This volume inaugurates the New Cambridge Companion series at a time when Melville is more vital than ever in American literary studies. Since the publication of The Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville (1998), there have been new biographies by Hershel Parker and Andrew Delbanco, discoveries about Melville’s process of composition and revision, an increasing interest in Melville the poet, and an abundance of new books on literary and cultural matters ranging from Melville’s literary friendship with Nathaniel Hawthorne to his less obvious connections with Frederick Douglass. Melville as a writer and cultural figure remains crucial to conversations in American literary studies on sexuality, race, travel, religion, literary traditions, and transatlanticism; and over the past fifteen years Melville’s writings have become central to discussions of transnationalism, ecocriticism, posthumanism, imperial politics, and aesthetics. Melville is more vital than ever outside of the academy as well. In the wake of 9/11, Moby-Dick was invoked by numerous cultural commentators for its prescient insights into imperialism, globalization, and America’s role in Afghanistan (Ishmael’s inclusion of “BLOODY BATTLE IN AFGHANISTAN” in the “grand programme of Providence that was drawn up a long time ago”[MD 7] could not help but haunt). In the wake of the financial crisis of 2007–2008 and the Great Recession of 2009 to the present, the Occupy movement adopted “Bartleby, the Scrivener” as its sacred text for the tale’s seemingly prophetic account of passive resistance to Wall Street. And, as ever, Melville attracts new generations of readers with his artistry. His presence can be felt in popular culture, and not only at the coffee shops named after the Pequod’s first mate. Community readings of Moby-Dick have become increasingly common; a New York trade house recently published an internationally popular book on why we should all read Moby-Dick; film and TV adaptations of Moby-Dick are in the offing; and the forty-fourth president of the United States lists Moby-Dick on his Facebook page as one of his two favorite novels. Novelists and visual artists at their most ambitious regularly find...
inspiration in *Moby-Dick* and other of Melville’s works, and a brilliant operatic version of *Moby-Dick* has taken the music world by storm. Though it is probably true, as John Bryant writes in his essay in this volume, that Melville tends to be equated with *Moby-Dick*, and that the many who make that equation have not actually read the novel (but have instead encountered it via film, popular culture references, and comic books), this is not to diminish the impact Melville’s writings continue to have on our literary and cultural moment.

It is time for a *New Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville*, a book for the twenty-first century that situates Melville in relation to current critical conversations and develops new perspectives on reading and interpreting the full range of his writings. Though you will encounter endnotes in this volume, it has been conceived for the widest possible audience. It is my hope that in addition to contributing to interpretive discussions among those who write about and teach Melville, this *Companion* will also speak to the many who (rightly) regard Melville as having a vibrant connection to the world outside of the classroom. This volume has essays on topics ranging from democracy to art history, and on such fundamental matters as the challenges of reading *Moby-Dick* and the relatively neglected great poetry. As a group, all of the contributors pay close attention to Melville’s art, taking Melville’s work as their most important guide, even as they assume the function of guides themselves.

Because this is my second tour of duty as an editor of a Melville *Companion*, it might be useful to offer a quick consideration of the two complementary collections. The 1998 *Companion*, like any such work, was of its time, and at the time (the mid-1990s, when contributors were writing their essays) the New Historicism and other historicist approaches were in the ascendency. That collection includes essays on Melville and race, Melville and social class, Melville and gender, Melville and slavery, Melville and sexuality, along with essays that consider Melville in relation to Victorian culture and religion. New Historicists tend to implicate authors in the power structures of their culture, but in that volume, as in this, Melville is accorded considerable privilege as a writer who could understand and critique his culture as well as any historicist critic.

In this 2013 *New Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville*, essays are also organized around key topics, but a glance at the table of contents will reveal that this collection is a bit quirkier and the topics more varied. In the spirit of Timothy Marr’s essay on “Melville’s Planetary Compass,” this volume offers a much wider compass, addressing the oceans, the non-human, art history, biography, digital humanities, philosophical skepticism, legal judgment, political theory, the problematics of reading, print culture
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and book history, along with sexuality (now addressed from the perspective of queer studies) and slavery (now addressed from a legal perspective). In significant ways, this new Companion responds to two large impulses in recent American literary studies: an increased questioning of nation-based models of literary study and a renewed interest in the aesthetic. The last fifteen years have seen a turn in American literary studies from nationalist to more expansive hemispheric, transnational, and global approaches. Likewise in Melville studies, we increasingly have a Melville who is something more than an “American” author. I credit this critical turn to developments both inside and outside the academy. Within the academy, there has been much interest in interdisciplinarity, which has had the inevitable impact of challenging the insularity of national study. Outside the academy, the events of 9/11, the global financial crisis, and the impact of the Internet on all aspects of life, including research, have revealed with stark clarity that nations simply do not and cannot exist in isolation. Perhaps in response to several decades of historicist study, canon busting, and now globalization (which can sometimes make the literary a subordinate player in the flow of peoples, capital, and ideas), a number of critics have begun to pay renewed attention to matters of form, language, and reading. The impact of the aesthetic turn within American literary studies can best been seen in this volume in Samuel Otter’s essay on Moby-Dick, which addresses the broad and sometimes neglected interconnections between form and content in Melville’s art. But aesthetic issues are central to all of the essays in this collection, for the good reason that it is nearly impossible to write about Melville without coming under the sway of his language. In some respects, the return to the “old” – form, language, and aesthetics – is something “new” in this New Companion.

The fifteen chapters of The New Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville survey a wide range of material and explore Melville’s writings from a variety of perspectives. The volume begins with three chapters that provide a foundation for what follows, focusing on major concerns of Melville’s fiction: nature (specifically animal and plant life), oceans, and democracy. These chapters are followed by seven chapters that consider Melville’s writings chronologically from his early sea fiction (with a focus on White-Jacket), to the celebrated works of the 1850s (Moby-Dick, Pierre, The Confidence-Man, and the magazine fiction), to the poetry (Battle-Pieces through Timoleon), and finally to the posthumously published Billy Budd. The volume concludes with three interpretive chapters on key aspects of Melville’s overall career, from Typee to Billy Budd, followed by two chapters – on biography and criticism, respectively – that look to the future of Melville studies.
The opening essay, Geoffrey Sanborn’s “Melville and the Nonhuman World,” depicts a Melville who is interested in communicating with trees, horses, cows, and other forms of nonhuman life through what Sanborn terms a “mutual summoning.” Drawing on recent work in animal studies, sustainability studies, and other ecologically centered critical movements, and adducing examples from numerous texts by Melville, Sanborn portrays an author whose writings are exclamatory, responsive, and charged with a vital sense of life. Sanborn’s focus text is Melville’s sketch “Cock-A-Doodle-Doo!” (1853), which has at its center the narrator’s responsiveness to a crowing cock. Loud as it may be, the cock bears close connections to other forms of nonhuman life in Melville’s writing, including quieter whales.

Hester Blum’s “Melville and Oceanic Studies” takes the reader to the locale of whales and the seamen who pursue them, and of course to the setting of much of Melville’s fiction. Attending to the emerging field of oceanic studies, Blum discusses how the oceans’ watery worlds can dissolve national identifications while stimulating new ways of thinking about citizenship, economics, and identity. As Blum shows through her readings of *Moby-Dick*, “Benito Cereno,” and (surprisingly) the land-bound *Pierre*, the fluid world of the ocean provides opportunities for political and ontological reorientations, as well as formal experimentation. In her essay on “Democracy and Melville’s Aesthetics,” Jennifer Greiman considers Melville’s representations of democracy on land and at sea – and on rivers, too. The subject of democracy is hardly new to Melville studies, and in Greiman’s essay there’s a refreshing turn to the “old”: an effort to read Melville’s political philosophy of democracy through the lens of Alexis de Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America* (1840). But the essay is also informed by Greiman’s engagement with recent debates in political theory. Like all of the writers in this volume, she is interested in aesthetics, and in her account of Melville’s astonishingly wide and varied approaches to democracy, she discerns a poetics of democracy in Melville’s fiction that makes use of three recurring rhetorical figures: circles, colors, and rivers.

With Jeannine Marie DeLombard’s essay on *White-Jacket*, we turn to a series of essays that for the most part examine single works and follow the course of Melville’s unfolding career. In “White-Jacket: Telling Who Is – and Aint – a Slave,” DeLombard makes the bold claim that the relatively neglected *White-Jacket*, more than the canonical “Benito Cereno,” constitutes Melville’s most profound statement on slavery. Picking up on Ishmael’s famous declaration in *Moby-Dick* – “Who aint a slave? Tell me that” *(MD 6)* – DeLombard examines *White-Jacket* in the context of the sometimes competing and sometimes overlapping antislavery and sailors’ rights movements, both of which called attention to the horrors of flogging. Like Gregg
Crane in his essay on *Billy Budd* later in the volume, she works with a law and literature approach, showing how *White-Jacket* absorbs and responds to legal rhetoric about seamen and slaves. The law, as both DeLombard and Crane make clear, is about the problem of interpretation, or reading, and reading is given center stage in Samuel Otter’s “Reading *Moby-Dick*.” After several decades of criticism that has analyzed *Moby-Dick* in various discursive contexts, Otter urges us to reengage such essential matters as form, language, and genre. Working against the grain of the New Historicism, Otter shows how *Moby-Dick* “flouts the choice between form and history” and is “distinguished by an elaborate reflexivity … that ties its meanings to its materiality.” In a short essay that cannot hope to take in all of *Moby-Dick*, Otter concentrates on what can appear to be the paradoxical claim that the novel gives form to formlessness, finding in the novel’s depiction of the squid a key locus for Melville’s thinking about textuality and reading.

Wyn Kelley takes up the question of how to read the enigmatic Pierre (the character) in her “*Pierre, Life History, and the Obscure*.” She addresses an issue that Maurice S. Lee and Michael D. Snediker discuss in their essays as well: that Melville’s characters often seem unreal and not even “characters” in the nineteenth-century realist understanding of what characters are supposed to be. Surprisingly, Kelley argues, Melville drew on popular biographies of the time for his portrayal of the eponymous hero of *Pierre*, crafting a character who seems all the more unknowable and unreal when thought of in relation to the (auto)biographical writings of Mason Locke Weems, Ben Franklin, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Frederick Douglass. *Pierre* suggests that one can perhaps best begin to know a life by not knowing it, at least in the conventional ways of biography. One year after publishing *Pierre*, Melville created perhaps his most unknowable character in the figure of Bartleby. In “‘Bartleby’ and the Magazine Fiction,” Graham Thompson presents the magazine world of Melville’s time not only as an important context for understanding “Bartleby,” but also as that which can help us to read “Bartleby.” Returning us to the November 1853 print context of the story, which first appeared in *Putnam’s Monthly Magazine*, Thompson challenges those who view “Bartleby” as transcending the contingencies of magazine writing and publishing. For Thompson, the nature of the magazines Melville was writing for during the mid-1850s, and the tropes circulating in those magazines (such as figures of lawyers and clerks), are crucial to the meaning of the story. Even so, the character of Bartleby remains as enigmatic as ever, and thus relatively easy to appropriate as a sort of spokesperson for whatever one might prefer not to do.

*The Confidence-Man* is one of Melville’s most enigmatic works, but as Maurice S. Lee explains in “Skepticism and *The Confidence-Man*,” enigma
and difficulty are integral to the novel's philosophical ambitions to address questions of identity, perception, and the bases of moral judgment. The novel, Lee suggests, is Melville's purest expression of his interest in skepticism, particularly as mediated through his reading of Descartes. Like a number of the contributors, Lee regards Melville as an experimental writer who in *The Confidence-Man* explores fictions of personhood. The novel's difficulties and inconsistencies, he concludes, speak to the challenge of trying to keep faith in a world that can seem beyond one's grasp. Or perhaps the novel speaks to Melville’s loss of faith in fiction, for after publishing the novel Melville turned almost exclusively to writing poetry. His approximately thirty-five-year career as a poet far outweighs his approximately ten-year-career as a fiction writer, and yet, as Elizabeth Renker notes in her essay on “Melville the Poet in the Postbellum World,” most readers of Melville know little about his poetry. Renker laments the relative neglect of the poetry, which she, along with a number of recent critics, regards as among Melville’s greatest literary achievements. As Renker shows in her wide-ranging essay, Melville was fully engaged with the poetry world of the nineteenth century and was writing at a time when poetry was central to the lives of many Americans. Rather than viewing Melville in the late 1850s as “retreating” from fiction to poetry, she sees him as choosing to work in a genre that placed him in an even closer relation to his culture; and though she allows that Melville was committed to a poetics of difficulty, she nonetheless demonstrates through close reading that the poetry is both accessible and moving. Melville the poet continues to await the many readers he deserves.

*Billy Budd* had no readers in Melville’s lifetime because the novella was still in manuscript at his death in 1891. A work that combines his interest in prose and poetry (the novella was inspired by the poem that Melville placed at the end of the manuscript), *Billy Budd* first appeared in 1924, at the time of the Melville revival (when Melville at long last was being discovered by modernist critics), and quickly became canonical. Like the poetry and much of Melville’s fiction, *Billy Budd* is richly allusive, difficult, and resistant to interpretation. In “Judgment in *Billy Budd,*” Gregg Crane responds to the novella’s interpretive difficulties by reading it in a law and literature context, asking us to think about the novella in relation to contemporaneous juridical and philosophical writings on intuition. Putting the novella in conversation with the writings of William James and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Crane makes a case for moving beyond the binary of acceptance and resistance that has dominated discussions of Vere’s decision to execute Billy Budd. Consistent with Otter’s essay on *Moby-Dick,* Crane underscores the crucial role of reading in the act of judgment.
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Turning from discussions of specific works and the poetry, the next three essays in the volume address Melville’s broader corpus from varied critical perspectives. In “Melville and Queerness without Character,” Michael D. Snediker views Melville’s writings through the optics of queer theory, which he differentiates from gay studies. Queerness can be about, or not about, sexual desire; the emphasis is more on departures from normativity, which Snediker discerns in Melville’s unreal (queer) characterizations. Because Melville’s characters often don’t seem “real,” then it might be odd to think about them as somehow possessing corporeal desire. Then again, given Moby-Dick’s “A Squeeze of the Hand” chapter and the account of Ishmael and Queequeg sleeping together as “a cosy, loving pair” (MD 52), to name just two of the many homoerotic-seeming moments in Melville’s writings, it’s difficult to ignore homoerotic sexuality. But after taking such moments into account, Snediker reads Melville’s characters as “irresolvable aesthetic problems” rather than mimetic representations of people. Melville, Snediker observes, anticipated some of the major insights of queer studies by locating pleasure apart from particular sexual acts, and even regarding pleasure (in language) as an aesthetic category of its own. Aesthetic issues are also essential to Elisa Tamarkin’s discussion of Melville as a theorist of vision. Though her essay, “Melville with Pictures,” considers some of Melville’s fiction, her focus is on the writings that followed his 1857 travels to Italy, Turkey, Greece, Palestine, and Egypt, where he developed his great passion for art. Thus, like Elizabeth Renker, she mainly discusses the poetry of Melville’s last three decades. Melville’s greatest love was for the paintings of Claude Lorrain, which he viewed in Rome’s Sciarra Gallery in 1857. As Tamarkin elaborates, Melville was attracted to Claude and other artists whose dreamlike atmospheric effects produced meditative states. Tamarkin’s essay offers new readings of ekphrastic descriptions in Melville’s poems, a number of which were inspired by Claude’s sense of looking at nature as if through a darkened mirror.

In “Melville’s Planetary Compass,” Timothy Marr emphasizes the Melville who looked directly at nature, asserting that his engagement with the planet informed his literary expression. Taking account of the full sweep of Melville’s writings in poetry and prose, Marr identifies three large strains in those writings that emerged from his planetary thinking: a desire for pantheistic merging with a paradisal nature; a fear of perilous encounters with a heartless materialism (or sharkishness) in a world that can seem a type of hell; and a willingness to take consolation in nature’s regenerative processes. Marr discusses Melville’s awareness of the new geological sciences, which had undercut ideas of fixity, and suggests that such knowledge had an impact on Melville’s development as an experimental writer. Ultimately,
though, Marr offers a new way of thinking about Melville and religion, depicting a Melville who is less interested in the Bible and other sacred texts than in the planet itself.

The volume concludes with two essays that help us to think about the future of Melville studies. In “Wound, Beast, Revision: Versions of the Melville Meme,” John Bryant takes the figure of the meme – a circulating unit for carrying cultural ideas, symbols, and images, particularly on the Internet – and applies the term to Melville himself. Investigating Melville as meme in relation to the traumas he discerns in Melville’s life and writings, Bryant raises provocative questions about who or what “Melville” is, making clear that the Melville we think we know may be just one of many revisions and adaptations. Looking to the future, Bryant describes how the Melville Electronic Library (MEL), the digital project he created and directs, promises to develop new ways of editing, reading, visualizing, and circulating Melville texts; in other words, MEL will help to create new Melville memes. Moving from digital studies to a book about Melville published in 1949 might seem counterintuitive when considering the future of Melville studies, but as Christopher Castiglia elaborates in “Cold War Allegories and the Politics of Criticism,” Richard Chase’s Herman Melville: A Critical Study (1949), a key text in the modern revival of Melville, though now relatively neglected, can help us to reorient our own thinking about Melville. Chase saw Melville as a visionary allegorist whose imaginative works posed a challenge to conformity, nurtured social ideals, and opened new worlds to readers. We could use more Richard Chases in our own time, Castiglia argues, critics who are willing to think beyond Cold War– and New Historian–inflected formulations of authorial blindness and complicity to develop new ways of reading for literary and cultural possibility.

A writer as rich, complex, and prolific as Melville cannot be contained by critics or a critical volume, I am happy to say. Even with fifteen essays in this New Companion, I am aware of the gaps, and I also know that this volume, like the 1998 Companion, must be of its time. Still, it is my hope that the New Companion will play a significant role in guiding this and the next generation of Melville readers to a number of the most compelling aspects of Melville’s writings. Some of the contributors discuss Melville’s work in the context of current critical conversations while others seek to initiate new conversations, but what links all of the essays are the contributors’ recognitions of Melville’s importance to our lives as readers. In the concluding paragraph of his essay, Christopher Castiglia writes, “Revisiting one of the greatest allegorists of the antebellum period might be an occasion to discover a Melville for our time, and to investigate new approaches for enlivening that Melville, one of which might be to affirm, as Melville
and Chase did, the imaginative idealism possible in and through literature.” These invigorating words about the imaginative genius of Melville and the regenerative power of literature seem a perfect way of concluding The New Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville.

NOTES

1 See the selected bibliography at the end of this volume for complete bibliographical information on the biographies by Parker and Delbanco and the books on Hawthorne and Melville (edited by Argersinger and Person) and Douglass and Melville (edited by Levine and Otter). The bibliography displays the wide range of work in Melville studies of the last fifteen years.

2 See, for example, the influential article by Edward Said, “Islam and the West Are Inadequate Banners,” The Observer, September 15, 2001, Web (accessed April 29, 2012), which compared the hunt for Osama bin Laden to Ahab’s hunt for the white whale.


4 On Jake Heggie and Gene Scheer’s new opera, Moby-Dick, see Robert K. Wallace, Heggie and Scheer’s Moby-Dick: A Grand Opera for the Twenty-First Century (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013). For a striking recent example of a visual artist’s response to Moby-Dick, see Matt Kish’s Moby-Dick in Pictures: One Drawing for Every Page (Portland, OR: Tin House, 2011). (The cover image on the paperback edition of this New Companion is from Kish’s volume; see also recent Melville-inspired art by Robert Del Tredici, George Klauba, and Kathleen Piercefield.) Chad Harbach’s The Art of Fielding (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2011) is one of a number of novels of the past decade that have found inspiration in Melville.


Melville and the Nonhuman World

Do you want to know how I pass my time? – I rise at eight – thereabouts – & go to my barn – say good-morning to the horse, & give him his breakfast. (It goes to my heart to give him a cold one, but it can’t be helped.) Then, pay a visit to my cow – cut up a pumpkin or two for her, & stand by to see her eat it – for it’s a pleasant sight to see a cow move her jaws – she does it so mildly & with such a sanctity. – My own breakfast over, I go to my work-room & light my fire – then spread my M.S.S on the table – take one business squint at it, & fall to with a will.

Herman Melville to Evert Duyckinck, December 13, 1850 (L 174)

Sometime in the early 1850s, the writer Maunsell B. Field and the illustrator Felix O. C. Darley visited Herman Melville at his home in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. In a collection of reminiscences published two decades later, Field writes that he and Darley “found Melville, whom I had always known as the most silent man of my acquaintance, sitting on the porch in front of his door. He took us to a particular spot on his place to show us some superb trees. He told me that he spent much time there patting them upon the back.” All three men then went to see Melville’s neighbor, the poet/physician Oliver Wendell Holmes. At first, “the talk, in which all tried to participate, dragged,” but when “the conversation drifted to East India religions and mythologies … there arose a discussion between Holmes and Melville, which was conducted with the most amazing skill and brilliancy on both sides. It lasted for hours, and Darley and I had nothing to do but to listen. I never chanced to hear better talking in my life.”

Tree patting and sparkling talk, like cow feeding and novel writing, might seem to have little in common. But there is, in each case, something subtly linking these apparently unrelated activities. What Field is most struck by in Melville’s remark about his trees is that he speaks of “patting them upon the back” – that he not only perceives the trees as beings like himself, with nobly vertical spines, but is moved to socialize with them. Although the nature of that socialization is, in Field’s anecdote, unclear, the evidence of Melville’s work suggests (as I will show) that it involves both receiving inspiration from the trees and conveying friendly, admiring feelings to them. Something