trying-Out of Moby-Dick* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949), p. 25.
- 85) Cf. *The Portable Melville*, pp. 406-410.
- 86) *Ibid.*, p. 406.
- 87) *Loc. cit.*
- 88) *Loc. cit.*
- 89) *Loc. cit.*
- 90) *Ibid.*, p. 407.
- 91) *Ibid.*, p. 408.
- 92) Cf. note 78 above.
- 93) *The Melville Log*, Vol. I, p. 290.
- 94) *Moby-Dick*, p. 181.
- 95) *Loc. cit.*
- 96) *Ibid.*, p. 175.
- 97) "Hawthorne and His Mosses," *The Portable Melville*, p. 408. Immediately after this phrase Melville inserted a parenthetical comment: "which alone made, and is still making, him his mere mob renown."
- 98) In this connection Charles Olson's remarks must be noted: "Melville and Shakespeare had made a Corinth and out of the burning came *Moby-Dick*, bronze." (*Call Me Ishmael*, p. 40.)
- 99) Quoted in Randall Stewart, *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, c1948), p. 5.
- 100) Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The English Notebooks*, ed. Randall Stewart (New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), p. 135.
- 101) *The American Notebooks*, ed. Claude M. Simpson ("The Centenary Edition"; Columbus: Ohio State University Press, c1972), p. 326.
- 102) *Hawthorne: Selected Tales and Sketches*, ed. H. H. Waggoner (Rinehart Editions; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, c1970), p. 439.
- 103) *Ibid.*, p. 441.
- 104) *Ibid.*, p. 515.
- 105) *Ibid.*, p. 517.
- 106) Chapters, I, II, and V.
- 107) *The Marble Faun* ("The Centenary Edition"), p. 194.
- 108) Cf. *The American Notebooks*, ed. Randall Stewart (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932), p. 317, Note 389.
- 109) *Our Old Home* ("The Centenary Edition"), p. 100.

- 110) *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- 111) *The Scarlet Letter* ("The Centenary Edition"), p. 259.
- 112) Matthiessen, p. 276.
- 113) *The English Notebooks*, p. 132.
- 114) *Our Old Home*, p. 99.
- 115) *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- 116) *Loc. cit.*
- 117) *Loc. cit.*
- 118) *Loc. cit.*
- 119) H. D. Thoreau, *Journal* (New York: Dover Publications, c1962), Vol. X, p. 131.
- 120) H. S. Canby, *Thoreau* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 190.
- 121) Thoreau, *Journal*, Vol. III, p. 236.
- 122) *Loc. cit.*
- 123) *Ibid.*, Vol. X, p. 131.
- 124) H. S. Canby, "Walt Whitman," *Literary History of the United States: History*, p. 491.
- 125) Cf. note 31 above.
- 126) Walt Whitman, "Democratic Vistas," *Leaves of Grass and Selected Prose*, ed. John Kouwenhoven (Modern Library College Edition; New York: The Modern Library, c1950), p. 463.
- 127) *Loc. cit.*
- 128) *Ibid.*, pp. 463-4.
- 129) *Ibid.*, p. 464.
- 130) *Ibid.*, p. 498.
- 131) Cf. note 15 above.
- 132) T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and The Use of Criticism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1933), p. 153.
- 133) E. A. Poe, "Letter to Mr. — — —," *Representative Selections*, com. Harding Craig ("American Century Series"; New York: Hill and Wang), pp. 241-2.