Mathews's Mosses? Fair Papers and Foul: A Note on the Northwestern-Newberry Edition of Melville's "Hawthorne and His Mosses"
Author(s): P. Marc Bousquet
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *The New England Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Dec., 1994), pp. 622-649
Published by: The New England Quarterly, Inc.
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/366437
Accessed: 28/04/2012 19:27

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The New England Quarterly, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The New England Quarterly.*

http://www.jstor.org

Reconsiderations

MATHEWS'S MOSSES? FAIR PAPERS AND FOUL: A NOTE ON THE NORTHWESTERN-NEWBERRY EDITION OF MELVILLE'S "HAWTHORNE AND HIS MOSSES"

P. MARC BOUSQUET

COMPOSED in the summer of 1850, near the exact midpoint of his most productive decade, Melville's lengthy paean to Hawthorne springs temptingly from an interval in the making of *Moby-Dick* and serves up what can be taken as an extended commentary on his craft, even a testament to his ambitions for the masterwork. While the essay announces itself as a review of the older author's *Mosses from an Old Manse*—published four years previously and not, as the Northwestern-Newberry editors dryly observe, "an obvious candidate for reviewing"—it is, in fact, much more.[1] Marking the beginning of Melville's enthusiasm for Hawthorne, the essay forecasts his decision to remove himself to Pittsfield and near association with the older author, testifies to the increasing influence New England writers and the romantic offshore writing favored by them were having on the New York author, and possibly hints at his future rupture with Evert Duyckinck and his New York circle. Recent years have seen the essay gathering not moss but critical mass: by virtue of its tantalizingly liminal position in the Melville chronology—and its strong, quotable rhetoric—"Hawthorne and His Mosses" features prominently in most developmental accounts of the author's life and literary career. Naturally, whatever goes by the

I acknowledge with pleasure the continuing financial support provided by a CUNY Gilleece fellowship and the insight into matters textual that David Greetham has so graciously shared. But this essay could not have been written without the early, strong, and vocal support of Bill Kelly, for whose guidance—and confidence—I remain deeply grateful.

[1]Hershel Parker, "Historical Note: II," *Moby-Dick, or, The Whale*, ed. Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. Thomas Tanselle, vol. 6 of *The Writings of Herman Melville* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press and the Newberry Library, 1988), p. 593. Future citations to the Northwestern-Newberry edition will appear abbreviated, e.g.: [NN 6: *Moby-Dick*, p. 593].

name of the "text" of this essay is of tremendous significance to Melville scholarship.

At the heart of the textual problems associated with the essay are the extensive revisions to the fair-copy manuscript (a clean copy of an earlier draft which was, presumably, already too illegible for the purpose of publication or further revision). These alterations greatly moderate—but do not succeed in erasing—the startling chauvinism of an earlier version. Leaf 15 of the fair copy, in Elizabeth Melville's hand, originally read:

. . . let America rather praise mediocrity in her children than the best excellence in the children of any other land

Alterations, in Melville's hand, were made as follows:

. . . let America **^first^** praise **^even^** mediocrity in her **^own^** children **^, before she praises (for anywhere, merit demands acknowledgement from every one)^** the best excellence in the children of any other land^.^[2]

Antagonistic to the original emphasis of the passage, the revisions convert a boldly chauvinist challenge—let America praise home-produced mediocrity *rather* than offshore excellence—into something more like an appeal sharply qualified by a universalist sentiment: while native authors ought, rightfully, to benefit from our encouragement, such encouragement should not inhibit our appreciation of real merit. Melville seems to have been sensitive to the contrary vectors of the passage as revised, for in a subsequent revision, patched over the fair copy, he somewhat unnecessarily glossed the passage with an added sentence explaining, in a still fainter formulation, that he meant that American authors should receive "the priority of appreciation" from their public.

At odds with itself on the issue of literary nationalism, the manuscript in its final form never resolves into a single consistency that can be presented profitably in an unprefaced clear-reading text (that is, text

[2]Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from "Hawthorne and His Mosses" are my transcriptions from the fair copy manuscript, Duyckinck Collection, New York Public Library (quotations by permission). Quotations described as from the fair copy present substantives in Elizabeth Melville's hand previous to Melville's revision; in the interest of clarity, however, they will very occasionally, where noted, also include accidentals (chiefly punctuation and spelling) as Melville subsequently corrected them. The ascription of accidentals is often tentative: see Harrison Hayford, Hershel Parker, and G. Thomas Tanselle, eds., NN 9: *The Piazza Tales and Other Prose Pieces* (1981), p. 675ff. for a detailed account of manuscript alterations. (The text of the NN edition of "Mosses" appears in this volume, pp. 239–53). As described in NN 9:645, the portion of leaf 15 from which the present citations are drawn was exposed from beneath the revision patch in 1945 at the request of Harrison Hayford.

pages unencumbered by notes or other scholarly apparatus). The fair copy, in Elizabeth Melville's hand, echoes the cultural nationalism of literary Young America, recirculating some of the more pungent brags first advanced in the preceding decade by the movement's "Centurion," Cornelius Mathews, and publisher, Evert Duyckinck, who both happened to be Melville's houseguests at the probable time of the essay's composition. By contrast, the revisions—in Melville's own hand—consistently attempt to muffle that rhetoric. The resulting final manuscript approaches, but never quite attains, a position somewhat more characteristic of Melville, who repeatedly satirized petty chauvinisms throughout his career.

The circumstances of the essay's composition have been the occasional subject of critical speculation for fifty years, but they acquired textual relevance in the 1981 Northwestern-Newberry edition. The NN edition is the work of prominent textual scholars G. Thomas Tanselle and Hershel Parker, under the general editorship of Harrison Hayford, who as a graduate student in 1945 pioneered study of the essay's composition history.[3] In producing the clear text of "Hawthorne and His Mosses" for the ninth volume of *The Writings of Herman Melville,* the editors take the somewhat unusual (though not unprecedented) position that Melville was not responsible for autograph revisions. Following a biographical reconstruction first advanced by Leon Howard and subsequently amplified by Perry Miller, the NN editors contend that Melville emended the early draft at the persuasion or insistence of his houseguest Evert Duyckinck, who had by this time moderated his own literary nationalism:

> In light of Samuel Butler's apothegm "He that complies against his will / Is of the same opinion still," NN restores to the text words and passages that expressed Melville's opinion as he first wrote it and rejects his revisions which are judged as 'complying' with Duyckinck's persuasion.[4]

The edition nonetheless falls far short of the rechauvinizing editorial program implied; with typical caution, NN rejects Melville's revisions in only four instances and retains the vast majority of the anti-chauvinisms as "possibly but not plainly" motivated by Duyckinck.

[3]In his unpublished 1945 Yale dissertation, Hayford first argued that Melville began the essay after meeting Hawthorne, not before, as the essay pretends. See NN 9:655, for an account of this controversy, and NN 6:612, n. 13, for an update in which Parker argues, "with greater assurance," from unspecified NYPL documents, that the essay was begun on Friday, 9 August, and three-quarters completed that day.

[4]NN 9:656.

The result of this tentative application of an editorial principle advanced with confidence is an edition presenting a *text* only moderately more nationalistic than would otherwise be justified but based on a *rationale* that threatens to pre-empt debate on the question of Melville's literary nationalism at the crux of his career. It is, in other words, offspring of an uneasy marriage between Hershel Parker's often combative but generously intentioned championship of editing from genesis and Tanselle's continued promotion of the Greg-Bowers protocol originally endorsed by the CEAA (Center for Editions of American Authors, subsequently the Modern Language Association's Committee for Scholarly Editions). While Parker's dictum that authorial revisions "are automatically suspect" apparently prompts the edition's intensive examination of the essay's compositional history, that inquiry's practices and results are shaped, even determined, by Tanselle's adherence to the teleology of "final authorial intention."[5] One purpose of presenting genetic evidence is to enable the edition's readership to examine the dynamics of the creative process critically, to map in all its ambiguity, hesitation, and reversals of consciousness, and—if authorial intention happens to be the object of that inquiry—to trace shifting intentions (or sometimes influences) to which the revisions attest. By contrast, the incorporation of a few pieces of that evidence into a clear text bearing NN's respected imprimatur has the largely incompatible result of forestalling further examination. NN's bibliographical protocols demand that Parkeresque suspicion must appear invested with

[5]Hershel Parker, *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1984), p. 79; G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention," *Studies in Bibliography* 29 (1976): 167–211. See also Parker's early effort to elaborate situations "in which the author's final intentions should not be obeyed," "Melville and the Concept of 'Author's Final Intentions,'" *Proof* 1 (1971): 156–68, and his critique of Tanselle, "The Text Itself: Whatever That Is," *Text* 3 (New York: AMS Press, 1987): 47–54. While preserving the essay's genetic record—the hundreds of revisions Melville made to the fair copy—in a comprehensive (though notoriously inaccessible) editorial apparatus, NN's edition is "critical" rather than "genetic," for it aims to represent an ideal text (in this case, a "text that represents as nearly as possible the author's intentions"). A genetic edition would instead aim to represent as clearly as possible the process of composition (its "genesis"), and would attempt to minimize judgments about authorial intention. Tanselle's essay, "Melville and the World of Books," in *Companion to Melville Studies*, ed. John Bryant (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1986), narrates the deeply intertwined histories of the CEAA and the NN Melville edition: a concise introduction to CSE standards, somewhat different from the original CEAA principles, is available in an MLA pamphlet, "The Center for Scholarly Editions: An Introductory Statement" (New York: MLA, 1977). The most important critique of intentionalist textual practices is Jerome McGann's *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlotte: University Press of Virginia, 1992).

Tansellian authority, mantled in a justification sufficient to satisfy the evidentiary standards of the CEAA (CSE).

It is exactly this justification—the judgment, advanced with confidence, as to Melville's final authorial intention—much more than the canceled revisions themselves, that portends an enduring effect on subsequent scholarship. By promoting the claim that the strident literary nationalism of the fair copy represents Melville's "actual literary opinions," NN neutralizes the authority that otherwise inheres not only in the revisions themselves but also in the markedly antichauvinist trajectory of them.[6] And in a climate of literary scholarship seeking to develop a far more nuanced view of Melville's relation to nationalism than was produced in the era of Mathiessen and Miller, NN counterproductively lends the powerful support of a deserved reputation for cautious—and conservative—scholarship to Perry Miller's almost certainly erroneous 1956 judgment that Melville was by August 1850 a devoted literary nationalist whose rhetoric and enthusiasm outstripped even that of the fiery Mathews.[7]

So while the present inquiry touches on matters of textual scholarship, the central field of inquiry is the Howard-Miller speculation—that Duyckinck, not Melville, initiated the essay's counterchauvinist revisions—a position the NN edition has all but realized as historical fact. While I share the belief that Young America influenced the composition of "Mosses," I would like to reopen the questions of when, and by whom, and to what end. If the chief line of influence was *literary* Young America, in the persons of Melville's houseguests (Michael Rogin has already persuasively traced in "Mosses" the rhetoric of *polit-*

[6]NN 9:656.

[7]One of the more recent efforts is Lawrence Buell's "Melville and American Decolonization," *American Literature* 64 (June 1992): 215–37, which distinguishes itself by envisioning Melville in comparative terms, as a postcolonial writer with strong anglophilic sentiments and an awareness of his English market, for whom "the literary nationalist project [was] a more fitful, incomplete, and ultimately secondary affair" (p. 234, n. 4) than has been previously argued. Buell's call to treat Melville in "more complexly transnational terms than heretofore" (p. 233) is exactly correct, but his model depends on an element of (postcolonial) "anxiety" which can be questioned. (Anxiety models, whether Buell's or Bloom's, overlook the insight that women, not fathers, made Melville nervous: Melville's fraternal model of genius is accompanied by a pervasive gynophobia but very little anxiety of influence.) Simply by emphasizing this "transnational" dimension, the new, internationalist readings, such as Buell's or Larry J. Reynolds's in *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), are beginning to nudge aside the cold-war vision of a nationalist Melville—though Reynolds also commits himself to a vision of Melville as a "spread-eagle" nationalist (p. 191, n. 9).

ical Young America),[8] the collaborator in question is much more likely to have been Cornelius Mathews than Evert Duyckinck and the site of intervention to have been not Melville's latest revisions but instead an early draft—the lost "foul papers" from which Elizabeth Melville produced the fair copy. The argument in favor of Mathews's intervention is circumstantial. But it is not necessary to accept the idea of his—or anyone else's—intervention to accept my overriding premise: that whatever intentions Melville may have had regarding the extravagant nationalism of "Mosses" reveal themselves unambiguously not in the static text before revision or the static text following revision but in the dynamic of the (almost certainly abbreviated) revision trajectory.

Oddly, few of the scores of scholars who have published studies of Melville's testament to Hawthorne have found its nationalistic rhetoric unusual. The silence on this question is a tribute to the staying power of Leon Howard's biography—and to the fascination exerted by Perry Miller's account of the New York literary wars (which, in qualifying her recommendation of it, Nina Baym first labeled "melodramatic").[9]

In 1951, Howard published his *Herman Melville,* thereby setting a standard subsequent biographers would find it difficult to meet. He made use of the material that would become Jay Leyda's massive *Log* and relied extensively on the research and advice provided by his young colleague at Northwestern University, Harrison Hayford. Howard stated explicitly that his biography would serve as a companion to the *Log:* whereas Leyda's volume would collect and briefly introduce ex-

[8]Michael Paul Rogin, *Subversive Genealogy: The Politics and Art of Herman Melville* (New York: Knopf, 1983), pp. 70–76. Rogin's book brilliantly exposes Melville's subversive relationship to the rhetoric of political nationalism. However, his brief discussion of Melville's relationship to literary nationalism, while hinting at subversive intent, ends by elaborating Perry Miller's discussion of Melville and literary Young America: "Like Emerson and O'Sullivan before him, Melville wanted political independence to set the stage for literary independence. . . . By the time he wrote *Pierre,* two years after the 'Mosses,' Melville no longer believed that Young America offered access to the nation's interior" (pp. 74–76). Like Buell, Rogin does not question the portrait of "Mosses" as a nationalist literary manifesto: while Buell takes the position that these nationalist outbursts are sincere, but only "an occasional motif" (p. 234, n. 6), Rogin seems content to rest on the distinction between political and literary nationalism, so that whereas Melville might be subversive of the former, he might be sincere in the latter.

[9]Nina Baym, *Novels, Readers, Reviewers: Responses to Fiction in Antebellum America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), p. 278.

tracts from documents relating to Melville's life, Howard's book would draw from that same body of evidence the "inferences necessary for a coherent and human narrative."[10]

Howard's inferential reconstruction of the events surrounding the composition of "Mosses," the famous Berkshire outing of August 1850, during which Melville first encountered Hawthorne, is largely supported by documentary evidence—save the one judgment crucial to NN's editorial policy.

In late July 1850, Melville invited his friends Duyckinck and Mathews to join him for a few days in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. Duyckinck and Mathews, as detailed by Perry Miller and others, had been the leaders of literary Young America, New York's most vigorous strain of literary nationalism, for more than a decade. Of the pair, it was clearly Mathews who retained a reputation for a "nationality mania": by the time of the Berkshire outing, Duyckinck was perceived by most of his fellow New Yorkers to have grown more moderate. Despite Melville's longstanding association with both figures, not one of his known contributions to the journals edited by either Duyckinck or Mathews shows a trace of literary nationalism. Although Melville occasionally attended the Saturday night bachelor gatherings at which the editorial policy of Young America's magazines was planned, his enthusiasm was fraternal and not political; Duyckinck's extensive surviving private papers nowhere impute chauvinistic views to his friend.[11]

[10]Leon Howard, *Herman Melville* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951; reprinted 1967), pp. vii–viii; Jay Leyda, *The Melville Log* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1951). Howard does not make clear the degree to which his "reconstruction" of the Berkshire episode is due to Hayford's advice or to Hayford's unpublished dissertation (Yale, 1945), which treats the episode at length. I have not seen Hayford's dissertation: however, the NN notes clearly give Howard the credit for suggesting Duyckinck's editorial interference.

[11]The distinction between *having nationality* and *being nationalist* should be noted here: the claim that Melville did not actively hold or promote nationalist or literary-nationalist views, and even the further claim that he despised such views, is not inconsistent with arguments such as Wai-Chee Dimock's, that "Melville's authorial enterprise can be seen . . . as a miniature version of the national enterprise" (*Empire for Liberty: Melville and the Poetics of Individualism* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989], p. 10). It's entirely possible to illustrate Melville's epistemology as partially structured by the rhetoric of manifest destiny without making the different claim that he intended political nationalism. The sole analogue to the rhetoric of "Mosses" anywhere in the body of Melville's work closes chapter 36 of *White-Jacket* (1850), a heated exhortation against naval flogging, which was at the time, and always had been, more savage in the British service: "There are some occasions when it is for America to make precedents, and not to obey them" ([New York: Library of America, 1983], p. 506). Harshly critical of the American navy, *White-Jacket* in most respects holds English marine practice as a model for the native service. The book, and its single stray "nationalistic" rhapsody, was so far from

By chance on Friday, 2 August, en route to Melville's Berkshire homestead, Duyckinck encountered another friend, David Dudley Field of neighboring Stockbridge, who extended an invitation to dinner and a climbing expedition for the subsequent Monday. Early in the morning of Monday, 5 August, Duyckinck, Mathews, and Melville were joined by Boston poet Oliver Wendell Holmes for the trip to Stockbridge. After being met by their host, they climbed Monument Mountain in a party that included Hawthorne and Boston publisher James T. Fields, among others. At the mountaintop, Mathews declaimed a selection from fellow New Yorker William Cullen Bryant's "Monument Mountain."

Whether or not Howard is right in hinting that Mathews's performance was calculated "for the honor of New York," it seems likely that either on the train to Stockbridge or along the mountain hike, the New York chauvinist Mathews ran afoul of Boston cosmopolite Holmes. At the ensuing meal at David Field's home, Holmes began to twit the nationalistic extravagances of patriotic Americans, literary and otherwise. Howard, probably correctly, assumes that the target of Holmes's witticisms was Mathews, although none of the several accounts of the lengthy meal, including Mathews's own, record his remarks.

Two eyewitness accounts, both of them reprinted in the *Log*, give the flavor of the conversation. Hawthorne's friend and publisher James T. Fields recalled:

> . . . we dined together at Mr. Dudley Field's in Stockbridge, and Hawthorne rayed out in a sparkling and unwonted manner. I remember the conversation at table chiefly ran on the physical differences between the present American and English men, Hawthorne stoutly taking part in favor of the American.[12]

And Evert Duyckinck wrote to his wife:

> Dr Holmes said some of his best things and drew the whole company out by laying down various propositions on the superiority of Englishmen. Melville attacked him vigorously. Hawthorne looked on. . . .[13]

---

associating Melville with literary Young America in the New York mind that the April 1850 *Democratic Review* criticized the fast-selling book as blatant toadyism to the English marketplace: "[A]ll the seamen heroes are Britons, and all the admirals of England are the oracles and textbooks," the reviewer complains. "Although the accomplished author thanks God that he is free from national invidiousness, he nevertheless betrays the fact, that London pays him better for his copy-right than New York" (see Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale* [New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956], p. 272).

[12]James T. Fields, *Yesterdays with Authors* (Boston, 1872), p. 53; reprinted by Leyda, *Log*, p. 384.

[13]Evert Duyckinck to Margaret Wolfe Duyckinck, 6 August 1850, Duyckinck Collection, New York Public Library.

Conversation was apparently general—the whole company being drawn out—and pleasant: Holmes's remarks, "some of his best things," were witty rather than offensive. Fields concludes his account: "This 5th of August was a happy day throughout, and I never saw Hawthorne in better spirits."

It's worthwhile to break into the narrative at this stage to emphasize two points. First, Duyckinck's account of Melville's "attack" on Holmes for asserting "the superiority of Englishmen" in no way convicts Melville of chauvinism (and Howard himself draws no such conclusion) but only of holding opinions consistent with the body of his work, that personal merit does not proceed from national identity. Second, Fields portrays *Hawthorne* "stoutly taking part in favor of the American." Perhaps because Fields's memoir appears some years after the event and seems to conflict with Duyckinck's more timely recollection of Hawthorne blandly "looking on," Howard chooses to dismiss Fields's version of events. But the two publishers were at the far end of the table, removed from the action; perhaps their accounts aren't in conflict at all.[14] If both accounts are contributed to the narrative, an important possibility emerges, one Howard fails to raise: that Melville took up a line of argument first essayed by Hawthorne.

After dinner, the party made another outdoor expedition. Before they broke up, as night approached, Hawthorne extended an invitation to Melville to spend several days as his houseguest in Lenox. Duyckinck, Melville, Mathews (and presumably Holmes) took the ten o'clock train together.

It is generally accepted that at least the nationalistic middle section of "Mosses" was composed at some point following the events of 5 August but prior to 12 August, when Duyckinck returned to New York, probably carrying the revised fair-copy manuscript. For the whole of that period, Mathews and Duyckinck were Melville's guests. Howard, identifying Melville's scant free time as Tuesday until midafternoon and possibly Tuesday evening, Friday before approximately midday, and the whole of Sunday, offers a time frame for composition:

> In the midst of all this activity, probably during the Sunday of peace which brought it to a close, Melville's essay got finished and copied; and the two editors of the *Literary World* went into conference with their author on the spot. They evidently decided that the marks of its origin were too strong upon it, for Melville altered the copied manuscript in order to attribute it to "A Virginian

[14]The seating arrangement appears in the second installment of Cornelius Mathews's account, *Literary World,* 31 August 1850, p. 166.

spending July in Vermont" and removed from it his sneer at Boston and some of its anti-English nationalism while carefully disguising any other signs of its connection with a New York critic.[15]

Howard's reconstruction fulfills his announced ambition of making "the inferences necessary for a coherent and human narrative." It's the sort of project that, as Howard observes, involves "guesswork aplenty." As biographical guesswork, his version of events is perfectly plausible: both Duyckinck and Matthews were in the house, and Howard's general inference that their presence influenced Melville's composition makes sense.

There's no evidence whatsoever, though, that Duyckinck and Matthews "conferred" with Melville over the piece, much less that Duyckinck persuaded Melville to make any of the revisions. In fact, the presumptive editorial conference is entirely a product of Leon Howard's biographical imagination, probably sparked by Evert Duyckinck's hand on the manuscript.

On two consecutive manuscript leaves, Duyckinck inserted instructions necessary to installment publication: "(to be concluded next week)" on leaf 14, and on leaf 14 1/2 a reinscription of the title and the phrase "Concluded from the last number." Duyckinck's hand also appears twice on the manuscript verso, in the same ink, at leaves 13 and 25, where he marks installment divisions for his compositors. Such emendations clearly are aimed exclusively at directing the publication process.

The only other revision, and the single one of substance, is Duyckinck's substitution of "there are some dozen at least" on leaf 15 for an honor roll of living native literati which had grown—with Melville's repeated insertions—so lengthy as to cause offense only by omission. This alteration bears at best a tangential relation to the anti-chauvinist revisions in Melville's hand. If Duyckinck had wanted to eliminate the essay's nationalist extravagances, he surely would have done a more thorough job of it (at least as thorough as the expurgation he had performed on *Typee* years earlier for his employer John Wiley): dozens of glaring instances survived Melville's latest revision and remained to tempt Duyckinck's editorial pen while he prepared the essay for press. At no point, then, does the content or circumstances of

[15]This chronology, as previously noted, was first advanced by Harrison Hayford. Howard actually mistakenly describes Melville as socially free for the whole of Friday, not believing that Melville was the costumed figure who kidnapped William Butler's wife from the train station that afternoon. For the quotation, see Howard, *Melville*, p. 160.

Duyckinck's autograph on the manuscript implicate him in the process of Melville's revisions—in conference or otherwise.[16]

Howard's conjecture of Duyckinck's influence is an argument addressed *toward* the manuscript evidence, and not emerging *from* it. The opposed trajectories of the fair copy and the late revisions pose a problem for Howard which the hypothesis of Duyckinck's influence settles—and seals: with the demands of narrative satisfied, Howard subsequently skirts the issue of Melville's literary nationalism. Howard never claims that Melville was a literary nationalist, but his handling of the manuscript evidence made it almost inevitable that others would do so.

Insofar as Howard's narrative drains Melville's authority from the antichauvinist revisions, it invests that authority in the fair copy, for the assertion that Duyckinck sponsored the revisions produces the unstated corollary that Melville's authentic opinions (or at least original intentions) are represented by the earlier, chauvinistic rhetoric. Five years later, this corollary would produce Perry Miller's lurid reading of the essay.

In a rare venture beyond his familiar New England transcendentalist turf, Miller unveiled an unlikely and largely unsubstantiated portrait of Melville as a helpless bumpkin entering the New York literary scene like "a lamb to the slaughter," soon a foot soldier in the service of Evert Duyckinck, eventually a committed literary nationalist: "Commencing his career in the metropolis as the lowliest adherent of a band of literary nationalists, he managed to carry his devotion to the cause to such extremes that even professional nationalists could not follow him." He was such a fanatic, Miller claims, that Duyckinck and Mathews "abandoned" him, "the only member of the band who had taken ["the war cry of Young America"] so seriously that he could still utter it with naive conviction." By August 1850, with literary Young America long dor-

[16]Neither does his physical handling of the manuscript: Duyckinck divided the essay into two installments by separating from the fair copy leaf 14 a revision patch previously affixed by Melville, retaining it as the concluding page of the first number. Melville's cut and paste was editorial and appears to represent the latest stage of revision; Duyckinck's cut and paste was publication oriented and coterminous with his notes to the compositor. If Duyckinck hadn't needed to publish the essay in two parts, his hand might have appeared on the manuscript only once, if at all; the leaf 15 revision appears synchronous with the publication-oriented inscriptions and something of an afterthought.

mant, Melville was suddenly prepared to "throw the gauntlet in the teeth of Duyckinck and Mathews."[17]

Despite its title, Miller's 1956 book *The Raven and The Whale: The War of Words and Wits in the Era of Poe and Melville* is only peripherally concerned with Herman Melville. Its chief focus is the Manhattan literary wars between Duyckinck and Matthews's Young America and the *Knickerbocker*'s Lewis Gaylord Clark. Possibly Melville's ancillary position in the narrative explains Miller's unfortunate lapse in regard to the relevant Melville documents.

Although it's clear that Miller glanced at the manuscript of "Hawthorne and His Mosses" when he examined the Duyckinck papers at the New York Public Library, he does not seem to have noticed, for example, that the fair copy is in Elizabeth Melville's hand or, for that matter, that it's a copy at all:

> The manuscript survives among Duyckinck's papers; it is written, obviously at top speed, with a thick pen, in a flowing hand. It is meticulously corrected, the interlineations done with a fine-pointed pen, with another ink. Most of the changes are merely verbal, but the major ones are all of a single tendency; they cut down or restrain the exuberant nationalism of the draft. Whether these changes came out of the conference that Sunday evening, or whether they are Melville's own concessions to moderation, they are obvious efforts to accommodate Melville's rage to the new, conciliatory tone Duyckinck had imparted to the *Literary World*.[18]

Miller's error is significant for two reasons. First, his mistaken impression that the "draft" manuscript is in Melville's hand constitutes the sum total of his evidence for the author's "raging" nationalism: "haste" equals "rage" equals conviction; ergo, Melville was a zealot. Miller labors under the unfortunate necessity of so portraying Melville on this occasion because, despite his wide search among the rubble of the literary wars, he was unable to produce even a single brickbat bearing Melville's fingerprints—other than the tardy salvo represented by the heavily revised passages in "Hawthorne and His Mosses."[19]

[17]Miller, *Raven and Whale*, pp. 4, 7, 286.

[18]Miller, *Raven and Whale*, pp. 285–86.

[19]The belatedness of this "literary nationalism" is a point underlined by the participant most neglected by masculinist accounts of the Berkshire festivities. In a preface to the first edition of *A New England Tale*, dated 30 March, 1822, Catharine Maria Sedgwick wrote that "The writer of this tale has made an humble effort to add something to the scanty stock of native American literature." Her note for the 1852 edition, reprinting the preceding forewords, begins with the wry admission, "The reason alleged in the first [prefaces] for the publication of the book is now rendered void by the immense and rapidly increasing mass of 'native American literature'" ([New York: G.P. Putnam, 1852], pp. 14–15).

Miller's carelessness in examining the fair-copy manuscript extends his hasty reading of Howard's account (hasty because Howard's narrative clearly points out that the essay was copied) and Leyda's log. Miller follows Leyda's unlikely original log dating of Sunday, 11 August ("*In the Melvill house M begins a critical essay*"): "On Sunday, while Mrs. Morewood kept the guests distracted, Melville wrote all day." At the critical juncture in his own account, Miller turns to Howard's ("the two editors of the *Literary World* went into conference with their author on the spot. They evidently decided . . .), even borrowing Howard's diction: "in the evening, evidently, he, Duyckinck, and Mathews held an editorial conference."[20]

This second point is of particular importance because the Northwestern-Newberry editors rely on Perry Miller's "judgment" as independent verification of Howard's conjecture—when, in fact, it's obvious that Miller only elaborates Howard's scenario, mistaking biographical guesswork for established fact. Miller knows substantially less, not more, than Howard about the only document that supports his view of Melville.

The scholarship of Howard and Miller has been widely and deservedly influential, and it's easy enough to see how Howard's notion regarding Duyckinck's intervention and Miller's suggestion that Melville's convictions were nationalist together produced the quandary that the NN scholars faced in editing this difficult and elusive essay. An important component of their difficulties, however, sprang from within.

Whereas the end of Howard's efforts is narrative, the end of NN's efforts is an authoritative text, construed as "a text that represents as nearly as possible the author's intentions," as reiterated by Tanselle in the note on the text in each of the NN volumes published to date. And yet—leaving aside for the present the question of external intervention—the manuscript evidence regarding intention in "Hawthorne and His Mosses" is at best shifting and contradictory. Even prior to the revisions, the chauvinist rhetoric of the fair copy testifies against itself. In one of the more boisterous passages, cut by Melville in revision (and restored by NN), the fair copy (leaf 14 1/2) reads: "For it will never do for us who in most other things out-do *as well as out brag* the world it will not do for us to fold our hands and say In the highest department

[20]Miller, *Raven and Whale*, p. 285.

[i.e., literature] advance there is none" (emphasis added). By issuing a nativist brag and deprecating that brag at the same time, this early-draft sentence forecasts the conflicts of the manuscript as they survive through its last revision. Assuming for the moment that the conflicting "intentions" expressed are exclusively Melville's, it seems impossible to resolve them textually, since we lack the foul papers that might, for example, indicate that the deprecation of the brag was a second thought or an editorial intervention. While the deprecation of native braggadocio reprises an important theme of *Mardi* and other works and is consistent with the revision trajectory, the rest of the sentence is in accord with the chauvinist sentiments of the fair copy: which sentiment, we must ask, did Melville mean to strike when he canceled the entire sentence?

NN's own teleology of intention, faced with the shifting and contradictory manuscript evidence of the essay, brings on a crisis of representation: "a text that *represents* as nearly as possible the author's intentions." Nowhere is NN's clear-text format more dramatically at odds with its mission than in this instance. If the authentic—the fullest, most eloquent—register of Melville's intentions for "Hawthorne and His Mosses" is the shifting evidence of its genesis, NN shoulders a representational task beyond the capacities of the clear-reading text, which inevitably portrays the complex and mobile intentions of the composition process as fixed and final. The clear-reading text places a teleological pressure on the NN editors even greater than that exerted on Leon Howard by the logic of narrative: circumscribed by a prescriptive philosophy of representation, the NN editors are driven to fix intention in a case where the manuscript and biographical evidence strongly suggest that intention remained fluid when the essay went to press.

The enlarged significance the NN editors assign to Duyckinck's hand on the manuscript is symptomatic of the pressure to ascertain a final intention. While they are prepared to discard Howard's idea that Duyckinck and Melville revised the manuscript together in conference, NN's editors cling to the notion that Duyckinck's single editorial intervention and his notations for the compositors somehow link him to Melville's elaborate antichauvinist revisions. In the notes to the essay, Tanselle characterizes Duyckinck's cancellation of the literary honor roll as "similar" to the antichauvinist revisions, then leaps to the hypothesis that "it seems more likely that in these revisions Melville was following (or anticipating) instructions than that he had changed his opinion." Hayford is more direct. In the Library of America edition, he declares that the essay reveals Duyckinck's "patent editorial *interference*" (emphasis added), a judgment he later elaborates, in a 1990 pam-

phlet, into the claim that Duyckinck "had a hand in the essay's writing." Parker similarly asserts in the NN *Moby-Dick* that Duyckinck "felt free" to "tone down some of Melville's extravagant literary nationalism."[21]

While Howard's and Miller's influential views naturally present themselves for consideration, NN's editors are not elsewhere shy of sharply dismissing the previous (or succeeding!) generation of Melville scholarship: it is not, finally, a question of Howard and Miller imposing themselves on NN, but of NN, driven by the quandary posed by its representational philosophy, reaching out to embrace Howard and Miller. This is obvious in NN's characterization of Howard's and Miller's scholarship as an "agreement as to Duyckinck's editorial intervention," when of course even Miller admits, in the passage quoted above, that the antichauvinist revisions probably resulted from Melville's own reconsideration.

This misreading of Miller's position is the unfortunate result of the burdens imposed upon the editor who accepts as his object the representation of (final) intention: if, in fact, Miller's mistaken impression that Melville wrote the essay in a "rage" were correct, and Melville subsequently moderated his rhetoric upon cooler review, NN's editors would be bound by their own representational philosophy to print the revisions in the clear text. In the doctrine of final intention, as articulated by Tanselle, the author never loses authority and culture has no agency; only persons have agency (on the hermetic model of personhood), so that an author's reconsiderations, where initiated traceably by persons, may be canceled, but those same reconsiderations, where initiated by culture, are required to stand.[22] Tanselle's rationale for treat-

[21]Tanselle, "General Note on the Text," NN 9:551; *Herman Melville: Pierre, etc.*, ed. Harrison Hayford (New York: Library of America, 1984), p. 1447; Harrison Hayford, "Melville's Monody: Really for Hawthorne?" (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1990), p. 36; Parker, "Historical Note: II," NN 6:614. In the "Historical Note" Parker vigorously defends the NN claim to the sincerity of Melville's literary nationalism, but in his introduction, "American Literature 1820–65," to the early nationalist section of *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, ed. Nina Baym et al. (New York: Norton, 1989), pp. 791–805, he takes the different line that Melville "half-champions and half-spoofs the chauvinist rhetoric in the essay" (p. 796).

[22]In addition to the previous citations, see G. Thomas Tanselle's *Rationale for Textual Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), p. 84. After listing the numerous sorts of influence an author experiences, Tanselle concludes "there is *another kind* of influence that occurs when someone reads or hears a text and makes recommendations for revision—sometimes gently, sometimes insistently—to the author. . . . This kind of influence ["outside influence"], directly affecting an already-formed passage, is the only kind an editor can try to counteract" (emphasis added).

ing authorial revisions privileges personal agency; thus the primary question becomes not what was done but whodunit: if Duyckinck was afraid of offending his literary friends or his readers and suggested that Melville change his manuscript, those changes may be canceled (even if Melville, on reconsideration, agreed with his publisher's recommendations); however, those same changes must stand if Melville made them for the identical, culturally inspired motives—only without the benefit of Duyckinck articulating them. The quest for intention, especially as it degenerates into speculations regarding agents of intervention, paradoxically, and finally unprofitably, draws attention to the essay's composition as a historical process while invalidating that historicity.

Howard and Miller become so important to the NN edition because they supply the useful hypothesis of Duyckinck's personal agency in the revision process, a fiction made necessary by the pressure to clarify Melville's intention, in satisfaction of the clear text. Unfortunately, this emphasis on the representation of a fixed and final intention obscures the most salient fact regarding Duyckinck's role in the essay's composition history: *Duyckinck most influenced the essay by intruding a deadline.* Far from demanding revisions of Melville, it seems obvious that—by virtue of his train schedule—Duyckinck instead forestalled them. The essay, though intermittently eloquent, is one of Melville's most disjointed prose efforts, the revisions appearing unfinished and incomplete by the standards of his other extant manuscripts. Despite line-by-line emendation, the revision trajectory seems not to have reached a logical terminus. An editor who had the courage of her convictions in seeking to represent Melville's intentions textually and teleologically would, then, follow the arc of that logic: she would *extend* the revision trajectory by canceling the remaining chauvinisms of the fair copy.

The repercussions of NN's approach to the essay spread throughout its edition, far beyond the text and commentary proper to "Hawthorne and His Mosses." It binds the editors to a developmental portrait of Melville that ignores overwhelming evidence indicating that, from the beginning of his career, Melville despised nationalist "brag," literary and otherwise, and simply steered entirely clear of the Manhattan literary wars.

In those few instances where he did address the concerns of literary

nationalism, he was pointedly critical: in chapter 180 of *Mardi* (written 1847–48; published 1849); in "Young America in Literature," book 17 of *Pierre* (1852); "The Fiddler" (1854); and in the "Epistle Dedicatory" of *John Marr and Other Sailors* (1888).[23] Most relevant to the present effort, since it substantially predates the composition of "Hawthorne and His Mosses," is *Mardi* chapter 180. It presents what amounts to a literary manifesto, one far more Melvillean than "Hawthorne and His Mosses," satirizes the New York literary scene, and parodies figures belonging to the Duyckinck circle to which Melville was supposedly enthralled.[24]

The effort to distill biography, even literary opinions, from literature has its pitfalls. While quoting extensively from *Mardi* chapter 180 in the historical note to the NN edition of *Moby-Dick*, Hershel Parker concedes that "in this chapter Melville lashed out at the New York literati." However, NN's need to shore up the Howard-Miller speculation regarding Duyckinck's intervention in "Hawthorne and His Mosses" more than two years later places Parker in the awkward position of exerting spin control: "Here Melville had declared his literary independence from the New York literati, including the Duyckinck clique, *but gaining it was another matter*" (emphasis added).[25]

NN's editorial policy toward the 1850 essay occasions an otherwise arbitrary developmental model of Melville's relationship to the New York literary nationalists, and all the signs of his "literary independence" prior to 1850 are discounted in the same fashion as is *Mardi* chapter 180. His 1848 refusal to review a particularly inept sailing tome for Duyckinck signifies, for NN's editors, that Melville had *begun* "resenting his assigned role."[26] Similarly, Melville's February 1849 letters to Duyckinck praising Emerson—which display a distinct independence of opinion (since the publisher disliked him)—are treated only in a

[23]Donald Yanella, who wrote his dissertation (Fordham) on Mathews, argues in "Writing the *'Other* Way,'" in *Companion to Melville Studies*, pp. 63–81, that Hautboy and Standard are parodies of Mathews and Duyckinck. The "Inscription Epistolary" to "John Marr" pokes fun at critical efforts to trace the national character of the author in his writing; like "Hawthorne and His Mosses," a series of late alterations to the heavily revised manuscript alienates some of its more extreme sentiments (in this case, ridicule) into the character of a third party (ms. Houghton Library, Harvard University).

[24]Herman Melville, *Mardi* (1849) (New York: Library of America, 1982). The great poet of chapter 180 directly addresses not only the thematic and biographical but also the textual issues of "Hawthorne and His Mosses," including manuscript revision: "It is *I* that stab false thoughts, ere hatched; *I* that pull down wall and tower, rejecting material which would make palaces for others" (p. 1260; emphasis added).

[25]NN 6:596.

[26]NN 6:594.

purely hypothetical version of Duyckinck's (lost) letter: "Duyckinck so primly reproached him [Melville] for his enthusiasm that he had to deny oscillating in Emerson's rainbow."[27] Melville's lengthy peroration to Emerson, clear evidence of his "independence," is suppressed, and an apparently good-natured exchange is converted into a small-minded attempt to secure Melville's apprenticeship to the New York literati.

The editorial policy toward "Hawthorne and His Mosses" both supports and is produced by a historical paradigm that sculpts NN's account of Melville's career around the chronological spike of the essay. The conceptual engine of this paradigm is the claim that the 1850–51 period of the making of *Moby-Dick* is the watershed of Melville's career; and that "Hawthorne and His Mosses" documents what they take to be the substance of that transformation, a flight from New York and uncertain literary fortunes to New England and the full flowering of his genius. Thus, Melville's independence from Duyckinck was merely "potential" before *Moby-Dick* and his paean to Hawthorne ("gaining it was another matter") and actual only afterward. It arbitrarily follows that the satire of Young America in *Mardi* doesn't have any substantial biographical significance; the similar satire in *Pierre* does. The refusal to review *The Romance of Yachting* doesn't mean anything; the refusal to write for *Holden's Dollar Magazine* does. The clear, strong portrait of Lombardo and his literary practices can't be Melville's literary manifesto; rather, "Only in ["Hawthorne and His Mosses"] does Melville exhibit anything approaching a developed rationale of the writer's art."[28] The text chronologically central to Melville's narrow span of highly productive years must also be philosophically central, NN's editors rationalize, and a few hours' worth of hack journalism written in response to his wildly mistaken first impression of Hawthorne's literary opinions becomes for NN the gold standard of Melville's literary thinking.

Reconsideration of both the manuscript's own testimony and the documentary evidence surrounding the circumstances of its production, however, drives almost inevitably to the conclusion that Melville's "intentions" for the essay, his motivation for putting pen to paper and his final intention alike, had almost nothing to do with literary nationalism.

[27]NN 6:597.
[28]NN 9:471.

The high profile imaginatively assigned to Evert Duyckinck in the making of the essay draws a veil over the figures of Cornelius Mathews and (most startlingly) Nathaniel Hawthorne. The unconsidered testimony by Fields, that Hawthorne gave out some stoutly Americanist opinions, provides an obvious motive for Melville, who was smitten with the New England mystical writer, to take up a similar line of argument over dinner. A perusal swift as Melville's own of the stories in Hawthorne's book suggests how easily Melville, familiar with the rhetoric of literary and political Young America but perhaps unaccustomed to ratiocinating in those terms, could have construed the stories in *Mosses from an Old Manse* as chauvinist and how he could have subsequently drafted "Hawthorne and His Mosses," if not as the "love letter" to Hawthorne that Edwin Haviland Miller describes, at least as a kind of letter of introduction, in which the anomalous nationalism reflects Melville's erroneous impression of Hawthorne's ideas.[29]

The manuscript evidence clearly suggests that Melville's operative intentions for the essay were personal: he wanted to make himself known to Nathaniel Hawthorne. Even as he constructed the fictional persona of the "Virginian spending July in Vermont," Melville provided unmistakeable clues to his identity by inserting nautical talk patently incompatible with the plantation persona, adding at leaf 14 the sentence "You must have plenty of sea-room to tell the Truth in," and at leaf 23 canceling the unremarkable "by all the gods of Greece" in favor of the trademark South-Sea pidgin, "by all the gods of Peedee." Such tell-tale revisions are deeply concerned not with the essay's politics but with its erotics, the leaf 23 substitution appearing in a paragraph featuring the admission that Hawthorne "shoots his strong New-England roots into the hot soil of my Southern soul" (previously written, "shoots his strong New-England roots into me"). It hardly seems necessary to point out that the term "root" continues to signify "penis" even in today's New England slang to see that Melville strongly resisted divorcing the essay from his personal feeling for Hawthorne. Once the Hawthornes had read the essay, Melville promptly revealed his authorship.

Melville was not similarly attached to the nationalist rhetoric of the early draft. Taking a pen to the fair copy, he moderated that rhetoric in every passage (virtually every sentence) where it appeared in accord with his unfolding understanding of Hawthorne's ideas. He alienated one of the grossest sentiments, previously written in the first person ("I stand by Pop Emmons and his 'Freddoniad' and till something better

[29]Edwin Haviland Miller, *Melville* (New York: Braziller, 1975), p. 30.

came along, swear it was not very far behind the Illiad") not only from the reviewer's persona but from the Virginian's and displaced it onto the character of "a hot-headed Carolina cousin." A genetic examination of this passage (leaf 15, beneath the revision patch) reveals at least four layers of emendation, each a qualification and distancing from the bumptious claims of the fair copy: the "hot-headed cousin" is first allowed to utter his support of Pop Emmons with a substantial reservation upon the fair copy: "**^'If there was no one else to stand by,' said he, 'why then, I would^** stand by Pop Emmons and his 'Fredoniad' [Freddoniad now corrected]. . . ." Melville subsequently revised the "hot-head's" opinion by inserting the qualification: "If there was no **^other American^** to stand by **^in literature^**," eventually canceling the qualification "other American" and the title of Homer's epic from the second term of his comparison ("swear it was not very far behind **/the Illiad/**"), probably intending to substitute some other work. Finally, Melville canceled the entire line "'Fredoniad,' and till something better came along" and determined to paste in a revision patch that contains all of the qualifications described above, and several more. It is clear he was still composing as he wrote the revision patch: as he began to reinscribe the phrase "& till something better came along," he interrupted himself after writing the word "something" but before he got to the word "came" and hedged further, actually writing, "& till [canceled: something] [inserted with caret: **a**] better **epic** came along, swear it was not very far behind the Illiad." Melville somewhat despairingly concluded the revision patch with the sentence "**Take away the words, & in spirit he was sound.**"

It's possible, from the psychological standpoint, to look at Melville's failure to "take away the words" and completely eradicate the offensive nationalism as an excresence of the essay's erotics: Melville's discourse necessarily retains traces of the terms in which he and Hawthorne conversed while forging a relationship, their eyes meeting across the dinner table. Although it is also possible to extend Michael Rogin's view of Melville's subversion of political rhetoric, that is, to argue that Melville displayed literary-nationalist rhetoric only to subvert it, it seems more likely in this instance that Melville's early intentions were vehicular rather than satiric: the distinct (though by no means total) consistency of the nationalist central portion of the early draft suggests that at first the nationalism served some valuable purpose for which Melville deemed it inappropriate by the revision stage. In the essay's concluding section, which represents itself as having been written twenty-four hours after the earlier pages, Melville claims not to have previously

read "A Select Party," and he cites the story—in which Hawthorne satirizes the idea that "there can never be an American genius" and simultaneously lampoons the alternate brag that the "first original work" of that genius "shall do all that remains to be achieved of our glory among nations"—as one of the reasons he has found it necessary to reconsider the "first simplicity" of his conclusions regarding Hawthorne. Melville's revisions, in this context, have the appearance of attempting both to moderate prior (mis)readings and, somewhat belatedly, to cloak others in the rarified irony achieved in Hawthorne's story.

In the same year that Edwin Haviland Miller issued his biography of Melville, Marvin Fisher, although somewhat inconsistently arguing for Melville's sincerity, perspicaciously suggested that his "flagrant nationalism" is a sort of masking device: "his hostility to English dominance over American cultural expression protects him from charges of blasphemy and allied excesses." It is illuminating to place Miller's characterization of Melville's intense homosexual feeling for Hawthorne alongside Fisher's statement that in the essay "Melville has repeated enough cultural pieties to cover his possible impieties and *there is more means than end* in his waving the flag, invoking the Bible, citing the way of nature, or applauding Shakespeare" (emphasis added).[30] Nationalism of the literary and political variety provided the most pervasive of the essay's original *topoi* (which is perhaps the reason why, upon reconsideration, Melville found it impossible to eradicate) but that does not necessarily imply that nationalism participated in the essay's *telos*. Perhaps a version of what Eve Sedgwick has described as "homosexual panic" was in an early draft masked in nationalist excess.

Once the essay's nationalism is understood as a mask rather than its essence, inquiry shifts from the pressing question of Melville's nationalism to the more arcane pursit of the sources of his borrowed language. The most immediate of these sources is, of course, Hawthorne's book and the published criticisms of it to which the essay addresses itself, such as Poe's November 1847 *Godey's Lady's Book* review, which levels the charge that Hawthorne "is peculiar and *not* original" (emphasis in the original), an imitator of German romanticism in his

[30]Marvin Fisher, "Portrait of the Artist in America," chap. 1 of *Going Under: Melville's Short Fiction and the American 1850s* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), p. 9.

consistent development of peculiar effects; Melville's essay answers, "mark it well, imitation is the first charge brought against real originality."[31] The present question, however, is of the possible intervention or collaboration of literary Young America in the persons of Melville's houseguests.

On the face of it, from a literary-detective point of view, Evert Duyckinck makes a far less satisfactory suspect than Cornelius Mathews. Duyckinck was not involved in the conflict with Holmes; he was by nature politic, compromising, and for the most part reluctant to interfere with the literary production of his friends; he was at the Berkshire idyll more socially and literarily occupied than either Melville or Mathews, who would have been for that week much thrown into each other's company. Apparently all of the week's social events were instigated by Duyckinck, who carried on an extensive correspondence during his stay and yet managed to make some progress in his scheme to excerpt Wordsworth's 1850 *Prelude*. It seems that Melville, by contrast, had set aside his whale book for the duration of the visit, and the notoriously underemployed Mathews was free for the holiday precisely because his latest venture was in the process of financial reorganization. Mathews was involved in the tussle with Holmes—probably precipitated it—and he, not Melville, was the object of Holmes's satire in his reading of *Astrea* to the Yale Divinity School on 14 August, the poem lampooning Manhattan scholar-critics in the person of a figure recognizably Mathews.

In addition, Mathews's explosive and argumentative temperament was, as Melville's portrait of him in *Mardi*, chapter 180, reveals, just that of one who would offer to intervene in his friends' literary labors. In the following passage, the poet Lombardo asks his literary acquaintances to comment on his work. The Duyckinck figure (Hauto) cautiously encourages Lombardo "not to be cast down, it was pretty good"; only the Mathews figure actually marks the manuscript: the character Pollo,

> conscious his opinion was sought, was thereby puffed up; and marking the faltering of Lombardo's voice, when the manuscript was handed him, straightway concluded, that the man who stood thus trembling at the bar, must needs be inferior to the judge. But his verdict was mild. After sitting up all night over the work; and diligently taking notes:—"Lombardo, my friend! here, take your sheets, I have run through them loosely. You might have done better; but then

[31]Edgar Allan Poe, *Essays and Reviews* (New York: Library of America, 1984), pp. 577–88.

you might have done worse. Take them, my friend; I have put in some good things for you."[32]

The lawyerly "puffed up" figure of "Pollo" strongly suggests the bantam Mathews, sporadically practicing attorney and author of *Puffer Hopkins* (the figure by which he was known in New York literary circles, as Melville was known by the moniker "Typee"). The *pollo,* or rooster, is the novel's figure for Vivenza's (America's) braggarts, scolded by the narrator in chapter 146: "As an army of spurred and crested roosters, her people chanticleered at the resplendent rising of their sun."[33] The militarism of the image is consistent with the Mardian allegory but also plays upon Mathews's favorite epithet for himself, "the Centurion." Part of the point of the satire is that the Mathews character, while claiming to have only loosely examined his friend's work, has in fact offered extensive emendations: it was distinctly Melville's view of Mathews that he had the temperament, if given the opportunity, to take a friend's manuscript and "put in some good things."

With suspect in hand, marked by motive, character, and modus operandi, the assiduous literary detective searches for evidence of opportunity, soon discovered in the missing foul papers. Given the assumption of agented intervention that governs the Howard-Miller-NN prosecution of the essay's composition history, perhaps the oddest oversight is their shared confidence in Melville's exclusive authorship of the foul papers. Indeed, it would seem that, *prima facie,* from the investigatorial point of view, the fair-copy manuscript, in Elizabeth Shaw Melville's hand, has less authority than the autograph revisions. In this atmosphere of suspicion, the fair copy appears to draw its legitimacy chiefly from the revisions: the extensive line-by-line emendations in his hand give Melville's imprimatur to sentences that, for all we know, were not originally drafted by him.

Finally, we look for evidence of Mathews's intervention, evidence that, of necessity, must be circumstantial: in the absence of the foul papers, we cannot know that Mathews *wrote* on them. But certainly he talked to Melville: W. A. Butler's recollection of the Berkshire events led him to speculate that the windy nocturnal exchanges under Melville's roof would swiftly see print: "doubtless many lucubrations have been hatched into life . . . to be food for publishers and critics in the Fall."[34] Melville's correspondence reveals that a studio model of

[32]Melville, *Mardi,* p. 1259.

[33]Melville, *Mardi,* p. 1129.

[34]William Allen Butler's column for the *Weekly National Intelligencer,* 31 August 1850; reprinted by Leyda, *Log,* p. 390.

literary collaboration took form in his mind that autumn: he facetiously wrote Duyckinck to search for "fifty fast-writing youths" to help him realize his literary plans.[35]

Two lines of research support the notion that some of Mathews's talk found its way into Melville's essay. The first, something of a reach, is Elizabeth Barrett's writings to and about Mathews, including: a review of his "Poems on Man," published some years earlier; the preface to the American edition of her own "Drama of Exile," of approximately the same period; and her private correspondence with Mathews, portions of which the recipient had somewhat more recently lent to the English rogue and litterateur Thomas Powell.[36] That Miss Barrett's review of 1845, published in *Tait's Edinburgh Review,* should have any relation to Melville's essay seems unlikely, except that we know Barrett featured sufficiently prominently in Mathews's talk that week for him to send Mrs. Melville an autograph of the English poet's "Cry of the Human" upon his return to New York and that he had a penchant for retailing laudatory views of himself.[37]

The *Tait's* review, which Mathews may have mentioned in defending himself against Holmes's charges, is a case in point of a phenomenon described on leaf 16 of the Melville fair copy: "American authors have received more just and discriminating praise however loftily & ridiculously given even from some Englishmen than from our own countrymen." In their correspondence, Barrett compliments the "unemasculated life" of Mathews's poetry: his poems "have more strength, fiber, bone and muscle than any American poetry I ever read in my life," she proclaims. The review develops this theme in such a way that rugged masculinity serves as a register of the poetry's success in achiev-

[35]Herman Melville to Evert Duyckinck, 13 December 1850, NN 14: *Correspondence,* ed. Lynn Horth (1993), p. 174.

[36]The *Tait's* review is reprinted, along with a transcript of the manuscript and numerous excerpts from the Mathews-Barrett correspondence, in Robert W. Gladish's monograph, "Elizabeth Barrett and the 'Centurion,'" *Baylor Browning Interests* 23 (January 1973).

[37]Mathews's accompanying note to Mrs. Melville describes the poem manuscript as an "autograph" (both items at Houghton Library). If this is true, the gift represented the furthest possible expression of Mathews's gratitude. He disposed of his Barrett autograph manuscripts carefully, almost always in recognition of literary or financial services; most often his Barrett items went to Duyckinck in recognition of Duyckinck's frequent gifts of money (see their correspondence, New York Public Library). Since Duyckinck on this occasion saw fit to express his thanks for the week's hospitality through her husband, it is tempting to speculate that Mathews, who wrote separately to the husband (the letter does not survive) perhaps owed this note and gift particularly to Elizabeth Melville because the foul papers of the essay she copied had some of his "good things" on them. "Hawthorne and His Mosses" appears to be the only one of Melville's contributions to the *Literary World* known to have been fair-copied by anyone other than himself.

ing a distinctly national character: gently criticizing Lowell and the "Longfellows" and "Whittiers" as imitators of English tradition, Barrett writes that "in speaking even of some of these, the English critic feels unawares that he would fain clasp the hand of an American poet, with stronger muscles in it, and less softened by the bath." As a remedy for a "defective nationality" marked by overflowing "grace and facility," she recommends Mathews's poems, which she finds "remarkable . . . for their very defects. . . . They are not graceful, but they are strong." Noting that "he writes not only 'like a man,' but like a republican and an American," she concludes that "Under this rough bark, is a heart of oak . . . and, if gnarled and knotted, these are the conditions of strength, and perhaps the convulsions of growth." In developing his portrait of the American author as "a man who is bound to carry republican progressiveness into Literature, as well as into Life," Melville, in the most pugnacious paragraph of the fair copy (leaves 16–18), derides the "graceful," "smooth pleasing" native poets who imitate the English. "No American writer should write like an Englishman," he continues. "Let him write like a man, for then he will be sure to write like an American. . . . Let us boldly contemn all imitation, though it comes to us graceful and fragrant as the morning And foster all originality though it be crabbed and ugly as our own pine knots."

It is not necessary to argue that Mathews carried around a tattered clipping of the *Tait's* review, or even that the general terms of Barrett's praise—apparently the chief fruits of his long efforts to reach the English market—were ready to his memory; it is only necessary to see this sampling of numerous shared topoi, concentrated into a single paragraph of Melville's essay, as evidence that Melville did not invent the language of the nationalistic fair copy but abruptly and anomalously, under some pressure, drew upon a fund of transatlantic cultural currency—with Mathews, possibly, acting as broker.

The second line of research, chronologically more alluring, is Mathews's own literary labor that summer. In 1850, he launched *The Prompter,* a theatrical review of the sort that Mathews and Melville appear to have once planned to produce in partnership.[38] Only seven numbers were published, four before the Berkshire episode and three after (renamed, under reorganization, with Mathews's name removed from the masthead, *The Prompter's Whistle*). The first issue, of 1 June, employs a version of the famous "shock of recognition" trope that ap-

[38]Cornelius Mathews, ed. *The Prompter* (New York: W. Taylor & Co), continued as *The Prompter's Whistle* (New York: S. French): biweekly, with interruptions; seven issues 1 June–21 September 1850. All quotations from Evert Duyckinck's bound set, Duyckinck Collection, but held separately in the drama collection at Lincoln Center.

pears in Melville's essay, Mathews's article recounting an episode in which a spectator falls back "as if he had received a sudden shock from an electric battery."[39] (Variations of the transmitted electric shock analogy were current in the romantic school of English acting.) The second and third issues, of 15 June and 1 July, complain of the English actors, managers, and plays dominating the New York dramatic scene. The third issue quotes Coleridge on Shakespeare, "By its nationality must every nation retain its independence" and, in reviewing James Fenimore Cooper's comedy "Upside Down," refutes his 1825 claim that America was incapable of producing a great dramatic artist ("Of dramatic authors there are none, or next to none," because there is "too much foreign competition and too much domestic employment in other pursuits, to invite genius to so doubtful an enterprise"). Mathews vigorously repudiates this assertion; leaf 13 of Melville's fair copy chimes in, "Believe me, my friends that Shakespeares are this day being born on the banks of the Ohio." Strong as the transatlantic influence was in poetry, novels, and magazine publication, it was at this time (and would remain for decades) strongest on the stage; perhaps this fact leads Mathews, whose chauvinism did not usually take the form of anglophobia or gross political expansionism, to make, in the third issue, one of the most forceful charges of his career: "Are we then to stand by and see love-sick plays—and the effete triflings of alien pens—pioneering us, wherever we extend our conquests and acquisitions[?]"[40] Interestingly, this rare instance of Mathews uncritically deploying the rhetoric of manifest destiny is synchronous with what is possibly the single (overt and possibly "intended") instance of a similarly uncritical deployment by Melville. With his subsequent punctuation retained for clarity, leaf 17 of the fair copy reads: "While we are rapidly preparing for that political supremacy among the nations, which prophetically awaits us at the close of the present century; in a literary point of view, we are deplorably unprepared for it; and we seem studious to remain so."

The fourth issue, dated 5 August, which Mathews would have sent to

[39]Mathews, *Prompter*, 1 June 1850, p. 2.

[40]Mathews, *Prompter*, 1 July 1850, p. 65. Many histories of the New York *litterateurs* fail to contrast literary nationalists such as Mathews with political-nationalist novelists such as E. Z. C. Judson ("Ned Buntline"), whose cheap city-mysteries serials sold widely (and internationally): the result is that Mathews, who was much more akin to the Knickerbockers who ridiculed him than he was to Buntline, fills the cultural void in these accounts. For purposes of contrast to Melville, Mathews takes on the character of a hack chauvinist-sensationalist, which he most emphatically was not. While Judson was jailed for a year in consequence of his Know-Nothing agitation of the chauvinist Astor Place riots, Mathews—as well as Duyckinck, Melville, and the Knickerbocker crowd—signed a petition pleading for peace.

press just before taking the train to Pittsfield, promotes Taylor's (the *Prompter*'s publisher) cheap edition of Shakespeare ("with Editorial Introductions, by Cornelius Mathews") and closes the issue with a squib that closely connects Mathews with the most important not immediately nationalist *topos* of Melville's essay:

> If any author deserved the name of *original,* it was *Shakespeare.* Homer himself drew not his art so immediately from the fountains of nature; it proceeded through Egyptian strainers and channels, and came to him not without some tincture of his learning, or some cast of the models of those before him. [Emphasis in the original][41]

Questions of originality and the imitation of precursors traverse Melville's essay and are only subordinately cast in national terms. The essay takes up, elaborates, and responds to the idea proffered by Mathews's squib (a quotation: the epigraph begins with inverted commas but does not conclude with them), that Shakespeare's originality consists in his drawing his art "immediately from the fountains of nature." Leaf 10 of the fair copy develops the idea in characteristically Melvillean language: "it is those deep 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, Shakespeare."

The first issue of *The Prompter's Whistle* to appear following the Berkshire events seems to show Mathews borrowing and elaborating one of Melville's points about Shakespeare. Leaf 13 of the Melville fair copy reads:

> The great mistake seems to be, that even with those Americans who look forward for the coming of a great genius among us, they somehow fancy he will come in the costume of Queen Elizabeth's day be a writer of dramas founded upon old English history or the tales of Boccaccio Whereas great geniuses are parts of the times they themselves are the times and possess a correspondent coloring

Mathews's 31 August issue responds "Who are the successful Dramatists of our day? Precisely those who do not imitate the Elizabethan form." Of Shakespeare and Racine, Mathews adds, "If they were born in this century, they would not adopt the tone of two centuries past, but do now what they did then, reflect their age."[42] Mathews's post-idyll articles continue to enact, elaborate, and grapple with the conflicts ev-

[41]Mathews, *Prompter,* 5 August 1850, p. 96.

[42]Mathews, *Prompter's Whistle,* 31 August 1850, pp. 7–10.

ident in (and between) the midsummer writing of both authors. Most likely, of course, the startling correspondence between their efforts illustrates something more like an intertextuality, something less traceable and yet more tangible than simple influence or "intervention." In keeping with the Melville essay's enthusiastic elaboration of a fraternal model of shared genius (Shakespeare, for example, "cannot be regarded as in himself the concretion of all the genius of his time"), Mathews's participation in the genius of the moment that generated the "Mosses" essay can be confidently asserted.

The case for Mathews's scribal involvement with an early draft of Melville's essay, of course, is far from conclusive. But if it casts some small doubt on the paternity of the anomalous anglophobia, chauvinism, and expansionism that characterize the fair copy, perhaps it casts a more substantial doubt on the effort to assign such a paternity. The nationalisms of the early draft should be read—if not edited—structurally, or genetically, rather than teleologically, as not signified but themselves signifying, vehicle rather than destination. Where final authorial intention on the question of chauvinism is desired, it should be found in the late revisions, which consistently, overwhelmingly, meticulously work against the grain of the earlier composition (if not, at last, entirely successfully, until Evert Duyckinck took the still fluid essay with him to New York and the typesetter). If, on the evidence of the hasty expressions of the fair copy, it is at all necessary to convict Melville of holding nationalist views for a period of time, it cannot be for the duration of the period in which he composed *Moby-Dick*—still less for the whole of his New York career—but only for a few days in August 1850, while he labored under a mistaken impression he had formed of the charismatic Hawthorne. The essay does not need to be re-edited so much as it needs to be re-imagined: it is worth considering whether seventy-two hours of misplaced enthusiasm make Melville a literary nationalist.[43]

[43]As this essay was going to press, Julian Markels's critique of the NN edition of *Moby-Dick* appeared ("The *Moby-Dick* White Elephant," *American Literature* 66 [March 1994]: 105–22). Sharply critical of the edition as "unwittingly self-serving" (p. 106), Markels writes approvingly of Tanselle's textual practices while complaining of the content of the lengthy notes appended by Hayford and Parker.

P. Marc Bousquet, *a Gilleece Fellow at the City University of New York Graduate School, is presently completing his doctoral dissertation, "The Pleasure Room: Theatricality and American Individualism, 1825–1917."*