

Preface to Criticism.

1.

Herman Melville, the American novelist, writing over a hundred years ago, in two novels and less than half a dozen stories, gave a picture of the world in which we live that is today unsurpassed for penetration, comprehensiveness, and force. Mariners, Renegades and Castaways was written to show this, a thing difficult to do and perhaps even more difficult to accept. But the book received a surprising welcome in the United States from the wide variety of scholars and critics of the works of Melville who, differing from each other as the colours of the spectrum, are today united in nothing so much as their conviction that Moby Dick is the central work of American literature. Yet despite the concentration of a whole generation of American criticism on Melville the result of their work is in its totality national and provincial. I have shown, I believe, that Melville is the culminating point of a line that leads from the Greek dramatists, through Shakespeare and Racine, Milton, to Rousseau. Rousseau being the point from where he consciously began. He anticipated still further, Ishmael, one of the characters in Moby Dick is the ancestor of the whole modern Ishmaelite school of writers from Dostoevsky to T.S.Eliot and Ernest Hemingway. It is in his work that can be traced clearly the origins and enduring popularity of the modern popular forms such as the gangster films and the detective novels of Dashiell Hammet and Raymond Chandler.

In preparing an edition of my book for English readers, I shall state the principles of literary criticism on which these conclusions are based and this is particularly necessary because literary criticism today means nothing to anybody except literary critics. Never before have scholars piled up such mountains of information necessary for criticism or discovered such a variety of technical instruments as during the last quarter of a century; yet never before has criticism been so incapable of integrating it into any coherent system or method. But contemporary literary criticism if it has no integrated method has achieved certain effects. Some of them represent a complete repudiation of all previous opinions, cultivated and commonplace (?), as has ever been achieved by criticism before. It has been for example a common opinion that the plays of Shakespeare were written for dramatic performance in a public theatre. Yet after briefly following the opinions of Mr. L.C.Knight's Doctor Leavis, and Mr. Wilson Knight, with a glance at Mr. William Empson, some of the most eminent of contemporary critics of Shakespeare, the reviewer gives his own judicial opinion "That there is something valuable in the sheer dramatic structure, underneath the words, seems to be shown both by Mr. Ken Tynan's effective staging, some years ago, of the bad quarto of Hamlet and by Mr. Marlon Brando's performance as Antony in the film of Julius Caesar – a performance which was in many ways a powerful and moving one, though Mr. Brando was incapable of speaking Shakespeare's lines in a way that brought out their rhythms, their sonorities, or even the finer subtleties of their poetic sense." So far as one school of modern criticism reached that the proof of something valuable in the dramatic structure of Shakespeare is one staging of the bad quarto and a performance by a Hollywood actor incapable, as indeed he was, of saying the lines properly. If modern criticism repudiates its ancestors, it is equally certain that this judgement would be repudiated by every English critic from Ben Jonson to Bradley, including Charles Lamb, the great apostle of Shakespeare in the study instead of on the stage. What is most remarkable is not only the judgement but the casual manner in which it is uttered. The critics have done this work so well that the writer has no idea of the utterly fantastic character of what he is saying. It is not surprising that

along with these ideas, goes an equally light hearted repudiation in many quarters of what have long been regarded as the fundamentals of critical practice. Thus an editorial again in the Times Literary Supplement (which claims and justly that it represents the middle body of opinion,) gives the following recommendation of translation of Aristotle's Poetics "What has Aristotle today to teach such a reader (query) If a young English poet or novelist were to come upon Aristotle on the Art of Fiction with a completely fresh eye, perhaps the most useful practical lesson he would learn from the little book would be that of the primary importance, in much literary creation, of construction or design of having, for instance, one story to tell, not a set of fragments of several stories, and of telling it as coherently as possible, without irrelevant additions. Diction, imagery, episode at all times tend to engross the attention of young writers at the expense of the total informing pattern of a work in hand, a total pattern which they hope perhaps will in some mysterious way take care of itself. It would be wrong indeed to say that it never does. Yet today, as at various periods in the past, Aristotle could usefully recall the attention of young writers to the part played by conscious planning and hard thinking in at least many major works, to the beauties of proportion and coherence, and to the whole vast problem of literary structure." If that is what Aristotle has to contribute to "the whole vast problem of literary structure", the he has no more to say than any instructor who undertakes to teach the writing of saleable fiction by post in ten easy lessons. My view is on the contrary that any integration of contemporary literary criticism must begin with Aristotle, the first and still the greatest of literary critics. Aristotle is the greatest of all literary critics because his method was completely comprehensive and completely integrated. It is not merely of historical importance. Today more than ever it is the indispensable foundation of any serious reorganisation of contemporary criticism. Modern critics do not understand him because, unlike Aristotle, they do not root their criticism in the world in which they live. Aristotle's promises, a commonplace for centuries, are usually tabulated as follows: 1. The audience; it is purged of pity and fear by the spectacle on the stage. This, the theory of catharsis has always been treated with respect as a brilliant and useful hypothesis. 2. The drama. Aristotle insists upon the central importance of what he calls the plot. Modern commentators in particular have never known what to do with this, so much so that Hollywood directors and Miss Dorothy Sayers have been able to appropriate it as the justification of their practice. To this insistence on the central importance of what he calls the plot Aristotle adds an enigmatic dictum, that the work must have a beginning, middle and an end. This can be considered as flash of genius or axiom, truism or formality. These ideas can be, and have been, analysed interminably but in the end we emerge by the same door that we went in. yet the principle which unifies them and explained them is one which stares the modern critic more than all others in the face – it is the popular audience, whose modern counterpart crowds into the cinema in every modern city and village. This was the dramatic audience of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. Aristotle knew no other and could conceive of no other.

We can therefore restate Aristotle's theory as follows. Actors imitating actions as though they were living it themselves in the emotions of a popular audience into a situation in which they can fool themselves profoundly involved. This at once excludes frivolity, for the popular audience was and in fact always has been a national audience. In fifth century Athens the whole population was present from the great magistrates and officials of the state to some of the slaves. This is the beginning of the plot. The middle

incites the emotions of the audience to the highest pitch. But fundamental questions have been posed and deep emotions have been aroused. There must therefore be fundamental solutions. This is the end. The body politic of Athens, for that was the audience, must be satisfied in accordance with the expectations that have been raised. To Aristotle the most ingenious plot of a novel by Miss Sayers would have been an ingenuity and nothing more. There was nothing there to involve the nation, in this case the city state, in some serious consideration of what mattered to it as a social unit. A detective novel is not a reasonable example. To Aristotle and the Greeks, novels like Mrs. Dalloway, or In Remembrance of Things Past, or Ulysses, could pose no problem which would immediately make the whole nation feel that it was involved, in that sense it would be weak in plot, it could have neither beginning, middle, nor end. A contemporary critic might think that this would prove the limitations of Aristotle's theory. Instead it is a proof of the limitations and narrowness forced upon the world of literature by the development of modern society. To Aristotle literary for the popular audience, that is to say, the whole nation, dealing with the things that concern it vitally was not easier but more difficult than literature for cultivated persons and for him the construction of a plot to express this was the most important part of artistic creation. That is why he could say that poetry was more philosophical and of higher value than history. Such a work of literature for such an audience was in reality the history of the nation at a certain time in its development. It is from there that we have to begin. Where the modern critic from Sainte-Beuve to T.S. Eliot conceives of literature as a form of culture for the cultivated, and popular art as some form of relaxation or anodyne for the common people, Aristotle, as between the epic, which was narrated or read before a cultivated audience, and tragedy which was performed before a popular audience, came down squarely on the side of tragedy as artistically superior. It is in its relation to the popular audience that modern criticism will find the beginning of the integration of the ever-accumulating mass of knowledge. Faintly and hesitantly, some contemporary critics are approaching to the Elizabethan audience of Shakespeare's day in relation to his plays. They dispute as to whether this audience could read or not. Aristotle says in the Poetics that the common people did not know the legends which were the material used by the great dramatists. And the remoteness of his world from ours is proved by this one fact: the judges of the festivals at which Aeschylus, Sophocles and the others competed, were chosen by lot. At one time it seems that the competition was actually decided by popular vote, and even when judges were chosen, inasmuch as the judges could be impeached the next day, the very theatre where the performance had taken place it is believed that the audience as noisy and partisan as the crowd at a modern football match, could and did intimidate the judges. Remains of one theatre show a seating capacity for 27,000 people, and as the total free population of Athens can be taken to be about 100,000 people, it is legitimate to say that practically the whole adult population of the city-state was present. Yet these people gave Aeschylus the prize thirteen times, and it is difficult to see how a literary committee consisting of Aristotle and Plato could have done any better.

<following section begun on new page>

I have said that catharsis; plot; beginning; middle and end must be the foundation of any modern critical method, and that the unifying principle is the popular audience.

Before we go any further we must make some attempt to see what catharsis; plot; beginning; middle and end meant to Athenian dramatists and the Athenian audience. The familiar schools of contemporary criticism in Britain make no sense whatever of the Greek drama, far less of Aristotle. Sir Gilbert Murray, writing of Aeschylus says that the Greek tragedians as a whole were poets of ideas and of bold ideas; poets like Milton or Shelley or Goethe or Victor Hugo, not like Shakespeare. He finds Aeschylus occupied with the struggle between God and man's conscience. To believe this is to believe that the audience of the Greek drama were enthralled and excited and driven to partisanship by philosophical ideas. No such popular audience has ever existed or will exist. We touch here one of the mountains that modern criticism carries on its back, the belief that the greatest powers are men using drama for the expression of ideas. Shakespeare was not, but neither was Aeschylus, and the mark of the inferiority of Milton and Goethe and Shelly, to Aeschylus and Shakespeare is their use of poetic forms as a vehicle for ideas.

<following section begun on new page>

Freud himself and the psychoanalytic critics have placed the stamp of their special preoccupation on the Oedipus The King of Sophocles. But here again we have to postulate either that the Athenian popular audience was skilled in the mysteries of the Freudian complexes, or that they did not understand the play. We might have expected that the critical school which operates under the banner of Stalin – Zhdanov – Mao-Tsetung would at least have some understand of this. And one of its most eminent representatives, Mr. G.D. Thomson, Professor of Greek in the University of Nottingham, has published a learned and valuable work on Aeschylus and Athens, A Study In The Social Origins of Drama. He says that the audience at the City Dionysia was not a cross-section of the community, but the community itself, associated for the performance of a collective ritual act. That is true and is the foundation of the greatness both of the dramatists and of Aristotle's literary criticism. But on the same page Mr. Thomson tells us that the great plays of Shakespeare were not "immediately and consciously related to the social movement of his time" the word "consciously" seems only one step removed from the conception of the poet as sugar-coating great and important ideas. The phrase "social movement" from the pen of a writer of this school, near to that wearisome arena where poets sugar-coated not elevating ideas but economic forces. But Mr. Thomson finally dispels our unwilling hesitations by stating that he realised for the first time the nature of the inspiration behind the Oresteia at a dramatic festival in Moscow. The theatre was packed with an "alert and critical audience of work-people". The theme was inspired by (only direct quotation will serve here) "the emancipation of women consequent on the abolition of private ownership." Mr. Thomson is a distinguished Greek scholar, but it is difficult to imagine anything more unlike an Athenian performance of the Oresteia of Aeschylus. First: intellectuals, people dealing in ideas, are alert and critical. The mass popular audience of a great dramatic artist is not. It wants to surrender itself completely. Daumier's wonderful print, entitle The Drama, at one stroke refutes all the principal positions of modern criticism. The Athenian popular audience did not criticise as Aristotle criticised, and Aeschylus and Sophocles wrote for them, not for Aristotle. Secondly, the Athenian audience did not consist of work-people, conscious of themselves as such; the audience was the whole community. A fact which Mr. Thomson himself

states but whose importance as an absence of (query) limitation he does not recognise. Proust, Joyce and Valery have written as they have precisely because their audiences and therefore their imaginations are limited, and a parallel limitation in Russia has produced, and can produce, nothing of any consequence in literature.

2) The AF of L, i.e. the first American labour organisation of the twentieth century, began where Melville left off. But because of its failure to absorb Melville as its own cultural heritage, the American labour movement became dominated by foreign literary sources and ideas. The minders and other workers of that period had copies of Shakespeare, Milton, Voltaire, Darwin, in their homes. They read Melville's Moby-Dick as a matter of course. In their own way they recognised him as a continuation of the great writers of Western Civilization.

But the American labour leaders of that period, Debs, Haywood, used as their intellectual guides, first, Shelley, Byron, Zola and Hugo, and then De Leon, Kautsky and Marx as present by Kautsky. This intellectual attachment to European cultural sources was the ideological form of making the American labour movement an extension of European politics. Instead of Americanising the immigrant workers, the American labour leaders tried to Europeanise the native movement.

The writers of that period who were sympathetic to the workers movement, Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, Jack London, tried desperately to approach the total conception of Melville. (Matthiesson in his book on Drieser has appreciated the seriousness of that attempt). But because they lacked Melville's conception of the crew, they could not bring to the labour movement that intellectual breadth which the movement needed to develop itself as an independent American force. As a result, these writers could only produce separate novels in which the heroes and villains were Ishmaels and Ahabs (The Sea-Wolf) and Pierres (An American Tragedy). Having left out the crew their literature remained muckraking.

3) The climax to this tendency towards European commination came in the 1930s after the depression. With the quadrupling of the labour movement and the birth of the CIO,

but the moment man the abstraction or what is essentially the same thing, man the individual, became the political measure, abstracted form the polis, you have chaos (Socrates) the theory that knowledge is virtue and then the concept of the intellectual elite as rulers (Plato), and finally Aristotle who cannot decide whether it is more important for man to be a citizen or to have friends. This is known in the history of philosophy as the conflict in Aristotle between, the political individual and the ethical individual. Intellectualism, individualism, reason, the aristocracy of intellect, classification and contemplation characterise the philosophic world after Aristotle.

In Aeschylus Symonds says you have heroic humans. He refers there by to Aeschylus' ties to Homer. But I don't agree with him, while knowing what he has in mind. In Aeschylus it is the whole human race, its destiny which is deeply concerned. The post-Socratic humanism has lost all that. Only the human mind is at stake. Aristotle

said: "The soul is the substance", it has powers of development (entelechia). This was his major contribution and that, together with his encyclopedia summation of the history of philosophic thought up to his time, is why Hegel pays him so much tribute. But this soul which is the substance in Aristotle is already torn between intellect and passions; between reason, understanding and the elemental. That is not the case in Aeschylus precisely because it is not an abstract man but a social man with whom he is dealing. It is the most grievous error to interpret the Aeschylean heroes, as some people do, as willful. That is a character and psychological analysis which was absent from Aeschylus. Symonds says: "Aeschylus apprehended immaterial and elemental forces – lusts, ambitions and audacities of soul – as though they were substantial entities, and gave them shape and form". He is writing externally, but I know what

-3a- continued.

he means. That is what Aristotle tried to categorise in the concept of the "soul as substance."

-11-

or Chapter
71.

"Fabled Heavens" – the history of humanity and the history of nature are inseparably intertwined in this metaphor.

That need to unite the objective and the subjective emerges in every crisis. The metaphor of the great artist in its content, and the fact that he has done it, are both testimony to a new command by man over his destiny and a new relationship of man to nature. The mastery of the artist is a symbol of the inherent capacity of man to master objective forces.

Compare this with Communist literature; They thrive on the fact that a deep-going crisis destroys thought and capacity for thought. Their literature destroys man's sense of command over nature, robs mankind of its history, fills him with the fear and threat that man is completely determined by eternal forces. That is what their abstractions and materialism mean in terms of literature.

These are the two extremes. In between comes the impressionism and pure empiricism of a man like Whitman. He has no metaphors, only adjectives. "the stars shining, the winds blowing". All this business about the dawn, the rolling sea, the upshooting stars drowns man in a cosmic awe. This too robs man of his history, of his activity. The objective is only object.

On the other side, the subject is only subject, only the individual "in his own rights", "great pride of man in himself." This is the capricious, the self-expressing I. The net result of this failure to achieve a sense of actuality (man's history, man's activity in the world and the world as a result of that) is that in any crisis this kind of intellectual individual has no defences against the system of economic determinism of the Communists.

Modern thought begins with Kant. Since then everybody is

-12-

his does not
een concrete
nough in
elation to
orm.

trying in one form or another to solve the contradiction between Understanding and Reason. Science, instead of increasing the control of man over nature, increases the control over man by external forces.

All thoughts since that time is a desperate attempt to reconcile science and freedom. There are only three tendencies possible:

- 1) The categorical or moral imperative. Given sufficient time and men of good will, it will all be all right. Starbuck.
- 2) Dialectical development through opposition and emergence of new human types.
- 3) Let the material foundations, science, develop uninterruptedly in the present. An elite, with the consciousness of the future and of the purpose of society, will take care of everything. We are the only ones who grasp all that is involved.

hall use this
cautiously.

I want to say a word about Lincoln. He was also a lonely democrat to be sure. But he is of the old Hamlet quality, "the melancholy man", the rustic in the Civil War capital. His style is that of withdrawal not of oratory, of Constitutional reconciliation not totalitarian reconciliation. Whitman, in poetry and prose includes everything. Lincoln dies with the Civil War. He is closer to Christian humanism.

The Whitmanian influence in Mailer is the mountain in the book as "the task". It is not the hunt for the whale which might create a community of labour. It is nature over man, and therefore Croft dominates. Jones must have Jack Malloy as the character in the end - vagabondage radicalism, sexual promiscuity.

his is a very
mportant
uestion. The
ange of
ndividuality
with in a crew.
ow much can
ou have?
What form or
orms will it
ake? We
annot be too
oncrete.

The second basis is Melville. All of the above authors begin where the crew collectively and Pierre and Isabel individually leave off. The problem, it seems to me, is to create out of the broad environment of the crew and labour an

-13-

individuality of the depth, penetration and subtlety of Pierre and Isabel.

shall attack
his.

Arvis hovers around claiming that the true antithesis to Ahab's egoism is humility, moderation, mediocrity, submission, on the one hand – and on the other, seeing that it is rather “a strong intuition of human solidarity as a priceless good.” There is a very profound problem here. (pp 179-182) What was the difference between Melville's idea of social relations and Hawthorne's “magnetic chain of humanity” or Whitman's “manly attachment”. Arvin points to Ishmael's saying in regard to Queequeg “My own individuality was no merged in a joint-stock company of two” and suggests a “Creative dependency of fraternal emotion.”

-14-

Crew – completely mechanised (describe these three)

It had to be an opponent worthy of the crash of society.

M/e however, has a vision of how men can live unconsciously. These are certain elements in the crew, and above all, the harpooners.

Christian Humanism because Me/e has lost sight here of the individual in relation to the mass and sees him in isolation. A sign of his decline.

Ahab was the product of his age in that he believed the secret of the history of man was the conquest of nature and the use of power, particularly fire and science. He went mad, recognising that this was not so.

Lear found nature also against him and that was the beginning of his madness.

Lear believed that there was a natural order in society over which nature presided. What he discovers was that man and nature were enemies – or that nature owed nothing to man.

Ahab believed that man could govern the forces of nature in his own name and for his own purposes. He now discovers this is not so.

-15-

Lear asked the question – what is the cause of thunder. He foreshadowed the scientific age and by denying all justice he foreshadowed a new basis for humanitarianism. In the arguments about the need, he was fighting against utilitarianism in the name of the old organic society. His refuge ultimately was intellectualism as we have described it.

Milton described heaven, earth and hell. Nature was a refuge. The garden of Eden was nature and agriculture. (r/u) For M/e, heaven and hell were in nature and society was an expression of nature or rooted in nature. Heaven and hell were in the same personality.

Metaphor-

Why are M/e and S/e so absolutely incredible in metaphor? You cannot compare these new forces, terrible forces and energies to anything, any content in the old world. They go far beyond it. Hence this tremendous power of imagination..... Are not to be compared to trade unions in the old democratic society. They are at the outermost boundary, the outer limit. They are not to be explained in mannerly terms. The old civil domestic society.

“Higher horror in the whiteness of her woe”
silent superstitious dread
Restless raging negativity – destroying all.

This whiteness is the result, the ultimate result of constant analysis, peeling off layer after layer until nothing but the bare abstraction remains. He does the same in the analysis of mind in Pierre.

Precisely – symbol of spiritual things where spiritual things are most defeated, it is symbol of utter hopelessness in life.

The thought of annihilation comes only when life has no meaning or purpose. The pagan harpooners had no fear

-16-

of the whale they had no conscious purpose.

Whiteness equals incessant creation of void equals dynamic force. Constant destruction of every form and determination equals permanent revolution.

Harlet, charnel house-

All outside is mere illusion. In reality everything inside is like a leper or corpse.

Religion is the coloured spectacles by which man is prevented from watching the world as a monumental white shroud.

There is no fixity in the world.

Real Nature has no fixity, no hues with which to please the eye and soothe the senses.

Not nature in the abstract, but nature in the shape of the whale which dominated all the society he knew. The whale was a duality – the most astonishing thing that lived and at the same time it was the abstraction which represented abstraction of society he knew. M/e knew that all intellectual purpose and cause-hunting was hopeless and led to disaster. It was because Ahab was seeking a method of conquering nature – as an individual – that the pursuit became one of seeking purpose and a cause.

The men also had some of Ahab's concrete resentment.

The anger that Ahab felt is the anger felt by administrators and bureaucrats at the intractableness of the economy and the society – the inscrutableness of it. They will solve it themselves.

M/e is constantly taking you all over the world. The whale travels over the whole world.

-17-

He gives you the history of the whale, traces it from earliest times, classical antiquity and goes even to the times before the world was formed. The white whale signifies life through all space and all time.

Everlasting terra incognita
Numberless unknown worlds.
However baby man may brag of his science and skill

M/e strips every finite thing of its determination anything that you might hold on to and say I can find a haven here.

The humanness of the metaphors of M/e. They all spring from tremendous depth of human spirit.

Rejection of everything considered civilised –

Ahab isn't chasing the whale for any philistine vulgar reason. He is doing it to expand human freedom as he knows it – and he has rejected the philistinism of Bildad and Peleg.

This tremendous thing the whale represented was overwhelming the human personality. M/e saw man as nothing at all in the face of all this, and the thunder and electricity. And Ahab said he would fight it to the end.

M/e was aware, it seemed, that to fight this meant only the further dehumanisation of society, emergence of men like Ahab, the degradation of the mass, and the insufferable vacillations of men like Starbuck.

The whale suffered too. M/e is very clear about that. Structure first of all – but for the time being, style. There are only two styles in English literature, S/E and

-18-

M/e. M/n is magnificent but is the style of knowledge, of learning, and more important, of contemplation, passively defensive, political.

S/e and M/e – what it is which gives them this abundance of metaphors – all of M/e's are of extreme simplicity – a child can understand them.

Never purely sensuous

Never intellectual abstractions

Wide wooing vacancies to leeward

He sees life from the point of view of the ordinary human being and his immediately easily apprehensive joys and sorrows.

The heart has moved M/e into the world. Feeling, but the ordinary man, not the language of institutions or abstractions which represent summations of thought but the reaction to those of the emotions.

This is a new method of thought. Every child can understand.

Not sophisticated seriousness – Flaubert.

Not sophisticated intellect – Milton.

There is no sophistication – It is all elementary but the elementary feelings of a common humanity.

Benito Cereno and Steelkelt –

the former is a grade below.

p.258 – Whales in stone, in mountains and in stars –

Fabled tents etc.

No crude imagination – no hypostatisation.

Anyone, Christian or non-Christian, atheist or child, could feel the same magic. No ignorance or superstition about it. There is nothing to explain away as a dream or a nightmare.

P.426-27 – His exuberance.

“To produce a might book you have to choose a might

-19-

theme.”

All of nature is refracted through an expansive humanity. An end to the empiricism of the 18th and 19th C. forever.

Whitman was an intellectual. He wrote like one. Only his individual feelings were ever the basis for his images.

The humanity that was the subject of all M/e's images was a creative non-intellectual, mass of humanity. These masses of space, this infinity, history, geological strata – he could never have seen them as an individual full of woe and his own subjectivity. This is the reason why you have such a sharp stylistic drop in Pierre – who is seeing everything as an individual and an intellectual.

Moby Dick is the mass of material, concrete, historical, realistic picture of industry etc.

He is writing a philosophical analysis of society and it is time we understand this can be as profound and probably more than the writings of those we consider great philosophers

(contradiction between productive man and intellectuals playing around with thought and mysteries)

The harpooners really represent the future as Edgar represents future in Lear.

There is here in M/e, probably because he lived at a time when it was obvious that the mass of humanity had to be taken into consideration, the creative force which comes from the mass, as opposed to Miltonic style which comes from the intellectual.

Be sure to compare the new worlds and the stand with one specific classes represented by S/e and M/e, the creative, the socially creative horizon that they embraced which gave

-20-

them their absolute.

Finally, the evil of tragedy as the dynamic of error by which they society had to find its truth. S/e was the beginning of the modern world so that what he wrote about was not only specific but all the fundamental problems were posed. M/e means a new beginning also.

The common humanity at the particular time is the basis of the style. You cannot write to and to teach. It must be the language that would be spoken if vast masses who have been brought into existence or consciousness were to express themselves in language corresponding to their inner aspirations.

In the same way a co-operative form of labour, there is here a new style springing from senses and spirit of large masses.

...greatest passages are those in which he sums up what happens to workers in profound simple human terms.

The range of imagination is that of men who are seeing the world for the first time and have brought to it vision and penetration far beyond anything known before. For M/e science and history were stages by which men and nature had reached where they were. It was no knowledge for knowledge's sake. They were to explain the world as it was and the relations of man to each other and to nature.

Dickens, Thackeray, Flaubert, and the rest had nothing to do with this.

The simplicity of the metaphors and the same time their grandeur is due to the fact that they represent the needs and aspirations of common humanity to the vast new world which has been opened to the man who sees it from their point of view.

(Some where here knock hell out of psychoanalysts with their father mother complex)

-21-

M/e's Absolute

There was now created a whole section of the population to whom politics was nothing. The absolute had changed from the absolute of R/u. He got to it through the first five books through a process of rejection.

In strictly human terms, it is the very concept of humanity which is enlarged. Both the concept and the difficulties of its realisation are expanded, and the antagonism sharpened.

1. Concept of new human relations
2. Concept of completely natural relations

3. Come from below.
4. The heart, feeling
5. Noble individual love which men held for him, noble in appearance.
6. Rejected the 19th C. conquest of nature (ease and skill in the ability to handle nature) for abstractions as greater abstractions. It was to be human. S/E just did not have this concept of the conquest of nature.

S/e foreshadowed the humanitarian in opposition to the utilitarian – the two forces which he saw. M/e foreshadowed social as opposed to humanitarian (which is form above), as opposed to that concept of social welfare which Ahab represented (totalitarian planning)

The greatness of S/e is due to the immense status which the centuries were to confer upon humanity at large, precisely because the problems were still abstract and had to be stated in their broadest form, S/e could reach so far) The classes are simple to get.

The tragedy acquires perfect form because of the clear

-22-

consciousness of a new absolute which governs the projection and logicalisation of the concrete which is to be developed.

It is not the context. It is the tension relation between the new absolute and the old concrete or the actual concrete which distinguishes the great tragic writer.

The metaphor and the range – He stands on a new height.

The new range of emotions, sentiments, needs, perceptions, give him the range of metaphor. It is like a man who has discovered a more powerful telescope.

When Lear becomes an outcast from society, is rejected by it and has rejected it, he acquires new sensibilities. These are the sensibilities of the author, the new intellectual, significant of the new.

M/e got his “language” and his new sensibilities form masses of men outcasts from society, rejected by it and rejecting it. However, it is the language of poetic drama – poetry – which means that it is a shorthand, an intensification, a dramatisation of the new feelings. Poetry and art are an economy of communication.

When he spoke of “fabled heavens” etc., these were the congealed experiences of millions of sailors with none of the manners of society intervening between them and nature. S/e was himself one of the new men. Dante’s Italian instead of Latin.

When M/e attempted to write the feelings of a pure intellectual, he collapsed and simply could not do it. And afterwards, he wrote magnificently but on a lower level than the previous. The poetry was gone. He has a plot – but the whole range is narrowed – like the modern short story. The plot usually takes on the scope to express the widest range of these feelings.

Dynamic of Evil.

He is very conscious of the barriers, the new barriers which stand in the way of the new feelings. He sees both sides, (and until the resolution must be conscious of defeat, because there are no new forms. The form and the structure of the great artist is his form by which he can express the new antagonism.

Both the positive and the negative are a further stage. He transmutes form White-Jacket both the type of needs and the type of rejection.

The he rejected White-Jacket was because he knew neither antagonism had been full stated. Moby Dick was to show why political was not the solution.

Chapter 26. – Knights and Squires – Split the universal of humanity (Starbuck – no crusading).

Queequeg, new friendship, democratic fraternity among men – and role of harpooner for discipline among the collectivity.

This is the new social relation which he didn't have W-J.

This is which is counterposed to the dictatorship.

This is which brings the Ahab type on the scene.

P.45 not clamorous for pardon but grateful for punishment opposed to that is the beautiful friendship.

The ship has to go forth into the sea because that is the nature of men. Bulkington is the ideal: thinker, common sailor, marvellous physique man at his boat.

This is a constructed fable, designed to put forward certain ideas M/e had and the characters in this are not

characters in the world but characters of the fable. It is because he knows he is doing this, making a world of his own, that M/e is so concerned to give it the stamp of reality.

Knights and Squires.

These are the real people.

Knights and Squires on the one hand – Ahab on the other.

Starbuck is squashed, ruined, the manhood is crushed.

What are these tragic graces (not one single incident of crew stands out except the work that they do).

Starbuck Chapter – chapter 26.

begins with virtues and goes on to limitations and ruin of Starbuck – Ends with mass of men and the kingly commons.

Community of interest – God's true princes

Irresistible dictatorship.

dead level of the mass

Plebeians herds crouching

Immense centralisation

But when we are dealing with tragedy which is to show the indomitableness of men in its full range and sweep, we have to remember the limitations of the particular type. The important hint alluded to – is that they establish this by a relation to the mass. They enter into politics.

First everything looked well because of the officers, respectable, orderly, disciplined, bourgeois society.

Tragic graces – The description of industry is not description of industry as such. It is the labour, the men working, that is the hero, and the true tragedy for

-25-

M/e – and the finest of the men working are the harpooners – so that the crew also is idealised.

The tragedy of humanity working.

Crew is new type of tragedy for M/e. This is not the tragedy of Lear.

The dynamic of Error is very plain.

It is that the the Starbucks and the Ahabs and to do so, they must bring to the modern, the instructive moral and physical heroism of the cannibal savages who did not think but did their magnificent men as men of nature.

All this is fixed before the whale appears.

Therefore the whale is the character which is going to show how and why life is a tragedy for each of these fundamental types.

N.B. Chapters.

41. – Moby Dick

42. – Whiteness of whale.

43. – the five in the hold

44. – Chart – Ahab – his scientific knowledge plus the evil that is in him. Ahab

works out his magnificent schemes – uses all knowledge and science to find a single whale in expanse of world.

The great discoveries of men from Prometheus on are the results of a certain madness, disease. To this M/e contrasts the working men and collective labour. The men are not differentiated. Ahab is the last of the tragic heroes of the old individualist society. Like Lear, Ahab so completely rejects the old that he is impelled forward to outline the new,

but he is not the new. That solution of the problems he seeks to solve rests with others than him. S/e poses Edgar as the leader, but in order to succeed, Edgar must assume the personality of the poorest of the poor. The intellectual must act and think and work in the name and in the embodiment of the spirit of the mass, the most humble and the most lowly – but the process is still

-26-

is still from above downward. It is not institutions, religion and natural order. “None does offend, “None”. What must succeed or what ought to succeed is that which takes into consideration all men. But man is still the responsibility of authority, of leaders, of intellectual investigation and analysis. With poor unaccommodated man as the centre of the universe, M/e is stating that workers as a collective body have become the centre and are. The true subject of the highest tragedy.

Then tremendous chapter on the science assuming independent purpose conjoined to will, disjoined from common vitality, common humanity.

Chapters on Cetology etc. This is Ishmael – like Lear – What is the cause of thunder?

Chapters on Men’s activity

They have a beautiful ring

Physical and industrial

Great comradeship, danger, the unity.

They are castaways and renegades – but that is not their fault. They begin that way, - the point is that despite the fact that they are renegades, the very structure of the whaling industry lifts men to the height.

The carpenter and the blacksmith are remnants of the old order. The style here is precise – does not reach heights – the choice of words to fit the limitations of the past. Carpenter is tragedy of contemplation.

In the transitional period, the clash, the violence of conflict – the swift changes. These make for drama. The tremendous range and rapidity of the sentiments cannot be expressed in ordinary language – they call for poetry.

-27-

Furthermore, they have not yet become common property so they have to be recorded in the new language. But inasmuch as they are dealing with human needs, desires, perceptions.

n.b. Negativity, grief, woe destructive qualities last chapters – the tremendous battle and the grandeur of the men – but all seen as Ahab’s fanatical quest.

The last scenes are Ahab and the men

The men are as magnificent as he. But he has subdued them to his will.

That simplicity of men working at full tension – that is for M/E the life and he hints in the chapter among the new and the girls what the idea of sex could be.

Negativity

The gloom

The passages about Soloman

The vast aspects of the world

The remoteness

The antiquity

The overwhelming character of all aspects of existence are the result of thought, of thinking man.

Opposed to this, the gloom, the misery, this woe, of Ishmael who is to the modern world, what Lear is to the older – although in this case not the main character but the subordinate one, to this world crushed by thought, is opposed to the world of action, of men deriving their motive force and understanding of the world, in their social activities and exercise of their powers. That is the contrast.

The Chase – Second Day

N.B. The excitement of the chase and the activity recurs.

Cp. active style, vividness, and profound philosophical

-28-

insight (Hegel's last chapter in **Bgic** <??> on individuality and universality) of these two paragraphs – with Ahab's isolation, loneliness, solitary command. This is no longer sociality of Queequeg and Ishmael.

Ahab becomes completely non-objective: "Nor white whale, nor man nor fiend, can so much as graze old Ahab in his own proper and inaccessible being."

He seems to be all, in reality he is nothing. Compare this with Queequeg's sovereignty over self – end of Chapter CX "nothing but a whale or a gale or some silent ungovernable, unintelligent, destroyer of that sort."

Objective forces could destroy Queequeg, subjective ones could not. VV for Ahab.

Ahab becomes more and more removed from his body – "the unconquerable captain in the soul"

"Ahab's soul's a centipede, that moves upon a hundred legs ... But ere I break, you'll hear me crack; and till ye hear that, know that Ahab's hawser tows his purpose yet."

Again – "Fearless fire" and "has mecha: FIRE SCIENCE
"I'll, I'll solve it, thought!" RATIONALISM

Compare "Cogito ergo sum" This is the end of that and its opposite.

(The Chase – third Day)

"my soul's ship" That is Ahab's ship – not the objective active ship of the men.

"Ye are not other men but my arms and my legs; and so obey me."

“From the ship’s bows, nearly all the seamen now hung inactive; hammers, bits of planks, lances, and harpoons, mechanically retained in their hands.”

Grant, Sheridan and Sherman were types like Ahab. They were not cavalier generals out to win battles. They required a national war, large scale strategy and master;

-29-

of men in order to reconstruct their own personalities. They were all failures in civilian life. Grant as President is like Ahab as President of a retired sea-captains association.

But to return to the book. If on deck Ahab reveals in himself some humanity, at the cabin-table, abstracted from the active whaleman’s functions there is displayed “a witchery of social czarship which there is no withstanding.” It is here that Ahab so successfully dominates his mates because they are part of the same social hierarchy. “Peace and satisfaction, thought Flask, have forever departed from my stomach. I am an officer; but, how I wish I could fish a bit of old-fashioned beef in the forecabin, as I used to when I was before the mast. There’s the fruit of promotion now; there’s the vanity of glory; there’s the insanity of life.”

Why do they resist Ahab? Savages, out of the heart of American civilisation, harpooning was their tie to a society in which they were strangers. (Like Ahab alienated, but in a different way) Being aliens they are to be the commentators of the demise of civilisation. Tashtego with the hammer at the end. Now their connections with the crew Ish’s relation to Queequeg at the beginning is, as you say, Rousseauian. On board ship, Queequeg pays him little attention. The other relation – between Ahab and Pip, is, as I shall try to show a degrading one to Pip and a prelude to the catastrophe at the end. At any rate these harpooners could not be the leaders resisting Ahab. They are present to accentuate the catastrophe. On the other hand, they are too civilised, too developed by their labour functions to symbolise the civilised paganism of Ahab, as do Feuallah and the Pharisees.

It is necessary to look at this excitement very closely.

-30-

Ahab’s cunning is to create the capture of Moby Dick as merely an extension of their natural functions and powers. The very fact that for them it can be intensified excitement while for him it is the abstracted and expanded ego shows the difference between Ahab and his crew. He traps Starbuck with the crew and then throws a sop to Starbuck’s individuality. “And what is it more? From this one poor hunt, then, the best lance out of all Nantucket, surely he will not hang

back etc.” And having begun with catechism, he end with ritual, the swearing of the vow by the crew.

In the next chapter, Melville poses the problem of future civilisation. If it is Ahab who gives them social being then it is all doomed to catastrophe. Ahab, in the cabin reflects: T was not so hard a task ... my one cogged circle fits into all their various wheels, and they revolve”. More contemptuously, “I ... like so many ant-hills of powder, they all stand before me; and I their match.” Not hills but ant-hills. Following this is the first tremendous outburst of egotism, of anti-social madness. Ahab is as far removed from Lear as our age from the Elizabethan days.

Things have moved since Shakespeare. This revelry in the fore-castle can be traced back to Ahab’s announcement of a great quest, but Ahab is in his cabin maddened by the egotism of his success.

Ish’s version of Moby Dick is again infinity, malignant intelligence and encyclopedic knowledge of the whale’s frightening powers. Moby Dick is for him a version of human history. And Melville is showing some limits when he says he cannot fully fathom how Ahab excited the crew with the prospect of Moby Dick. The search for a community of human excitement that characterized America in the 1850’s – the underground party formations, the Kansan Crusade, the fugitive slave rescues, the John Brown and Fort Sumter tensions, the

-31-

reception to Louis Mossuth – he could not anticipate fully, but he anticipated enough.

..... with vision of floodgates of wonder-world and “wild conceits that swayed me to my purpose” – going beyond rational understanding.

Chapter IX The Sermon.

It is part of Bildad’s and Peleg’s world, although the parable is of the sea.

Chapter X a Bosom Friend.

Yes, there is something Rousseauian about Ishmael’s approach and interpretation to Queequeg, but there is something strangely moving in it too. For the first time the style begins to achieve an intrinsic rhythm; it comes from an internal harmony of concept which is deeply felt. I. feels his first transformation.

N.B. “No more my splintered heart and maddened hand were turned against this wolfish world.” This tells us more about Rousseau than Rousseau about Melville. There will be passages like this later on when he describes the men at work ... again that internal harmony.

Chapter XII Biographical.

Queequeg's story is quite elementary – until you get to the point “that barbed iron was in lieu of a scepter now.” There is something new here which anticipates the later. For the rest it is thesis.

Chapter XIII Wheelbarrow.

Everything is now deftness

strength

dexterity

Chapter XX All Astir

Unknown now is concentrated around a particular man, the captain.

-32-

Chapter 22 MERRY CHRISTMAS

(The Lee Shore)

“this six-inch chapter is the stoneless grave of Bulkington” --- Ishmael's image of what the sea meant back on land. What seamen were like, a kind of idealization and romanticism of both. These now are behind him as much as is Peleg and Bildad.

Bulkington is the end of a certain beginning with the Cartesian Ishmael.

Chapter XXVI Knights and Squires

Starbuck – staid – steadfast man ... domestic memories, careful man, practical

“yet cannot with stand those more terrific, because more spiritual terrors which sometimes menace you from the concentrating brow of an enraged and mighty man.” (NB emphasis on brow of Ahab. Vide later)

“fall of valour”

Chapter XXVIII AHAB

“Infinity of firmest fortitude, a determinate, unsunderable willfulness, in the fixed and fearless, forward dedication of that glance.”

Chapter XXXV The Mast Head

Observe where this chapter with our Cartesian philosopher is hemmed in – between the frantic democracy of the harpooners and the thought-possessed Ahab in Chapter XXXVI

Chapter XXXVI The Quarter Deck.

NB harpooners describe MC accurately, simply, without fear, as something they have seen and known.

Ahab has mastered the mates. That is what Melville insists on concretely. To the mastery of the men, he only refers with a passing phrase.

-33-

"I do not order. ye will do it."

This is politics on a very high level. This is completely new. Where is it anywhere before this? "Bestow them, ye who are now made parties to the indissoluble league"

Organisation, conversion, belief. Much higher than submission of cabin table. Here they are all part of one will and purpose. The mates and Ahab.

Chapter XXXVI Sunset

"I am madness maddened" – essence, not just quality. Contrast with Lear. Ahab is not just the mad captain. He is madness incarnate in a captain, and conscious of it beside. Self-consciousness which is no longer self.

"the path is to my fixed purpose is laid with iron rails, whereon my soul is grooved to run". Shakespeare could never have.

Chapter XXXVIII Dusk.

Hates the "heathen crew"

Chapter XLII

But for Ishmael, all Nature is a harlot who paints herself. This is the lowest depths of despair toward the world. Ahab was desperate but not in despair about nature.

Chapter XLIV The Chart.

"Wild ratification of his purpose with his crew"

"some invisible pencil was also tracing lines and courses upon the deeply marked chart of his forehead."

"spiritual throes in him heaved his being up from its base"

"The eternal living principle or soul in him"

"self assumed independent being of its own"

"while the common vitality to which it was conjoined, fled horror-stricken from the unbidden and unfathered birth."

-34-

"God help these, old man, they thoughts have created a creature in thee; and he whose intense thinking thus makes him a Prometheus, a vulture feeds upon that heart for ever; that vulture the very creature he creates."

Chapter XLVI: Surmises

... "even violently wrest from him the command"

"manufactured man"

Chapter XLVIII The First Lowering.

NB – “those tiger yellow creatures, of his seemed all steel and whalebone; like five trip-hammers”

.. with free-flowing activity of harpooners and sailors. Mechanical image.

Chapter LX The Life.

(Q) The intellect here is creating a “Bad infinite” with every situation, running to the absolute, unable to live in the spontaneous present.

Chapter LXI Stubb Kills A Whale.

Theme of this central section. “If to Starbuck the apparition of the Quid was a thing of portents, to Queequeg it was quite a different object.

“When you see him ‘quid’, said the savage, honing his harpoon in the bow of his hoisted boat “then you quick see ‘sparm whale’.

For Daggoo – done is done – He’s dead, Mr. Stubb.

For Stubb – “Stood thoughtfully eyeing the vas corpse he had made.”

-35-

Chapter LXXIX The Prairie.

“how many unlettered Ishmael hope to read the awful Chaldee of the Sperm Whale’s brow.”

Reflecting on Ishmael’s ideas on the whale, not on whaling, but on the whale itself, it occurs to me that there is something surrealist about them, attempts to break out form the bounds of scientific analysis, with all kinds of analogies, jamming up of widely dispersed fields, grotesque ideas and the like. What Lear could open up at the beginning of the 17th century is no longer possible for Ishmael in the middle of the 19th. Hence these attempt to paint his fantasies about whales in prose. What else could explain these solid chunks in the middle of the books? There are some elements of science fiction in them.

Chapter CXIV A Squeeze of the Hand.

“But to learn about all these recondite matters, your best way is at once to descend into the blubber-room and have a long talk with its inmates.”

Chapter SCVII The Lamp.

This on the Lamp – after the preceding one on the Fire ???

Chapter CI The Decanter

Abounding good cheer, plenty to eat, on the English whaler, doesn’t scrimp its crew. High living on the ship.

This enjoyment is what distinguishes the English ship from the American.

Chapter CIV The Fossil Whale.

The whale has given Ishmael “outreaching comprehensiveness of sweep, as if to include the whole circle of the sciences.

-36-

Chapter CX Queequeg in his Coffin.

Pip says “Queequeg dies game”

(Q) “Queequeg in his own proper person was a riddle to unfold” –

Chapter CXIII The Forge

“In no Paradise myself, I am impatient of all misery in others that is not mad. Thou shouldn't go mad, blacksmith; say, why dost thou not go mad? How canst thou endure without being mad? Do the heavens yet hate thee, that thou can't not go mad?”

Chapter CXVII The Whale Watch

(Again and again the madness of Ahab is not the inquiring rationalism of Lear. It is finding a dark deep nature irrational, immeasurable, challenging to action, demanding purpose and not contemplating. Symbolism of water depths as compared with the sun. The latter could be wisdom of philosopher or scientist)

Chapter CXXVI The Life Buoy.

The carpenter doesn't have any use for the crew or the ship's company. Artisan, craftsman. “I like to take in hand none but clean, virgin, fair-and-square mathematical jobs, something that regularly begins at the beginning, and is at the middle when midway and comes to an end at the conclusion.”

Chapter CXXXII The Symphony

All the doubt of self in that paragraph “What is it, what nameless inscrutable, unearthly thing is it ; what cozening, hidden lord and master, and cruel remorseless

-37-

emperor commands me; that against all natural lovings and longings. I so keep pushing and crowding, and jamming myself on all the time; recklessly making me ready to do what in my own proper natural heart, I durst not so much as dare. Is Ahab, Ahab? Is it I God, or who, that lifts this arm.” Self – and nature in complete divorce.

-34(a)-

[text crossed out, begin]

Notes 2.

Each has a different style.

Each has a different method of observing objectivity.

He has a tension within himself which requires him to find calm and a serenity, and you find therefore that in all his metaphorical expressions which break up the old philistine way of thinking, are of this type.

... in regard to the fact that in the rev'y crisis it is not bourgeois democracy which fights with collective bargaining by any manner of means. You have a new type of personality reaching its extreme in the rev'y crisis that Fascism vs. Bolshevism.

[text crossed out, end]

This isolated individual, this Ishmael, is always moving towards an intuitive unity of the land and of the sea. He has this intuitive type of knowledge which Hegel ascribes to Shelley. It is an immediate unity. He has a tension within himself which requires him to find calm and a serenity, and you find therefore that in all his metaphorical expressions which break up the old philistine way of thinking, are of this type

It is also a new type of unity; it is not a new simplicity. In the chapters which deal, on the other hand, with the men who are behaving in their productive and industrial activity there is a new type of simplicity and directness, new positives, a new naturalness, a new spontaneity which is precisely what we speak about the actions of the working class in a period of revolutionary crisis.

-38-

As a matter of fact, in the prose style itself you will see achieved by these workers, or rather by the description of these workers by M/e the same sort of clearness and distinctness of ideas which in the 16 Cent. came from the intellectual Descartes – an opposition to the old abstractions of the medieval period.

Now passions and feelings of this kind which express the infinite development of personality must express itself in familiar things. Such things as clothes, food, nature, grass, trees, houses, thunder, lightning, such important things as love, marriage, children, immediate feelings as jealous, anger, these things constitute the expression, feelings and personality of a man. Sometimes, if he is a king or some important person, they go further. But the great writer is dealing with

personality. The result is that when the personality is in this sense expressing itself in the things around him. The result is that when the feelings and the ideas change, through developments there is no need to go into now, they can only be expressed by the alteration which these familiar common things around the man undergo, because of his change in ideas. This is seen clearly and sharply in Wordsworth.

Now the greatness of Sh/e is due to the fact that never were new feelings, so wide, so deep, so all embracing, as when the personality for the first time in centuries began to feel itself. We have general feelings, discoveries, recognitions, etc. in the abstract. They are not concretized and separated too clearly into different strata and different gradations, so that Sh/e range is tremendously wide.

-39-

We should note Bradley on page 77 where he says that Sh/e's art organises and vitalises his product from the centre outward to the minutest markings on the surface. So that when you turn upon it the most searching light that you can command, when you dissect it and apply to it the tests of a microscope, still you find nothing formless, general or vague, but every where structure, character, individuality. I think that is of vast importance for us to find out and define concretely why men like Sh/e and M/e find their way to the centre of things so to speak, so that the analysis and representation of it radiates outwards. There is important dialectical work here.

We have also to work out carefully the term "abstraction". Dorothy Van Ghent in Partisan Review enlightened me a great deal on this. The word becomes abstract. Sh/e and M/e at their various periods find it necessary to negate certain conceptions, certain ideas, methods, expression, metaphors, styles, which were useful to express the world at certain times because not only are the feelings new, but the expressions which characterized the old feelings have become abstract. That is the only word I can think of – they have no life in them. They are hypnotised (?) so that the breakage of these things becomes an absolute necessity. Have to work that out very carefully.

-40-

And it is not only that this is a form which reconciles opposites – the opposites that they are aware of – the negation of the old abstractions, and the creation of positives – it is that with Sh/e and M/e, from the very beginning they are aware of the contradictions. They are not joining contradictions externally metaphysical. Their whole conception of society, personality, activity, etc. is a contradiction and a recognition from the very beginning, so that they work always from the antagonism outside and that is at the back of the form – and when these antagonisms are very sharp they can only be expressed by drama.

The positive, the new, what we shall call for the time being socialities. The way the crew behaves – and we shall have to trace very carefully everything about the crew.

Negation is a question of woe and grief. We must remember that; and we have to be very careful about the positives also. Those, it would seem to me, are the most natural, the most simple, and the ones that are the most difficult to note. For example, I am still in difficulty over what are the real positives in S/e. I have a feeling that to say merely the expressing of personality, recognition (of the right) of the intellectual to develop itself that is seen most clearly in Hamlet, but on the whole all through S/e are these magnificent speeches. Those speeches, soliloquies, classical references, etc. I think that those what is new (?) That is the S/eian language, the tremendous depth, richness and colour, is not language, but it is what S/e is expressing what society is expressing at the time; the new thing that has come in.

-41-

So there can be no separation at all between the magnificence of the language, the metaphorsverse, and places where S/e seems to be talking for talking's sake, between that and what is being expressed, socially. In other words, it is not only new ideas that are being expressed, but the mere fact of this full and fluent expression of the ideas is what is new.

How else to account for such speeches of Lear such as "Reason not the need" etc. and the habit of S/e characters constantly at any time to make astonishing remarks and develop modes of thought which would not take place in ordinary conversation. I think that is fairly clear.

GRACE

I shall make a tentative suggestion as to what it is that is occurring in such a speech as the "Reason not the need".

There is first of all, in the speech, some of the confusion, the beauty of the revolution. Why? Because all the tendencies of the rev. appear in that speech, and there is a resolution at the end of the speech, in the intellectual saying that he will not go mad – which is really the opening of the new epoch. So you must take the whole movement of the speech, in order ?????

Here we are dealing with what Hegel would call the phenomenology of the development of consciousness. I am very conscious here between the difference between Richard II and Hamlet. Richard II is caught in all sorts of old values, old abstractions and old institutions. The main thing which governs him and which causes this difficulty in him is that on the one hand he believes in the divine right

of kings, and on the other hand this divine right of kinds is being challenged, but he has not overthrown the institution of the

-42-

the divine right of kings. He is therefore reduced in his conception of human feelings and his metaphors to sentimentality and to all sorts of moral values. On the other hand, when you have overthrown the old institutions, and are no longer concerned with them – I think the ones which M/e is overthrowing are those of individualism and isolation in that sense, and rationalism in the sense of the old scientific method where the man and humanity were ‘here’ and the world was over ‘there’. These are the ones he is overthrowing. Wh3n you do that you reach new depths of human personality which have nothing of abstract moral values about them and nothing of sentimentality about them.

[text crossed out, begin]

We should note Bradley on page 77 where he says that Sh/e’s art organises and vitalises his product from the centre outward to the minutest markings on the surface. So that when you turn upon it the most searching light that you can command, when you dissect it and apply to it the tests of a microscope, still you find nothing formless, general or vague, but every where structure, character, individuality. I think that is of vast importance for us to find out and define concretely why men like Sh/e and M/e find their way to the centre of things so to speak, so that the analysis and representation of it radiates outwards. There is important dialectical work here.

[text crossed out, end]

-44-

marked until the 19th Century; however, is already in S/e. It is in this inner action that “the function devolves of maintaining tragic equilibrium by counterpoising the presentation of evil in the outer action.” The thought-world of Cordelia or Kent has little effect upon the course of those events in Lear that are shaped by and shape the other characters; but it is of immense effect in our final impression of the universe revealed by the play, reaching its triumph in certain passages that, looking through death, create the harmony of the play.”

To some degree in S/e, as in all major dramatists, third means of balance – balance achieved within the strictly discernable separate inner action. Presence of beneficial world-order, of imminent good is implied by the presence of form even when evil or suffering is the theme (as in Macbeth or Oedipus). Result is equilibrium between manifestation of evil and embodiment of principle or order. “Harmony of form is achieved despite the inherent evil or hideousness of the

theme, and so profound is the transmutation that it becomes an image of that reconciliation by which order and beauty convert all things into themselves, by which ... we pass from an Inferno to a paradiso."

"... the religious interpretation of phenomena which means in fact the perception that they are only 'appearances' is incompatible with tragedy, which forever doubts whether their significance is ultimate or relative. Religion .. declares that the unseen world is real and the actual varyingly transparent veil. The ends of tragedy can never be served by that interpretation which, while seeing with it that 'in the world ye shall have tribulation', sees also that which has 'overcome the world'. For tragedy's concern is with 'tribulation' while fills man's consciousness to the exclusion of all but a doubtful and half-discerned promise of transvaluation. In religious drama the 'world' has been

-45-

overcome; "its seemingly solid structure has revealed itself as transparent in that irradiation which destroys the significance of outward event."

"Tragedy then is an interim reading of life. And in so far as it does not rest its interpretation upon that ultimate conclusion, in so far as it maintains that balance which is the source of its strength and of its value, to that extent it is the result of relative limitation of thought. The paradox ... has a specific function. we observe that it is on the relative limitation of its thought that its universal and enduring value depends. Precisely because it is an interim reading of life, it speaks to the condition of all but a few as some period of their lives; for it reveals that balance, that uncertainty, which sees two worlds of being and cannot wholly accept either. It speaks more potently to those within its reach than any other literary kind, because it reveals this interim reading in terms of those very technical limitations which impose upon it the necessity for concentration of form and directness of method."

-46-

The Stalinist say: The bourgeoisie was cowardly in the beginning, then ruthless, then capitulated. They, the C.P., therefore see the historical advance as being their own consistent determination and ruthlessness.

It is not the hour. making the rev. to liberate its economic forces. It has those ideas in its head and talks about it. Rather it is the socialized mass on a lower level, seeking a total, for itself, and the energy of this living labour which creates the revolution. The Stal. movement does not aim to any total emancipation, it is hostile to these early movements and blind to them.

Tragedy is striving for something new in conditions which do not in any way suit the something new. Qualities of Hamlet, Othello and Lear, were out of place in

Britain until Cromwellian rev. had cleared the way and society re-organised to give free way.

Solution of S/e was that intellectual types of which S/e was one rejected both the old and the new. The new for S/e was Goneril, Regan, etc. Hamlet, Lear, etc. were outside both. Rationalism, humanitarianism, romanticism. But these are outside the current.

-47-

Remember that this thing deceived Marx first and then Lenin up to 1915. It is nowise simple. However in 1951 it is much easier for us than it was for them. We have to grasp it and draw it out to its very end. Connected with it – at the heart of it; - question of intellectual organ. Of data and creative human forces. All these are tangled up here.

As far as W/R's book is concerned, the key is in the precise change made by Lenin in his think as expressed in the note books. It is the difference also between Whitman and Melville, between White Jacket and MD.

The key words for us are new passions, new forces – historical accumulation. Man does not appropriate an external object, but only his externalised self. (Isn't the whale the externalized self which Ishmael was vaguely conscious of at the beginning as a monster. And as this ha grown century by century, stage by stage, so Melville traces the whale, century by century, stage by stage. The grasping of the wale by Ahab is the grasping of Ahab of his own externalized image.

The monster which man has created now stands between him and his own natural fulfillment. Yet this monster has brought out the finest qualities in society and in man. The whale is not (Mumford) the unconscious. It is the exact opposite – the conscious in general.

-48-

However leftist their criticism, it is confined within bourgeois limits, there is nothing original in it in M/E's sense of the word. It fights the bourgeoisie with bour. ideas and weapons super-imposed upon the prol. These ideas with the prol. become the source of the greatest tyranny over the prol. The Stalinist "mass" is a tyrannical abstraction of and over the prol.

Rather than taking figures larger than life, the Stalinists take figures smaller than life.

They take social-political needs of a class and embody these in some individual. A great artist looks upon some individual and works it out vice-versa. Marx began with the alienated personality and traced it to labour process and social relations.

The Stal. begin with exchange relations and limit the personality to whatever exchange relations are substituted for feudal relations. The weeking of expression of a total personality is for them a lot of nonsense. He is heroic etc. and before his time, which means only martyrdom.

Other note. "Pierre".

The ghost in Hamlet represented the impossible restoration of order, but Hamlet was, himself, symbolical of something new. His conflict was between his own impulses and his very real respect for the past.

-49-

Pierre, on the other hand, had nothing new in himself. He represented the revolt against the old order, but what he needed was as new a vision of society as that which Hamlet had (Descartes, etc.) All that Pierre could reach was a raw opposite and an opposite that was tied, although illegitimately, to the old.

Melville knows that before he beings to write. Proof: P says nothing of any importance, whatever. Whatever is important in the book, M/e says himself. He does not give it to Pierre.

In the Elizabethan age, the new men had flowered within the old. They were tied close together. The only thing new in P/E was the raw, unformed potentiality of Isabel. She was formed in his own mind. She had no social reality because there was none that M/e could see. His book as a dramatic expression was doomed form the start because the conflicts were unreal. They were entirely in his own head and personality.

The world in 1851 was a very devastated place. In a great social conflict, old baggage was being shed but the new was, in reality, an intensification, an exaggeration of what was already a reality. That was not the problem of S/e's milieu where the new was really new and emerging and the problem was to see it in its fulfillment and its dangers and to discipline it.

-50-

The very quality of the unfulfilled concrete concrete personality which is the weakness of Isabel, at the same time is powerful in its suggestiveness as to the emerging of a new abstract universal.

Emphasise that Hamlet had in his own mind the new mind of the 17th Century, the means of seeing new content in everything around him. Pierre's "new" was a constructing of his own mind, just an abstract revulsion of what hew was accustomed to.

For next time: What is the relation of inner conflicts of the individual to the social development? It is first of all in periods of transition that these inner conflicts – Freud, etc. – are most violent, because man is most upset. Two, it is in the periods inner conflict find most direct objectification in the social order. Thus where to begin is the transitional social order. without that the Freudian analysis means nothing at all.

M/e knew that the social weight does not affect an individual abstractly. Ahab lost his leg and that brought home to him what was social. This strikes a blow at those who think that Ahab's loss of leg is something sexually abnormal.

In Billy Budd, M/e, in reality, is at the bottom of the ladder because he writes abstract arguments embodied in

-51-

in people – i.e., GBS and Hollywood films in tackling a serious problem. Clothe the ide with flesh and blood. Everybody understands what is involved and after it is over, moved not one stage forward. That is really art as propaganda.

The breakdown of morality and immorality leads to lowest level of terror and pity. The only thing that he finds to end the book is to fill you with terror or make you feel pity and charity. The most famous definition of tragedy is Aristotle's "tragedy purges us by pity and terror." But the pity and terror that comes from high charity is one that arises from a sense of the grandeur of the criminal. In this P/e ends as a very small person indeed and instead of pity and terror, arising from a superb spectacle, M/e makes the pity and terror the spectacle itself. The reader, therefore, at the end, nothing.

The social problem is posed in a sexual way. The Freudians, their only positive side, is they are product of a certain revolt against abstract profits and objective crisis in the capitalist system.

Here is a whole gulf of sexual disorder, superstition and primitive slime that is always present at the bottom of a social order. The more highly organised society and personality

-52-

The rationalist believes that the more men advance, the more he got away from this mess. What I stress is, what M/e and Marx understood, that the more advanced the society, the more highly organised the personality, the more catastrophic the drop back into the primitive slime with the breakdown of society. That is the total significance of barbarism. The ferocity of so many millions is what bourgeois can't understand. S/e showed where man can reach (what slime is just below the surface).

What we deal with as abstract labour, abstract sociality, social energy, Freud, discovering the powers of the unconscious, trying to define, concretize it ... M/e knew nothing of the social ideas and political economy of Marx. He was watching human personality in a total setting. It is M/e who goes furthest in revealing this sociality who also must go furthest in revealing the powers and striving of the unconscious.

In *Mardi*, the hero is concerned with a double pilgrimage. He is looking for an ideal state of society (the object in social relations) and for an ideal sexual persona partner (the object in his personal relations). These are inter-woven to no particularly successful literary effect. In MD there is the voyage for a collective opposite that binds together the social relations – the whale – and the needs of the personality (why does he exclude woman?)

In *Pierre* there is also a double voyage. One is P/e to become a writer, etc. (but this has no opposite, no object)